



County of Sacramento

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 6, Sections 15070 and 15071 of the California Code of Regulations and pursuant to the Procedures for Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents adopted by the County of Sacramento pursuant to Sacramento County Ordinance No. SCC-116, the Environmental Coordinator of Sacramento County, State of California, does prepare, make, declare, publish, and cause to be filed with the County Clerk of Sacramento County, State of California, this Mitigated Negative Declaration re: The Project described as follows:

1. Control Number: PLNP2023-00010

2. Title and Short Description of Project: Mann Road Wireless Communication Facility

The project is a request for the following entitlements from the County of Sacramento:

1. A **Use Permit** to allow a new wireless communication facility on an A-5 zoned parcel.
2. A **Special Development Permit** to allow the proposed project to deviate from the following development standards:
 - A height of 85 feet where the maximum height allowed is 55 feet pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Table 3.6.2 and;
 - A reduced setback of 205 feet from the adjacent group 1 zone parcel to the west where the minimum setback required is three times the height of the tower, 255 feet, pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 3.6.2.
3. A **Design Review** to determine substantial compliance with the *Sacramento County Countywide Design Guidelines* (Design Guidelines).

The applicant proposes a new 85-foot Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) tower with a monopine stealthing design and an associated 40ft by 40ft lease area to include a fenced concrete pad for ground equipment, to be located in the southwest portion of the subject parcel. Associated ground equipment would include two ground mounted radio cabinets, a generator, and utility panels. The tower and ground lease area both include space provisions for future equipment collocation by other carriers.

3. Assessor's Parcel Number: 134-0211-007-0000

4. Location of Project: The subject parcel is located at 10230 Davis Road, at the intersection of Mann Road and Davis Road, in the unincorporated Cosumnes Community of Sacramento County.

5. Project Applicant: Assurance Realty obo Vertical Bridge

6. Said project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

- a. It will not 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.
- b. It will not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.
- c. It will not have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

- d. It will not have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
7. As a result thereof, the preparation of an environmental impact report pursuant to the Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California) is not required.
8. The attached Initial Study has been prepared by the Sacramento County Office of Planning and Environmental Review in support of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. Further information may be obtained by contacting Sacramento County Planning and Environmental Review at 827 Seventh Street, Room 225, Sacramento, California, 95814, or phone (916) 874-6141.

Joelle Inman

Joelle Inman

Environmental Coordinator

County of Sacramento, State of California

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT INFORMATION

CONTROL NUMBER: PLNP2023-00010

NAME: Mann Road Wireless Communication Facility

LOCATION: The subject parcel is located at 10230 Davis Road, at the intersection of Mann Road and Davis Road, in the unincorporated Cosumnes Community of Sacramento County.

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER: 134-0211-007-0000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is a request for the following entitlements from the County of Sacramento:

1. A **Use Permit** to allow a new wireless communication facility on an A-5 zoned parcel.
2. A **Special Development Permit** to allow the proposed project to deviate from the following development standards:
 - A height of 85 feet where the maximum height allowed is 55 feet pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Table 3.6.2 and;
 - A reduced setback of 205 feet from the adjacent group 1 zone parcel to the west where the minimum setback required is three times the height of the tower, 255 feet, pursuant to Zoning Ordinance 3.6.2.
3. A **Design Review** to determine substantial compliance with the *Sacramento County Countywide Design Guidelines* (Design Guidelines).

The applicant proposes a new 85-foot Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) tower with a monopine stealthing design and an associated 40ft by 40ft lease area to include a fenced concrete pad for ground equipment, to be located in the southwest portion of the subject parcel. Associated ground equipment would include two ground mounted radio cabinets, a generator, and utility panels. The tower and ground lease area both include space provisions for future equipment collocation by other carriers.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The subject parcel is a 10 acre A-5 zoned parcel in the Cosumnes Community (Plate IS-1). The parcel is currently developed with one storage structure used as a garage for personal vehicles. The property owner owns and resides on the immediately adjacent parcel to the west (Plate IS-2). Surrounding parcels are zoned A-5 to the west and south, A-2 to the north, and A-10 to the east. All surrounding parcels are currently developed with single family residences (Plate IS-3).

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed an Initial Study Checklist (located at the end of this report). The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area. The topical discussions that follow are provided only when additional analysis beyond the Checklist is warranted.

Plate IS-1: Project Overview Map





Plate IS-2: Project Vicinity Map

4/19/23, 10:25 AM


<https://inside.gis.saccounty.gov/exportmaps/39d2c25c-2c63-4a9b-a8ad-c76d3ad8f554.html>

SACRAMENTO COUNTY **PLNP2023-00010** Print date: 4/19/2023




1" = 1192'

Plate IS-3 Zoning



1" = 595'

Plate IS-4: Site Plan



CLIENT

verticalbridge

750 PARK OF COMMERCE DR.
SUITE 200 | BOCA RATON, FL 33487
561.948.6367

SITE ACQUISITION

AD
ASSURANCE
DEVELOPMENT

1499 HUNTINGTON DR., SUITE 305
SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030
626.705.9079

NO.	SUBMITAL / REVIEW	BY	DATE
B	ISSUED FOR ZONING	APP	21/05/23
A	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	APP	12/14/22

DRAWING: APP
DESIGNED: RP
CHECKED: BK

PROJECT NUMBER: US-CA-5449

PROJECT TITLE:
**US-CA-5449
SC60017A
MANN ROAD**
10230 DAVIS RD,
WILTON, CA 95693

ENGINEER STAMP:

DRAWING TITLE:
SITE PLAN


DRAWING SCALE:
AS NOTED

DATE:
2023

UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE STATE AND/OR LOCAL LAWS

DRAWING NUMBER:
A-1


Plate IS-5: Enlarged Compound Plan



ENLARGED COMPOUND PLAN

750 PARK OF COMMERCE DR. SUITE 200 BOCA RATON, FL 33487 561.945.8397	
CLIENT AD ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT 1499 HUNTINGTON DR. SUITE 305 SOUTH PASADENA, CA 91030 626.765.9079	
PROJECT NUMBER: US-CA-5449	
PROJECT TITLE: US-CA-5449 SC60017A MANN ROAD 10230 DAVIS RD, WILTON, CA 95693	
ENGINEER STAMP:	
DRAWING TITLE: ENLARGED COMPOUND PLAN	
DRAWING SCALE: AS SHOWN	ZD
DATE: 2023	
UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE STATE AND / OR LOCAL LAWS	
DRAWING NUMBER: A-2	

Plate IS-6: Proposed Elevations of Mono-Pine



CLIENT
verticalbridge

750 PARK OF COMMERCE DR.
SUITE 200 | BOCA RATON, FL | 33487
561.948.6367

SITE ACQUISITION

AD
ASSURANCE
DEVELOPMENT

1499 HUNTINGTON DR. | SUITE 305
SOUTH PASADENA, CA | 91030
626.765.3079

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY
1	ISSUED FOR ZONING	APP	01/05/23
2	ISSUED FOR REVIEW	APP	12/14/22
3	SUBMITTAL REVIEW	BY	DATE

DRAWING: APP
DESIGNED: RP
CHECKED: SL

PROJECT NUMBER: US-CA-5448

PROJECT TITLE:
US-CA-5449
SC60017A
MANN ROAD
10230 DAVIS RD.
WILTON, CA 95693

ENGINEER STAMP:

DRAWING TITLE:
ELEVATIONS

DRAWING SCALE:
AS SHOWN

DATE:
03/23

UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS A VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE STATE AND LOCAL LAWS

DRAWING NUMBER:
A-4

LAND USE

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

REGULATORY SETTING

Sacramento County Zoning Code section 3.6.7. stipulates the development standards for wireless towers. Projects that are within a group 1 zoning category [group 1 includes the following zones: RD, AR, O, C-O, RM-2, DW, RR, and SPA zoning districts (unless otherwise specified in the particular SPA ordinance)], are subject to a Conditional Use Permit to be approved by the Planning Commission.

Table 3.6.2 further specifies development standards for wireless facilities including the following standards applicable to the group 1 zone:

- A maximum height of 55 feet; and,
- Separation from a group 1 zoned property – 3 times the height of the tower

PROJECT ANALYSIS

The project seeks a Special Development Permit to allow the proposed project to deviate from the standards specified in Zoning Code section 3.6.7 and outlined above. The project requests a deviation to allow an 85 foot tower in a zone where the maximum height is 55 feet. The project site is also a group 1 zoned parcel (AR-5) surrounded by properties that are also a group 1 zoning classification (agricultural residential uses). With a proposed tower height of 85 feet, the separation requirements from adjacent group 1 properties would be 255 feet (3 times the height of the 85 foot tower).

The height and separation requirements in the zoning code were adopted to address land use compatibility and aesthetics (see aesthetics discussion below). The proposed tower location would be located 205 feet from the neighboring group 1 zoned parcel, fifty feet less than stipulated by the zoning code. However, agricultural residential properties tend to be larger than other group 1 zoned properties and contain more open space and undeveloped land within the parcel. As such, when measured to the sensitive uses (the onsite residences), the proposed tower location will be a distance greater than three times the tower height from the neighboring residence (approximately 280 feet), and the residence on the subject parcel (approximately 400 feet). Therefore, the project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Impacts associated with land use are **less than significant**.

AESTHETICS

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The degree of impact of a project, either negative or beneficial, to the visual character of the area is largely subjective. Few objective or quantitative standards are available to analyze visual quality, and individual viewers respond differently to changes in the physical environment.

The 85-foot tall mono-pine would be visible from the nearby residential properties. Under CEQA, an evaluation of a project's potential visual change as viewed from private property is not required (*Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside*, 119 Cal.App.4th 477 [Cal. Ct. App. 2004]). Therefore, the analysis focuses on the potential of the project to substantially degrade visual character from public viewpoints. The property is not located on a State Scenic Highway and the general vicinity does not contain a scenic vista.

Photo simulations of the project can be found in Plates IS-7 through IS-10. The mono-pine style tower has life-like branches for concealment of the antennas. The equipment shelter will be located within a 40' x 40' lease area, behind an 8-foot high chainlink fence with green privacy slats. The proposed project is located in a semi-rural environment with above ground utilities, power lines and poles, and accessory buildings along Mann Road and Davis Road.

The mono-pine would be visible from motorists traveling along Mann Road and Davis Road, which are not heavily traveled roadways. The Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) met on May 11, 2023 and recommended the Planning Commission find the project in substantial compliance with the County's Design Guidelines. Given the existing development and utilities that are visually present in the existing viewshed of the agricultural-residential environment, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on the existing visual character. The project is consistent with policies governing scenic resources and has been found consistent with objective County design standards. Impacts associated with aesthetics are ***less than significant***.

Plate IS-7 - Photo Simulation

AERIAL MAP



COPYRIGHT: GOOGLE MAPS, 2023

PROPOSED



DISCLAIMER: THIS IS A RENDERING REPRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ONLY

PHOTO PROVIDED BY: ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT

EXISTING



<p>DRAFTLINK CONTACT: JAMES HU EMAIL: JHU@DRAFTLINK.COM PHONE: 951-222-1000 WWW.DRAFTLINK.COM</p>	<p>AD ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT</p>	NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY
		0	01/12/23	ISSUED FOR SUBMITTAL	JFT



US-CA-5449
MANN ROAD
10230 DAVIS ROAD
WILTON, CA 95693

VIEW	SHEET
A	1 / 4

Plate IS-8 - Photo Simulation

AERIAL MAP



COPYRIGHT: GOOGLE MAPS, 2023

PROPOSED



DISCLAIMER: THIS IS A RENDERING REPRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ONLY

PHOTO PROVIDED BY: ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT

EXISTING



 <p>DRAFTLINK CONTACT: JAMES WU EMAIL: JAMES@DRAFTLINK.COM PHONE: (925) 231-0081 WWW.DRAFTLINK.COM</p>	 <p>AD ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT</p>	NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY		<p>US-CA-5449 MANN ROAD 10230 DAVIS ROAD WILTON, CA 95693</p>	VIEW	SHEET
		0	01/13/23	ISSUED FOR SUBMITTAL	JFY			B	2 / 4

Plate IS-9 - Photo Simulation

AERIAL MAP



EXISTING



PROPOSED



DISCLAIMER: THIS IS A RENDERING REPRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ONLY

PHOTO PROVIDED BY: ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT



NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY
0	01/13/23	ISSUED FOR SUBMITTAL	JFY



US-CA-5449
MANN ROAD
 10230 DAVIS ROAD
 WILTON, CA 95693

VIEW	SHEET
C	3 / 4

Plate IS-10 - Photo Simulation

AERIAL MAP



COPYRIGHT: GOOGLE MAPS, 2023

EXISTING



PROPOSED



DISCLAIMER: THIS IS A RENDERING REPRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT ONLY

PHOTO PROVIDED BY: ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT

<p>DRAFTLINK CONTACT: JAMES HU EMAIL: JHU@DRAFTLINK.COM PHONE: (951) 233-0000 WWW.DRAFTLINK.COM</p>	<p>AD ASSURANCE DEVELOPMENT</p>	NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY
		0	01/13/23	ISSUED FOR SUBMITTAL	JFT



US-CA-5449
MANN ROAD
10230 DAVIS ROAD
WILTON, CA 95693

VIEW	SHEET
D	4 / 4

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species.

NATIVE TREES

Sacramento County has identified the value of its native and landmark trees and has adopted measures for their preservation. The Tree Ordinance (Chapter 19.04 and 19.12 of the County Code) provides protections for landmark trees and heritage trees. The County Code defines a landmark tree as “an especially prominent or stately tree on any land in Sacramento County, including privately owned land” and a heritage tree as “native oak trees that are at or over 19” diameter at breast height (dbh).” Chapter 19.12 of the County Code, titled Tree Preservation and Protection, defines native oak trees as valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), interior live oak (*Quercus wislizenii*), blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), or oracle oak (*Quercus morehus*) and states that “it shall be the policy of the County to preserve all trees possible through its development review process.” It should be noted that to be considered a tree, as opposed to a seedling or sapling, the tree must have a diameter at breast height (dbh) of at least 6 inches or, if it has multiple trunks of less than 6 inches each, a combined dbh of 10 inches. The Sacramento County General Plan Conservation Element policies CO-138 and CO-139 also provide protections for native trees:

CO-138. Protect and preserve non-oak native trees along riparian areas if used by Swainson’s Hawk, as well as landmark and native oak trees measuring a minimum of 6 inches in diameter or 10 inches aggregate for multi-trunk trees at 4.5 feet above ground.

CO-139. Native trees other than oaks, which cannot be protected through development, shall be replaced with in-kind species in accordance with established tree planting specifications, the combined diameter of which shall equal the combined diameter of the trees removed.

Native trees other than oaks include Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), California black walnut (*Juglans californica*), Oregon ash (*Fraxinus latifolia*), western redbud (*Cercis occidentalis*), gray pine (*Pinus sabiniana*), California white alder (*Alnus rhombifolia*), boxelder (*Acer negundo*), California buckeye (*Aesculus californica*), narrowleaf willow (*Salix exigua*), Gooding’s willow (*Salix gooddingii*), red willow (*Salix laevigata*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), shining willow (*Salix lucida*), Pacific willow (*Salix lasiandra*), and dusky willow (*Salix melanopsis*).

PROJECT ANALYSIS – NATIVE TREES

The project site has one oak tree located along the proposed frontage road. The access road will encroach on the dripline of the tree. However, there is an existing dirt access road in the same location as the proposed access road, which currently encroaches in

the oak dripline. No significant grading is proposed in the vicinity of the existing tower, and the project proposal will not cause additional impacts within the oak dripline area. Impacts to native trees would be ***less than significant***.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

A desktop survey and habitat evaluation were conducted by Planning and Environmental Review (PER) staff. The project site consists of a large agricultural residential lot with scattered accessory buildings and disked pasture land. There are no jurisdictional waters onsite. Potential presence of special status species is limited to nesting birds. Species that have the potential to be impacted by the project are discussed further below.

SWAINSON'S HAWK

The Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is listed as a threatened species by the State of California and is a candidate for federal listing as threatened or endangered. It is a migratory raptor typically nesting in or near valley floor riparian habitats during spring and summer months. Swainson's hawks were once common throughout the state, but various habitat changes, including the loss of nesting habitat (trees) and the loss of foraging habitat through the conversion of native Central Valley grasslands to certain incompatible agricultural and urban uses has caused an estimated 90% decline in their population.

Swainson's hawks feed primarily upon small mammals, birds, and insects. Their typical foraging habitat includes native grasslands, alfalfa, and other hay crops that provide suitable habitat for small mammals. Certain other row crops and open habitats also provide some foraging habitat. The availability of productive foraging habitat near a Swainson's hawk's nest site is a critical requirement for nesting and fledgling success. In central California, about 85% of Swainson's hawk nests are within riparian forest or remnant riparian trees. CEQA analysis of impacts to Swainson's hawks consists of separate analyses of impacts to nesting habitat and foraging habitat.

The CEQA analysis provides a means by which to ascertain impacts to the Swainson's hawk. When the analysis identifies impacts, mitigation measures are established that will reduce impacts to the species to a less than significant level. Project proponents are cautioned that the mitigation measures are designed to reduce impacts and do not constitute an incidental take permit under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Anyone who directly or incidentally takes a Swainson's hawk, even when in compliance with mitigation measures established pursuant to CEQA, may violate the California Endangered Species Act.

SWAINSON'S HAWK NESTING IMPACTS

For determining impacts to and establishing mitigation for nesting Swainson's hawks in Sacramento County, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) recommends utilizing the methodology set forth in the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (Swainson's Hawk TAC 2000). The document recommends that surveys be conducted for the two survey periods immediately prior to the start of construction. The five survey periods are defined by the timing of migration, courtship, and nesting in a typical year (refer to Table IS-1). Surveys

should extend a ½-mile radius around all project activities, and if active nesting is identified, CDFW should be contacted.

Table IS-1: Recommended Survey Periods for Swainson’s Hawk (TAC 2000)

Period #	Timeframe	# of surveys required	Notes
I.	Jan. 1 – Mar. 20	1	Optional, but recommended
II.	Mar. 20 – Apr. 5	3	
III.	Apr. 5 – Apr. 20	3	
IV.	Apr. 21 – June 10	N/A	Initiating surveys is not recommended during this period
V.	June 10 – July 30	3	

For example, if a project is scheduled to begin on June 20, three surveys should be completed in Period III and three surveys in Period V, as surveys should not be initiated in Period IV. It is always recommended that surveys be completed in Periods II, III and V.

This recommendation would require a minimum of four surveys. Due to the fact that no trees will be removed, and that construction only involves construction of a 40’x40’ pad and 85-foot WCF with no significant earthwork or extensive machinery, a single pre-construction survey is sufficient for the project and would be required 30 days prior to construction.

The nearest Swainson’s Hawk nest, according to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Data Portal (CNDDDB), is 0.55 miles away from the project site. There are suitable nesting trees along the perimeter of the project site parcel and in the vicinity. To avoid impacts to nesting raptors, mitigation involves pre-construction nesting surveys to identify any active nests and to implement avoidance measures if nests are found – if construction will occur during the nesting season of March 1 to September 15. The purpose of the survey requirement is to ensure that construction activities do not agitate or harm nesting raptors, potentially resulting in nest abandonment or other harm to nesting success. If nests are found, the developer is required to contact CDFW to determine what measures need to be implemented in order to ensure that nesting raptors remain undisturbed. The measures selected will depend on many variables, including the distance of activities from the nest, the types of activities, and whether the landform between the nest and activities provides any kind of natural screening. If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. Mitigation will ensure that impacts to Swainson’s hawk will be ***less than significant***.

MIGRATORY NESTING BIRDS

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, which states “unless and except as permitted by regulations, it shall be unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, kill, attempt to take, capture, or kill” a migratory bird. Section 3(19) of the Federal Endangered Species Act defines the term “take” means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Causing a bird to abandon an active nest may cause harm to egg(s) or chick(s) and is therefore considered “take.” To avoid take of nesting migratory birds, mitigation has been included to require that activities either occur outside of the nesting season, or to require that nests be buffered from construction activities until the nesting season is concluded.

Large trees in the project vicinity provide potential nesting habitat for migratory birds. To avoid take of nesting migratory birds, mitigation has been included either to require that activities occur outside of the nesting season, or to require that nests be buffered from construction activities until the nesting season is concluded. Impacts to migratory birds are ***less than significant***.

NESTING BIRDS OF PREY

This section addresses raptors that are not listed as endangered, threatened, or of special concern, but are nonetheless afforded general protections by the Fish and Game Code. Raptors and their active nests are protected by the California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5, which states: It is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds of prey, or raptors) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto. Section 3(19) of the Federal Endangered Species Act defines the term “take” means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Causing a bird to abandon an active nest may cause harm to egg(s) or chick(s) and is therefore considered “take.” Thus, take may occur both as a result of cutting down a tree or as a result of activities nearby an active nest which cause nest abandonment.

Raptors within the Sacramento region include tree-nesting species such as the red-tailed hawk and red-shouldered hawk, as well as ground-nesting species such as the northern harrier. The following raptor species are identified as “special animals” due to concerns over nest disturbance: Cooper’s hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, golden eagle, northern harrier, and white-tailed kite. The project site perimeter does contain trees that could provide suitable habitat for nesting birds of prey. Construction of the tower could cause nesting birds to be disturbed and could possibly abandon established nesting sites nearby.

To avoid impacts to nesting raptors, mitigation involves pre-construction nesting surveys to identify any active nests and to implement avoidance measures if nests are found – if construction will occur during the nesting season of March 1 to September 15. The purpose of the survey requirement is to ensure that construction activities do not agitate or harm nesting raptors, potentially resulting in nest abandonment or other harm to nesting success. If nests are found, the developer is required to contact CDFW to

determine what measures need to be implemented in order to ensure that nesting raptors remain undisturbed. The measures selected will depend on many variables, including the distance of activities from the nest, the types of activities, and whether the landform between the nest and activities provides any kind of natural screening. If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. Mitigation will ensure that impacts to nesting raptors will be **less than significant**.

BURROWING OWL

According to the California Fish and Wildlife life history account for the species, burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) habitat can be found in annual and perennial grasslands, deserts, and arid scrublands characterized by low-growing vegetation. Burrows are the essential component of burrowing owl habitat. Both natural and artificial burrows provide protection, shelter, and nesting sites for burrowing owls. Burrowing owls typically use burrows made by fossorial mammals, such as ground squirrels or badgers, but also use human-made structures such as cement culverts; cement, asphalt, or wood debris piles; or openings beneath cement or asphalt pavement. Burrowing owls are listed as a California Species of Special Concern due to loss of breeding habitat.

Burrowing owls may use a site for breeding, wintering, foraging, and/or migration stopovers. Breeding season is generally defined as spanning February 1 to August 31 and wintering from September 1 to January 31. Occupancy of suitable burrowing owl habitat can be verified at a site by detecting a burrowing owl, its molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, or excrement at or near a burrow entrance. Burrowing owls exhibit high site fidelity, reusing burrows year after year.

According to the California Fish and Wildlife “Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation” (March 2012), surveys for burrowing owl should be conducted whenever suitable habitat is present within 500 feet of a proposed impact area; this is also consistent with the “Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines” published by The California Burrowing Owl Consortium (April 1993). Occupancy of burrowing owl habitat is confirmed whenever one burrowing owl or burrowing owl sign has been observed at a burrow within the last three years.

The California Fish and Wildlife Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation indicates that the impact assessment should address the factors which could impact owls, the type and duration of disturbance, the timing and duration of the impact, and the significance of the impacts. The assessment should also take into account existing conditions, such as the visibility and likely sensitivity of the owls in question with respect to the disturbance area and any other environmental factors which may influence the degree to which an owl may be impacted (e.g. the availability of suitable habitat).

The project site contains open grassland. There could be suitable habitat for burrowing owls to use the site for breeding, burrowing and foraging. Mitigation The construction footprint of the proposed project is small in comparison to the parcel as a whole, but if burrowing owl are present in the vicinity, then individual birds could be disturbed by construction activities. Mitigation has been included in the form of preconstruction

surveys to ensure that burrowing owl are not present within the construction footprint or the vicinity. Impacts to burrowing owls are ***less than significant***.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section supplements the Initial Study Checklist by analyzing if the proposed project would:

- Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials.

MICROWAVE EMISSIONS

Potential impacts associated with microwave emissions will be less than significant, per the following analysis.

PERSONAL WIRELESS SERVICE FACILITIES BACKGROUND

Three of the major types of personal wireless communication services currently in use are described below (information from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) website at http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/index.htm?job=wtb_services_home (Accessed 5/22/2023)).

CELLULAR TELEPHONE SERVICE

Cellular telephone service is an extension of ordinary telephone services, except that it utilizes radio waves instead of wire to transmit and receive telephone calls. The cellular radiotelephone service is intended to provide customers with mobile telephone service over a broad geographic area. A cellular system operates by dividing a large geographic service area into cells and assigning the same frequencies to multiple, non-adjacent cells. This is known as “frequency reuse”. When a cellular subscriber makes or receives a call, the call is connected to the nearest cell site. As a subscriber travels within a cellular provider’s service area, the cellular telephone call in progress is transferred, or “handed-off”, from one cell site to another without noticeable interruption. The smaller and more numerous a provider’s cells are, the more it can reuse frequencies and the more users it can accommodate. In addition, all the cells in a cellular system are connected to a mobile telephone switching office (MTSO) by wireline (landline) or microwave links. The MTSO switches wireline-to-mobile and mobile-to-wireline calls between the public switched telephone network (PSTN) and the cell site. Cellular radio systems operate in the 824 – 849 MHz and 869 – 894 MHz frequency range, per FCC allocation.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES (PCS)

PCS encompasses two different licensed services offered over two different frequency bands, as well as certain unlicensed service. “Narrowband” PCS operates on frequencies in the 901 – 941 MHz range and is suitable for offering a variety of specialized services such as Messaging and two-way paging. “Broadband” PCS is similar to cellular radiotelephone service, except that PCS operates in a higher frequency band (1850 – 1990 MHz) which allows for a wider variety of communications services such as digital,

voice, data and paging transmissions, over the same spectrum. Because PCS operates at a higher frequency than cellular service, PCS systems may require more antenna transmitters in the same geographic area.

WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE (WCS)

WCS may provide fixed, mobile, radiolocation or satellite communication services to individuals and businesses within their assigned spectrum block and geographical area. The WCS is capable of providing advanced wireless phone services which are able to pinpoint subscribers in any given locale. WCS is used to provide a variety of mobile services, including an entire family of new communication devices utilizing very small, lightweight, multi-function portable phones and advanced devices with two-way data capabilities. WCS systems are able to communicate with other telephone networks as well as with personal digital assistants, allowing subscribers to send and receive data and/or video messages without connection to a wire. By FCC allocation, WCS operates in one of two bands: 2305 – 2320 MHz and 2345 – 2360 MHz.

ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS (EMFs) AND SAFETY STANDARDS

The FCC published “A Local Government Official’s Guide to Transmitting Antenna RF Emission Safety: Rules, Procedures, and Practical Guidance” (June 2, 2000, hereafter called RF Guide), the purpose of which is to ensure that the antenna facilities located in communities comply with the FCC’s limits for human exposure to radiofrequency (RF) electromagnetic fields. The RF Guide explains the science of RF and the electromagnetic spectrum, the exposure guidelines and rules, and explains the procedures for compliance. The FCC Office of Engineering and Technology has also published Bulletin 56 (and 65, an addendum) in 1999, which answers many common questions about RF and about exposure limits. The RF Guide and Bulletins 56 and 65 are incorporated by reference and are available for review at the Division of Planning and Environmental Review, 827 7th Street, Room 225, Sacramento or online at <http://www.fcc.gov/oet/rfsafety/> (Accessed 7/26/22). The information below is based entirely upon the incorporated publications.

As discussed above, personal wireless service facilities utilize radio waves to transmit and receive telephone calls. Radio waves and microwaves are forms of electromagnetic energy that are collectively described by the term "radiofrequency" or "RF." RF emissions can be discussed in terms of "energy," "radiation" or "fields." Radiation is simply defined as the movement of energy through space in the form of waves or particles. Electromagnetic radiation is when both electric and magnetic energy move together. The term "electromagnetic field" is used to indicate the presence of electromagnetic energy at a specific location. Like any wave-related phenomenon, electromagnetic energy is described by a wavelength and a frequency. RF signals are transmitted over a wide range of frequencies. The frequency of an RF signal is expressed in terms of cycles per second, or “Hertz” (Hz).

The range of wavelengths and frequencies of electromagnetic radiation is known as the electromagnetic spectrum. The frequency of the wave corresponds to its energy: a high frequency wave has high energy. Waves with sufficient energy are “ionizing”, that is, they are capable of stripping electrons from atoms and molecules, which results in a

fundamental alteration of the nature of those molecules. Only very high-frequency waves, such as X-rays and gamma rays, have sufficient energy to ionize atoms and molecules. At the low-frequency end of the electromagnetic spectrum are low-energy, non-ionizing waves such as radio waves and visible light. Radiation described as non-ionizing does not have sufficient energy to alter the nature of the atoms and molecules it encounters.

Electromagnetic energy is common in the environment, resulting from numerous human-made and natural sources. Human-made sources include electrical wiring, utility lines, appliances, computers, and television and radio broadcasts. Natural sources include the human body, the earth's magnetic field, and visible light. Electric and magnetic fields produced by every-day electrical appliances, radio waves, and microwaves are low-energy – even visible light is higher energy than these sources. High-energy waves at the top of the spectrum are X-rays and gamma rays.

The rate at which an organism will absorb RF energy is specific to the type of organism – this is referred to as the specific absorption rate (SAR), defined as the power absorbed per mass of tissue (watts per kilogram). Therefore, standards for maximum safe exposure are set to limit the specific absorption rate (SAR) below a maximum permissible level as averaged over the human body. The absorption of this energy can result in thermal effects – that is, the energy produced causes heating of the tissues. At low-level RF radiation exposure, such as what is generated by appliances, cellular phones, and cellular towers, significant heating effects or health hazards are not observed.

To ensure that exposure remains well below safe limits, in August 1996 the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) adopted guidelines for evaluating the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions (FCC, (1996) Report and Order, ET Docket No. 93-62 Washington, D.C.). The guidelines effectively set a national radio frequency (RF) exposure standard based on elements of both the 1992 revision of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard for RF exposure and the exposure criteria recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP).

The 1996 FCC limits for maximum permissible exposure specifies two tiers of exposure criteria, one tier for “controlled environments” (usually involving occupational environments) and a second, more stringent tier for “uncontrolled environments” (usually involving the general public). The FCC limits set the allowable specific absorption rate (SAR) level from *localized* exposure (e.g., hand-held devices) at 1.6 watts per kilogram (W/kg) for the general public (uncontrolled environments), as averaged over 1 gram of tissue. The FCC recommended exposure limits for generalized exposure are summarized in Table 1 of Bulletin 56, which includes maximum power density levels for RF energy originating from communication sites (as well as other sources). The levels are determined based on continuous exposure, are dependent on the frequency which is transmitted from the site, and are usually expressed in milliwatts per square centimeter (mW/cm²).

Generally, personal wireless services such as cellular, PCS, and WCS transmit in a frequency range of 300 – 3000 MHz (megahertz). Power density limits for uncontrolled

environments (i.e., general public) from transmitters in this range are calculated by dividing the frequency by 1500 (f/1500). Therefore, a facility transmitting at a frequency of 870 MHz would have a maximum recommended power density of 0.58 mW/cm². At frequencies of 1500 – 100,000MHz the maximum power density is set at 1.0 mW/cm².

REGULATORY BACKGROUND

Section 704 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the “1996 Act”) addresses federal, state and local government oversight of site selection for personal wireless service facilities such as towers for cellular, personal communication services, and specialized mobile radio transmitters. The 1996 Act states the following regarding a local government’s jurisdiction pertaining to the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions (FCC, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (1996), Fact Sheet #1 National Wireless Facilities Siting Policies, Washington, D.C.):

“No state or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission’s regulations concerning such emissions.”

On January 1, 1997, the new Guidelines adopted by the FCC (referred to as “the Commission” in the 1996 Act section cited above) went into effect. As discussed above, the new guidelines set a national RF exposure standard which is based on elements of both the 1992 revision of the ANSI/IEEE standard and the exposure criteria recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. In addition, the updated guidelines are based on recommendations from those federal agencies responsible for health and safety, including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH) of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). The FCC has stated that the updated guidelines will ensure that the public and workers are adequately protected from exposure to potentially harmful RF emissions.

PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION

There are no known significant biological effects associated with cellular facilities when they are operated at or below FCC-adopted standards. At this location, the applicant is proposing an 85-foot tall mono-pole that will accommodate twelve (12) 8-foot direction panel antennas and six (6) RRUs (remote radio units). The applicant provided a Radio Frequency Emissions Compliance Report prepared by William Hammett, Registered Professional Engineer, which included an engineering statement confirming compliance with radiofrequency radiation exposure limits (Appendix A). There are specific FCC regulations regarding radiofrequency exposure that address the actions necessary to bring an accessible area into compliance with the 5% power density exposure limit. Hammett & Edison, Inc. performed predictive modeling, following the FCC requirements, for the proposed project. No significant environmental impacts related to EMF emissions are expected as a result of this project; impacts are ***less than significant***.

TOWER FAILURE

Communication towers are manufactured under rigid conditions and the design and required safety factors are specified in the Uniform Building Code. The pole fabrication process is subject to independent inspection. The tower and foundation designs will be engineered to meet or exceed all requirements of the Uniform Building Code. The codes take into account the various stress loads that could be placed on the tower structure by earthquake, winds, storms, and any other combinations of high stress factors. The safety factors involved in the manufacture of these poles and their installation results in a very large margin of safety.

Accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), a Standard entitled “Structural Standards for Antenna Supporting Structures and Antennas” has been established for the design, superstructure, and foundation of telecommunication towers. This standard is designated as ANSI/TIA-222, provisions F and G, and is the governing document for telecommunication towers in the United States. The development of the standard was sponsored by the *Telecommunication* Industry Association (TIA) subcommittee TR-14.7. The key aspects discussed in the document are: modernization of the design of new towers and existing towers, definition of wind and ice load, and applicable requirements in the case of seismic activity.

DISCUSSION

The “fall drop zone” (radius of tower failure) for the proposed project is estimated to be within an 85± foot radius of the tower center. The area that would be affected by potential pole collapse consists of open agricultural field and a few storage containers. The distance from the footprint of the mono-pole to the single-family residential to the east is approximately 280-feet. No residential structures occur within the potential fall zone of the tower. Monopole failure has the potential to impact vehicles parked within the fall drop zone. However, as the monopole is an engineer-designed structure that will comply with the safety factors specified in the Uniform Building Code, monopole failure is considered extremely unlikely. Potential impacts as a result of monopole collapse are therefore considered ***less than significant***.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measures A-F are critical to ensure that identified significant impacts of the project are reduced to a level of less than significant. Pursuant to Section 15074.1(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, each of these measures must be adopted exactly as written unless both of the following occur: (1) A public hearing is held on the proposed changes; (2) The hearing body adopts a written finding that the new measure is equivalent or more effective in mitigating or avoiding potential significant effects and that it in itself will not cause any potentially significant effect on the environment.

As the applicant, or applicant’s representative, for this project, I acknowledge that project development creates the potential for significant environmental impact and agree to

implement the mitigation measures listed below, which are intended to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Applicant _____ Date: _____

MITIGATION MEASURE A: BASIC CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS CONTROL PRACTICES

The following Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices are considered feasible for controlling fugitive dust from a construction site. The practices also serve as best management practices (BMPs), allowing the use of the non-zero particulate matter significance thresholds.

Control of fugitive dust is required by District Rule 403 and enforced by District staff.

- Water all exposed surfaces two times daily. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to soil piles, graded areas, unpaved parking areas, staging areas, and access roads.
- Cover or maintain at least two feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Limit vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, parking lots to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

The following practices describe exhaust emission control from diesel powered fleets working at a construction site. California regulations limit idling from both on-road and off-road diesel-powered equipment. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) enforces idling limitations and compliance with diesel fleet regulations.

- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes [California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485]. Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- Provide current certificate(s) of compliance for CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation [California Code of Regulations, Title 13, sections 2449 and 2449.1]. For more information contact CARB at 877-593-6677, doors@arb.ca.gov, or www.arb.ca.gov/doors/compliance_cert1.html.

- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic

MITIGATION MEASURE B: SWAINSON'S HAWK SURVEY (TAC 2000)

If construction, grading, or project-related improvements are to commence between February 1 and September 15, focused surveys for Swainson's hawk nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within a ½-mile radius of project activities, in accordance with the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (Swainson's Hawk TAC 2000). To meet the minimum level of protection for the species, surveys should be completed for the two survey periods immediately prior to commencement of construction activities in accordance with the 2000 TAC recommendations. If active nests are found, CDFW shall be contacted to determine appropriate protective measures, and these measures shall be implemented prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities. If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required.

MITIGATION MEASURE C: MIGRATORY BIRD NEST PROTECTION

To avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds the following shall apply:

1. If construction activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) is to commence within 50 feet of nesting habitat between February 1 and August 31, a survey for active migratory bird nests shall be conducted no more than 14 day prior to construction by a qualified biologist.
2. Trees slated for removal shall be removed during the period of September through January, in order to avoid the nesting season. Any trees that are to be removed during the nesting season, which is February through August, shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist and will only be removed if no nesting migratory birds are found.
3. If active nest(s) are found in the survey area, a non-disturbance buffer, the size of which has been determined by a qualified biologist, shall be established and maintained around the nest to prevent nest failure. All construction activities shall be avoided within this buffer area until a qualified biologist determines that nestlings have fledged, or until September 1.

MITIGATION MEASURE D: RAPTOR NEST PROTECTION

If construction activity (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) is to commence within 500 feet of suitable nesting habitat between March 1 and September 15, a survey for raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The survey shall cover all potential tree and ground nesting habitat on-site and off-site up to a distance of 500 feet from the project boundary. The survey shall occur within 30 days of the date that construction will encroach within 500 feet of suitable habitat. The biologist shall supply a brief written report (including date, time of survey, survey method, name of surveyor and

survey results) to the Environmental Coordinator prior to ground disturbing activity. If no active nests are found during the survey, no further mitigation will be required. If any active nests are found, the Environmental Coordinator and California Fish and Wildlife shall be contacted to determine appropriate avoidance/protective measures. The avoidance/protective measures shall be implemented prior to the commencement of construction within 500 feet of an identified nest.

MITIGATION MEASURE E: BURROWING OWL

Prior to the commencement of construction activities (which includes clearing, grubbing, or grading) within 500 feet of suitable burrow habitat, a survey for burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The survey shall occur within 30 days of the date that construction will encroach within 500 feet of suitable habitat. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the following:

1. A survey for burrows and owls should be conducted by walking through suitable habitat over the entire project site and in areas within 150 meters (~500 feet) of the project impact zone.
2. Pedestrian survey transects should be spaced to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the ground surface. The distance between transect center lines should be no more than 30 meters (~100 feet), and should be reduced to account for differences in terrain, vegetation density, and ground surface visibility. To efficiently survey projects larger than 100 acres, it is recommended that two or more surveyors conduct concurrent surveys. Surveyors should maintain a minimum distance of 50 meters (~160 feet) from any owls or occupied burrows. It is important to minimize disturbance near occupied burrows during all seasons.
3. If no occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found in the survey area, a letter report documenting survey methods and findings shall be submitted to the Environmental Coordinator and no further mitigation is necessary.
4. If occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found, then a complete burrowing owl survey is required. This consists of a minimum of four site visits conducted on four separate days, which must also be consistent with the Survey Method, Weather Conditions, and Time of Day sections of Appendix D of the California Fish and Wildlife "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (March 2012). Submit a survey report to the Environmental Coordinator which is consistent with the Survey Report section of Appendix D of the California Fish and Wildlife "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (March 2012).
5. If occupied burrows or burrowing owls are found the applicant shall contact the Environmental Coordinator and consult with California Fish and Wildlife prior to construction, and will be required to submit a Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan (subject to the approval of the Environmental Coordinator and in consultation with California Fish and Wildlife). This plan must document all proposed measures, including avoidance, minimization, exclusion, relocation, or other measures, and include a plan to monitor mitigation success. The California Fish and Wildlife "Staff

Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation” (March 2012) should be used in the development of the mitigation plan.

MITIGATION MEASURE F: CULTURAL RESOURCES UNANTICIPATED DISCOVERY

In the event that human remains are discovered in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, work shall be halted and the County Coroner contacted. For all other unexpected cultural resources discovered during project construction, work shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist may evaluate the resource encountered.

1. Pursuant to Sections 5097.97 and 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, if a human bone or bone of unknown origin is found during construction, all work is to stop and the County Coroner and the Office of Planning and Environmental Review shall be immediately notified. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours, and the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposition of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods.
2. In the event of an inadvertent discovery of cultural resources (excluding human remains) during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained at the Applicant’s expense to evaluate the significance of the find. If it is determined due to the types of deposits discovered that a Native American monitor is required, the Guidelines for Monitors/Consultants of Native American Cultural, Religious, and Burial Sites as established by the Native American Heritage Commission shall be followed, and the monitor shall be retained at the Applicant’s expense.
 - a. Work cannot continue within the 100-foot radius of the discovery site until the archaeologist and/or tribal monitor conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources.
 - b. If a potentially-eligible resource is encountered, then the archaeologist and/or tribal monitor, Planning and Environmental Review staff, and project proponent shall arrange for either 1) total avoidance of the resource, if possible; or 2) test excavations or total data recovery as mitigation. The

determination shall be formally documented in writing and submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator as verification that the provisions of CEQA for managing unanticipated discoveries have been met.

MITIGATION MEASURE COMPLIANCE

Comply with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for this project as follows:

1. The proponent shall comply with the MMRP for this project, including the payment of a fee to cover the Office of Planning and Environmental Review staff costs incurred during implementation of the MMRP. The MMRP fee for this project is \$3,100. This fee includes administrative costs of \$1,039.00.
2. Until the MMRP has been recorded and the administrative portion of the MMRP fee has been paid, no final parcel map or final subdivision map for the subject property shall be approved. Until the balance of the MMRP fee has been paid, no encroachment, grading, building, sewer connection, water connection or occupancy permit from Sacramento County shall be approved.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential environmental impacts. Based on this guidance, Sacramento County has developed the following Initial Study Checklist. The Checklist identifies a range of potential significant effects by topical area. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to impacts as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act as follows:

- 1 Potentially Significant indicates there is substantial evidence that an effect MAY be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant" entries an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. Further research of a potentially significant impact may reveal that the impact is actually less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
- 2 Less than Significant with Mitigation applies where an impact could be significant but specific mitigation has been identified that reduces the impact to a less than significant level.
- 3 Less than Significant or No Impact indicates that either a project will have an impact but the impact is considered minor or that a project does not impact the particular resource.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
1. LAND USE - Would the project:					
a. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		Sacramento County Zoning Code section 3.6.7. stipulates development standards for wireless towers. The project seeks a Special Development Permit to allow the proposed project to deviate from development standards. Please refer to the land use section above.
b. Physically disrupt or divide an established community?				X	The project will not create physical barriers that substantially limit movement within or through the community.
2. POPULATION/HOUSING - Would the project:					
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of infrastructure)?				X	The proposed infrastructure project is intended to service existing or planned development and will not induce substantial unplanned population growth.
b. Displace substantial amounts of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	The project will not result in the removal of existing housing, and thus will not displace substantial amounts of existing housing.
3. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or areas containing prime soils to uses not conducive to agricultural production?				X	The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the current Sacramento County Important Farmland Map published by the California Department of Conservation. The site does not contain prime soils.
b. Conflict with any existing Williamson Act contract?				X	The project site is located on a Williamson Act contract site. Per County code Sec. 51238 (a) (2), Wireless Communication Facilities are a compatible land use.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Introduce incompatible uses in the vicinity of existing agricultural uses?				X	The project is a compatible land on the Williamson Act parcel.
4. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a. Substantially alter existing viewsheds such as scenic highways, corridors or vistas?				X	The project site is 13.6 miles east of the nearest scenic Highway. The project is not in the vicinity of any scenic highways, corridors, or vistas.
b. In non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings?			X		It is acknowledged that aesthetic impacts are subjective and may be perceived differently by various affected individuals. Nonetheless, given the non-urban environment in which the project is proposed, it is concluded that the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the project site or vicinity. The project is consistent with policies associated with aesthetics, please refer to the Aesthetics discussion in the Environmental Effects section above.
c. If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X	The project will not occur in an urbanized area.
d. Create a new source of substantial light, glare, or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X	The project will not result in a new source of substantial light, glare or shadow that would result in safety hazards or adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.
5. AIRPORTS - Would the project:					
a. Result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport/airstrip?				X	The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip safety zones.
b. Expose people residing or working in the project area to aircraft noise levels in excess of applicable standards?				X	The project occurs outside of any identified public or private airport/airstrip noise zones or contours.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Result in a substantial adverse effect upon the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft?				X	The project does not affect navigable airspace.
d. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X	The project does not involve or affect air traffic movement.
6. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:					
a. Have an adequate water supply for full buildout of the project?				X	The project will not result in increased demand for water supply.
b. Have adequate wastewater treatment and disposal facilities for full buildout of the project?				X	The project will not require wastewater services.
c. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X	The Kiefer Landfill has capacity to accommodate solid waste until the year 2050.
d. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new water supply or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities or expansion of existing facilities?				X	The project will not require construction or expansion of new water supply, wastewater treatment, or wastewater disposal facilities.
e. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of storm water drainage facilities?				X	Project construction would not require the addition of new stormwater drainage facilities.
f. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of electric or natural gas service?			X		Minor extension of utility lines would be necessary to serve the proposed project. Existing utility lines are located along existing roadways and other developed areas, and the extension of lines would take place within areas already proposed for development as part of the project. No significant new impacts would result from utility extension.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
g. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of emergency services?			X		The project would incrementally increase demand for emergency services, but would not cause substantial adverse physical impacts as a result of providing adequate service.
h. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of public school services?				X	The project will not require the use of public school services.
i. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of park and recreation services?				X	The project will not require park and recreation services.
7. TRANSPORTATION - Would the project:					
a. Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) – measuring transportation impacts individually or cumulatively, using a vehicles miles traveled standard established by the County?				X	The project will not increase vehicle trips.
b. Result in a substantial adverse impact to access and/or circulation?				X	No changes to existing access and/or circulation patterns would occur as a result of the project.
c. Result in a substantial adverse impact to public safety on area roadways?				X	No changes to existing access and/or circulation patterns would occur as a result of the project; therefore no impacts to public safety on area roadways will result.
d. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X	The project does not conflict with alternative transportation policies of the Sacramento County General Plan, with the Sacramento Regional Transit Master Plan, or other adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
8. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:					
a. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X		The project does not exceed the screening thresholds established by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment. The project is within the screening criteria for construction related impacts related to air quality. The project site is less than 35 acres, and does not involve buildings more than 4 stories tall; demolition activities; significant trenching activities; an unusually compact construction schedule; cut-and-fill operations; or, import or export of soil materials requiring a considerable amount of haul truck activity. Basic Construction Emissions Control Practices have also been included as a mitigation measure with which the project must comply. The project meets the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's screening criteria for PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} and Ozone precursors.
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations in excess of standards?			X		There are no sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, nursing homes, hospitals, daycare centers, etc.) adjacent to the project site. See Response 8.a.
c. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X	The project will not generate objectionable odors.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
9. NOISE - Would the project:					
a. Result in generation of a temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established by the local general plan, noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?				X	The project is not in the vicinity of any uses that generate substantial noise, nor will the completed project generate substantial noise. The project will not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of applicable standards.
b. Result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?			X		Project construction will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. This impact is less than significant due to the temporary nature of the these activities, limits on the duration of noise, and evening and nighttime restrictions imposed by the County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 6.68 of the County Code).
c. Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.				X	The project will not involve the use of pile driving or other methods that would produce excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels at the property boundary.
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:					
a. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge?				X	The project will not substantially increase water demand over the existing use.
b. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project area and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X		The project does not involve any modifications that would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern and/ or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would lead to flooding.
c. Develop within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map or within a local flood hazard area?				X	The project is not within a 100-year floodplain as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, nor is the project within a local flood hazard area.
d. Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain?				X	The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
e. Develop in an area that is subject to 200 year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP)?				X	The project is not located in an area subject to 200-year urban levels of flood protection (ULOP).
f. Expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X	The project will not expose people or structures to a substantial risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
g. Create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?			X		The minor increase in impervious surface area would not contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater drainage system.
h. Create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality?			X		Compliance with the Stormwater Ordinance and Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance (Chapters 15.12 and 14.44 of the County Code respectively) will ensure that the project will not create substantial sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade ground or surface water quality.
11. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:					
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving 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?				X	Sacramento County is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Although there are no known active earthquake faults in the project area, the site could be subject to some ground shaking from regional faults. The Uniform Building Code contains applicable construction regulations for earthquake safety that will ensure less than significant impacts.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, siltation or loss of topsoil?			X		Compliance with the County's Land Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance will reduce the amount of construction site erosion and minimize water quality degradation by providing stabilization and protection of disturbed areas, and by controlling the runoff of sediment and other pollutants during the course of construction.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
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, soil expansion, liquefaction or collapse?			X		The project is not located on an unstable geologic or soil unit.
d. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available?				X	The project will not require sewer connections.
e. Result in a substantial loss of an important mineral resource?				X	The project is not located within an Aggregate Resource Area as identified by the Sacramento County General Plan Land Use Diagram, nor are any important mineral resources known to be located on the project site.
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		No known paleontological resources (e.g. fossil remains) or sites occur at the project location.
12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community?		X			The Project site is located within ½ mile of a identified Swainson’s Hawk nesting site. Mitigation has been incorporated in the form of a Swainson’s Hawk Nesting Survey. Also, the Project site vicinity may provide nesting habitat for other raptors, migratory birds, and burrowing owl. Mitigation has been incorporated to mitigate any potential impacts to a less than significant level (Mitigation Measures A through C). Refer to the biological resources discussion above.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities?			X		No sensitive natural communities occur on the project site, nor is the project expected to affect natural communities off-site.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on streams, wetlands, or other surface waters that are protected by federal, state, or local regulations and policies?				X	No protected surface waters are located on or adjacent to the project site.
d. Have a substantial adverse effect on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?			X		The project site is a 40 foot by 40 foot piece of the parcel. The project will have minimal impact to the surrounding habitat.
e. Adversely affect or result in the removal of native or landmark trees?			X		The project does not propose to remove any trees. One native oak tree along the frontage of the property would experience minimal encroachment. See discussion above.
f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?			X		The project is consistent with local policies/ordinances protecting biological resources.
g. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, state or federal plan for the conservation of habitat?				X	There are no known conflicts with any approved plan for the conservation of habitat.
13. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?			X		No historical resources would be affected by the proposed project. In the unlikely event that subsurface materials are uncovered during construction, mitigation for inadvertent discoveries has been incorporated.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on an archaeological resource?			X		The Northern California Information Center was contacted regarding the proposed project. A record search indicated that the project site is not considered sensitive for archaeological resources. Mitigation for inadvertent discoveries is incorporated in the event that unknown subsurface resources are uncovered during construction.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X		The project site is located outside any area considered sensitive for the existence of undiscovered human remains. Mitigation for inadvertent discoveries is incorporated in the event that unknown subsurface resources are uncovered during construction.
14. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?			X		Notification pursuant to Public Resources Code 21080.3.1(b) was provided to the tribes and request for consultation was not received. Tribal cultural resources have not been identified in the project area.
15. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:					
a. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.
b. Expose the public or the environment to a substantial hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?			X		The project does not involve the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous material.
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	The project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing /proposed school. The project does not involve the use or handling of hazardous material.
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, resulting in a substantial hazard to the public or the environment?			X		The project is not located on a known hazardous materials site.
e. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan?			X		The project would not interfere with any known emergency response or evacuation plan.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Comments
f. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to or intermixed with urbanized areas?			X		There is no significant risk of loss, injury, or death to people or structures associated with wildland fires. The project is surrounded by rural land use.
16. ENERGY – Would the project:					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction?			X		Compliance with Title 24, Green Building Code, will ensure that all project energy efficiency requirements are met resulting in less than significant impacts.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X		The project will not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.
17. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:					
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		The project will not have the potential to interfere with the County meeting the goals of AB 32 (reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020); therefore, the climate change impact of the project is considered less than significant.
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?				X	The project is consistent with County policies adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

LAND USE CONSISTENCY	Current Land Use Designation	Consistent	Not Consistent	Comments
General Plan	Agricultural-Residential	X		
Community Plan	AR-5	X		

Land Use Zone	AR-5	X		
---------------	------	---	--	--

INITIAL STUDY PREPARERS

Environmental Coordinator: Joelle Inman

Senior Environmental Analyst: Julie Newton

Associate Environmental Analyst: John Q. Barnard IV

Office Manager: Belinda Wekesa-Batts

Administrative Support: Justin Maulit