
(PROJECT #09PLN-02)

**Initial Study and
Proposed Negative Declaration**

Prepared by
City of Grass Valley
125 East Main Street
Grass Valley, CA 95949

March 26, 2009

Proposed **Mitigated Negative Declaration**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Grass Valley has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the City finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. Therefore, this Negative Declaration has been prepared.

LEAD AGENCY: City of Grass Valley
125 East Main Street
Grass Valley, CA. 95945

Contact: Daniel D. Chance, Associate Planner
(530) 274-4333

PROJECT APPLICANT: Metro PCS LLC
785 Orchard Drive. Suite 200
Folsom, CA. 95630

Contact: Ken Crouse
(916) 220-0085

PROPERTY OWNER: Pacific Gas and Electric Company
5555 Perkins Road, Room 112
Sacramento, CA. 95826

Contact: Kurt Eid
(916) 471-8111

PROJECT LOCATION: The project is located at 531 South Auburn Street, northeasterly of South Auburn Street and East Empire Street intersection, in the City of Grass Valley in Nevada County (APN 29-190-58) in the NC (Neighbor Center) Zoning District.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project is a Use Permit for the construction of a 90-foot monopole, with four antennas mounted at the 83-foot elevation of the tower, and an equipment cabinet and panels located within a 392-square foot, fenced, area on a property at 531 South Auburn Street in Grass Valley. The subject property currently consists of an electrical substation and related buildings on 2.58 acres. The project includes artificial branches, needles and bark on the monopole to create a conifer tree appearance, similar to conifer trees in the immediate area. The facility would be located in the rear of the property, approximately 70-feet from an apartment building to the east. The upper portion of the monopole and antennas would be visible from South Auburn Street, East Empire Street and State Highway 20. Existing pines and cedars to the south, east, and north will screen a majority of the facility and tower. The monopole provides for the potential co-location of two additional telecommunication firms at the 73 and 63-foot elevations.

REVIEW PERIOD: March 31, 2009 to April 30, 2009

**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY
INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

1. **Application Number:** 09PLN-03
2. **Applicant's/Representative's Name and Address:** Ken Crouse
Metro PCS LLC
785 Orchard Drive. Suite 200
Folsom, CA. 95630
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Grass Valley,
Community Development Department
125 East Main Street
Grass Valley, CA 95945
4. **Project Description:** The project is a Use Permit for the construction of a 90-foot monopole, with four antennas mounted at the 83-foot elevation of the tower, and an equipment cabinet and panels located within a 392-square foot, fenced, area on a property at 531 South Auburn Street in Grass Valley. The subject property currently consists of an electrical substation and related buildings on 2.58 acres. The project includes artificial branches, needles and bark on the monopole to create a conifer tree appearance, similar to conifer trees in the immediate area. The facility would be located in the rear of the property, approximately 70-feet from an apartment building to the east. The upper portion of the monopole and antennas would be visible from South Auburn Street, East Empire Street and State Highway 20. Existing pines and cedars to the south, east, and north will screen a majority of the facility and tower. The monopole provides for the potential co-location of two additional telecommunication firms at the 73 and 63-foot elevations.
5. **Project Location:** The project is located at 531 South Auburn Street, northeasterly of South Auburn Street and East Empire Street intersection, in the City of Grass Valley in Nevada County (APN 29-190-58) in the NC (Neighbor Center) Zoning District.
6. **General Plan Designation:** Office/Professional
7. **Zoning:** NC (Neighborhood Center)
8. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- X I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ___ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ___ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ___ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ___ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to the earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature _____ Date _____

Printed Name _____ For _____

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be significantly affected by this project as indicated by the checklist in the following sections:

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

CEQA GUIDANCE

Appendix I of the State CEQA Guidelines was used in answering the checklist questions:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the discussion. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the discussion shows that the impact simply does not

apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained when it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15063[c][D]). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., General Plans, Land Use Codes). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Identification of the potential for residual significant adverse environmental impacts would trigger the need for preparation of an EIR. For issue areas in which no significant adverse impact would result or impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation, further analysis is not required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS				
Would the proposal:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			x	
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, tree, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic state highway?			x	
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			x	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in this area?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

a-d. The project is located northeasterly of the South Auburn Street and East Empire Street intersection in the southeastern portion of Grass Valley. This area represents the southern entryway to the City, and any development would require review for visual impacts. Existing pines and cedars will screen a percentage of the facility and tower. The upper portion of the monopole and antennas would be visible from South Auburn Street, East Empire Street, and State Highway 20; but would not be visible from State Highway 49.

Existing cedars to the south, east, and north will screen a large percentage of the facility and tower from the residential apartments located to the east and East Empire Road to the south. Ponderosa pines located further up the hillside create a backdrop to the telecommunication tower. As a condition of approval, the project would be required to provide landscaping around the fenced in area of the equipment structure and monopole to provide screening. The purpose of the landscape vegetation is to reduce the visual impact of the base of the monopole and equipment facility at the base of the facility. The landscaping screening for the facility shall be drought tolerant, native species. With the implementation of the condition for landscaping, the base of the facility would have a less than significant visual impact.

Impact Discussion: The City of Grass Valley's General Plan goal and objectives include protection of major views in the planning area, that include hillsides, ridgelines and forested view; as well as improving the entrances to the community. The monopole would be visible from eastbound State Highway 20 as one enters the City of Grass Valley. The majority of the proposed project would be screened by the existing trees located on and in the general vicinity of the property. The upper portion of the tower shall be designed to mimic a conifer tree similar to trees in the immediate area. With the imitation tree appearance for the tower, the project would not have a significant visual impact on the City's entryway or have an impact on aesthetics. The pole shall be covered with a dark brown, epoxy to simulate bark and branches with pine needles along a majority of the tower. Construction plans shall reflect the "monopine" design. The colors used for the monopine shall be the same as the pine and/or cedar trees in the immediate area. Color and bark-material samples shall be submitted to the Community for review and approval prior to issuance of the building permit.

Conclusion: No significant impacts associated with aesthetics or scenic resources are anticipated with this telecommunication facility project. No mitigation measures would be required for air quality.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AIR QUALITY				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.				
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			x	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			x	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			x	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			x	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a.-e. The overall air quality in Nevada County is good but two known air quality problems exist, the Ozone and Suspended Particulate Matter (PM-10). Nevada County is considered to be “non-attainment” for both pollutants. PM-10 in Grass Valley meets federal ambient ozone standards but exceeds more stringent State standards in the winter, primarily due to wood smoke from the use of wood stoves and fireplaces. Violations in the summer months have been noted during forest fires or periods of open burning. The PM-10 is usually associated with dust generated during construction. The scope of construction for this project (388-square feet of disturbed area) would not create the amount of dust that would create a significant impact. The use of the telecommunication will not generate pollutants, odors or impact air movement in the immediate area.

Conclusion: No significant impacts associated with air quality are anticipated with this telecommunication facility project. No mitigation measures would be required for air quality.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the proposal:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			x	
b. 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 California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			x	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			x	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native residents or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			x	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			x	
f. Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a.-b. The 2.58-acre site currently consists of large electrical substation for PG&E, and three buildings. The location of the telecommunication facility is proposed on a portion of the property that has been previously disturbed. The site includes limited non-native landscaping associated with the electrical utilities taking place on the property. The native trees on the site includes a significant number of cedar trees. Elderberry shrubs exist on the property. The Valley elderberry longhorn beetle is listed as a threatened species and is fully protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The beetle is entirely dependent on elderberry shrub as its host to complete its lifecycle. This beetle is usually located in the central valley of California, however, anytime an elderberry shrub is located, specific established criteria is required to limit the potential impacts on the beetle. The elderberry shrubs are located a distance away from the proposed project, and would

not be impacted with the construction or use of this project. Pacific Gas and Electric has already implemented protection measures for the elderberry shrubs and Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, if the beetle exists on the site.

c-d. No wetlands or riparian habitat exist on the property. No vegetation or wildlife habitat associated with the riparian or wetland habitat exists on the property. No wildlife corridor or nursery sites exist on the project site. The site does not represent an identified a native grassland or woodland habitat, and though small native animal and bird species may be viewed on the property, no substantial ground cover or habitat exists on the property.

e. No native trees are located within the proposed site and the immediate area. No existing trees would be impacted with the proposed telecommunication facility.

f. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans, NCCP's, or local conservation plans in the area.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with biological resources are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required for the biological resources section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the proposal:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?			x	
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			x	
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			x	
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-d. The site is currently has an existing commercial structure on the property with signs of having been disturbed. The General Plan identifies the cultural sensitivity of the property as moderate. The grading and past development has disturbed the property reducing the potential for cultural resources on the property. The limited amount of disturbance required for the telecommunication facility further decreases the potential of accidentally discovery cultural resources during construction.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with cultural resources are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required for the cultural resources section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structure to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			x	
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			x	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			x	
iv. Landslides?			x	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?			x	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable because of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			x	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			x	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a.-e. The Soil Survey of Nevada County identifies a majority of the soils on the project site as “Musick sandy loam 15 to 50%.” This is a well drained soil with an erosion hazard potential is high, and run-off is medium to rapid. This soil is generally considered a stable soil. The Geologic Map of Western Nevada County identifies the geologic make-up of the immediate area as Quartz Diorite. There are no identified active fault lines on the property. The City of Grass Valley is located in the low intensity zone for earthquake severity. The average gradient of the site is 15% over the property. The site does not contain any unique geologic or physical features. No landslides or subsidence of the site is expected. The project as proposed is not expected to result in significant short-term and long-term geologic impacts. Erosion hazard potential is considered low. All projects are required to incorporate measures into the grading plan to minimize any short-term risks. The soils associated with this site are stable and the small structures are not expected to impact the site’s

geologic or soil stability.

The City shall review and approve all plans for grading, and through on-site inspections ensure all erosion control measures are implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

No significant geologic impacts are expected to occur as a result of the project. No mitigation is required for the geology and soils section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIAL				
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			x	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			x	
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	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			x	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			x	
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			x	
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			x	

h. Expose people of structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	x
--	---

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-h. There could be a potential for exposure to the public of electromagnetic emissions (EME) associated with the telecommunication facility. The telecommunication facility is located on a property currently used as an electrical substation, with residential uses surrounding the site. A Radio Frequency Emissions Analysis Report was prepared for the project on January 30, 2009 by SVG Technologies, Inc. The report identified the MPE (Maximum Permissible Exposure limit) standard at 0.08 Watts/Kg. The anticipated exposure to the residential apartment's located 70-feet to the east is less than 9% of that standard; with those residential uses at 100-feet is less than 5% of that standard. The EME is proposed to be very low and not a significant impact.

Nevada County and the City of Grass Valley have a high probability for naturally occurring serpentine, ultramafic rock or naturally occurring asbestos. The geologic make-up of this area is Quartz Diorite, which is not the type of rock that contains serpentine or ultramafic rock containing asbestos.

All of Nevada County has a potential for mine waste that could include mercury, arsenic, serpentine and naturally occurring asbestos. The scope of construction for this project (392 square feet of disturbed area) with limited grading would not create the potential of disturbing a significant amount of mine waste. In addition, the use associated with a telecommunication facility would not have the potential for long term exposure to mine waste. The project would have no significant impact associated with mine waste.

Conclusion:

No significant impact associated with health hazards is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the health hazards section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			x	
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			x	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			x	
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			x	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			x	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			x	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			x	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			x	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-j. The project site is located within the Wolf Creek Drainage Basin. Wolf Creek is located westerly of the property. There are no water bodies or wetlands on or adjacent to this site. The total square footage of area to be disturbed with this project is 392-square feet. The size of the project would not create a significant increase in stormwater runoff or water quality from the telecommunication facility, or significantly increase runoff with the existing structures on the property. The project would be required to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMP's) as part of this project to ensure no run-off from the site has the potential of impacting downstream areas. The BMP's may require adequate silt screens or hay bales, depending on the time of year the work is to be performed. No significant impacts associated with water is anticipated with this telecommunication facility project. No mitigation measures would be required for stormwater runoff or water quality.

Conclusion:

Impacts associated with hydrology and water quality resources are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the hydrology and water quality section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. LAND USE PLANNING				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?			X	
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or Land Use Code) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X	
d. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmland from incompatible uses)?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-d. The General Plan designation for the property is Office/Professional. The property is zoned Neighborhood Center (NC) District. The communication facility is an allowed use with a Use Permit. The Development Code has specific criteria for Telecommunication facilities. The property is currently used an electrical substation, with several buildings, consistent with the General Plan and Zoning. The project proposes development of a telecommunication facility consisting of a monopole and equipment structure. The proposed telecommunication facility is consistent with the criteria in the Development Code. Under that criteria, when a project is to be considered in any other zone than a P (Public) zone, the applicant shall provide evidence that no other feasible Public zones exists. The applicant has submitted evidence that no other locations exists. Although, Public and Open Space zoning districts exist further up the hill to the east, heavily forested areas limit the use of those locations for a telecommunication facility. No impacts were identified associated with the land use and planning with the proposed development. No mitigation measures would be required for the land use section.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with land use and planning are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required for the land use section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. MINERAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-b. The project is not expected to result in the use of mineral resources for the proposed site improvements. No significant impact on mineral resource use is anticipated. The project is not located near a possible Mining Conservation area as defined in the Mineral Management Element. The project would not have an impact associated with the potential Mining Conservation area.

Conclusions

Impacts associated with mineral resources are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the mineral resource section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. NOISE.				
Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels?			X	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-d. The General Plan establishes maximum allowable noise levels for different land uses. The project site is located within an existing electric substation in a commercially zoned area, adjacent to residential homes. The operation of the telecommunication facility is not anticipated to have a significant noise impact. Temporary noise will occur during construction. The City has established hours for construction which will minimize the neighbors exposure to the construction noise. Once completed, the telecommunication facility would not generate significant noise. No significant impact associated with noise is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the noise.

e-f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or near a private or public airport.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with noise are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the noise section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-c. The current zoning for the parcel is NC (Neighborhood Center). The project site is currently developed with an electrical substation. No significant impact on housing and population is anticipated with this telecommunication facility project.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with population and housing are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the population and housing section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
12. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?			x	
ii. Police protection?			x	
iii. Schools?			x	
iv. Parks?			x	
v. Other Public Facilities?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a. The project is located within the City limits of Grass Valley, and within the service boundaries of the City. The project would be served by the City of Grass Valley Fire and Police Departments. With proper fire prevention measures as required under the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code, the project is not expected to significantly impact Fire Department services. Payment of new development fees will address the project's impact on City Fire and Police Department Services.

Conclusion

No significant impact on public services is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the public services section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. RECREATION.				
Would the Project:				
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-b. The proposed telecommunication facility will not create a need for recreational facilities. No significant impact on recreation is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the recreation section.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with recreation are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the recreation section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
Would the proposal:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c. 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	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X	
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a.- b. The telecommunication facility would be located on property located at the intersection of South Auburn Street and East Empire Street. The self contained telecommunication facility will only require monthly inspections by employees and will not generate significant traffic. No significant impacts associated with traffic or transportation is anticipated with this telecommunication facility project. No mitigation measures would be required for traffic or transportation.

c.-e. The project is located outside of the Nevada County Airport flight patterns and would not have an impact on air traffic. The project may be required to provide a warning beacon at the top of the monopine by the FAA (Federal Aviation Association)

f. The telecommunication facility would not be required to provide parking.

Conclusion

Impacts associated with traffic and circulation is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required for the traffic and circulation section.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could have significant environmental effects?			X	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements necessary?			X	
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-g. The proposed telecommunication facility is not connecting to sewer or water. No significant impact on utilities is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the utility services section.

Conclusion:

No significant impact on utilities is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the utility services section

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife species 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?			x	
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, and the effects of probable future projects)			x	
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			x	

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-c. As discussed in sections 1 through 15 above, the project, as mitigated, will not impact habitat of a fish, wildlife or plant species, nor will it create substantial adverse impacts on human beings. The project is consistent with the City's General Plan and, as mitigated, it is not expected to create significant impacts on the environment. No short-term impacts were noted that could lead to potential long-term impacts. Since the project is consistent with the General Plan the project can rely on established impact fees to address any potential cumulative impacts created by this development.

Conclusion: No significant impact associated with cumulative impacts has been identified with this project and other projects in the immediate area. No mitigation measures would be required for this section.

REFERENCES: The following references used in preparing this report have not been attached to this report. The reference material listed below is available for review upon request of the Grass Valley Community Development Department, 125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, CA 95945 (530) 274-4330.

- City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan and General Plan EIR
- Background Report, City of Grass Valley General Plan Update, November 1998
- Soil Survey of Nevada County, United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service,

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Vicinity/Location Map
2. Site Plan