

**LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABILITY
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (LA-RICS)
LAND MOBILE RADIO (LMR) SYSTEM**

Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations



Prepared for:

LA-RICS Joint Powers Authority
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200
Monterey Park, CA 91754

March 2016

This page intentionally left blank



Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	Certification	1-1
1.2	Project	1-2
2.0	LA RICS – LAND MOBILE RADIO SYSTEM PROJECT	2-1
2.1	Project Objectives.....	2-1
2.2	Project Overview	2-2
2.3	Summary of CEQA Compliance	2-3
3.0	CEQA FINDINGS	3-1
3.1	Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant or No Impact	3-1
3.1.1	Aesthetics	3-1
3.1.2	Air Quality	3-2
3.1.3	Biological Resources	3-3
3.1.4	Cultural Resources	3-6
3.1.5	Geology / Soils	3-7
3.1.6	Green House Gases.....	3-9
3.1.7	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3-9
3.1.8	Hydrology / Water Quality.....	3-12
3.1.9	Land Use	3-15
3.1.10	Noise	3-15
3.1.11	Recreation.....	3-17
3.1.12	Transportation / Traffic	3-18
3.1.13	Utilities / Service Systems.....	3-19
3.2	Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Determined to Be Significant but Would Be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level.....	3-21
3.2.1	Aesthetics	3-21
3.2.2	Air Quality	3-21
3.2.3	Biological Resources	3-24
3.2.4	Cultural Resources	3-38
3.2.5	Geology / Soils	3-48
3.2.6	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3-52
3.2.7	Hydrology /Water Quality	3-55
3.2.8	Noise	3-56

3.2.9	Transportation / Traffic	3-58
3.2.10	Utilities / Service Systems.....	3-59
3.3	Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Determined to Be Significant that Cannot be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level.....	3-60
3.3.1	Aesthetics	3-60
3.3.2	Cultural Resources	3-61
3.4	Findings Regarding Cumulatively Considerable Impacts.....	3-67
3.4.1	Findings Regarding Cumulatively Considerable Impacts That Would Be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level.....	3-67
3.4.2	Findings Regarding Cumulatively Considerable Impacts That Cannot Be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level.....	3-70
3.5	Findings Regarding Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR and Revisions to the Final EIR	3-71
4.0	FINDINGS ON ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT.....	4-1
4.1	Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Consideration.....	4-1
4.1.1	Collocation	4-1
4.1.2	Use of Cell on Wheels	4-1
4.1.3	Use of Satellites	4-2
4.1.4	Alternative Systems	4-2
4.2	Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EIR	4-2
4.3	Alternatives and Mitigation Measures Identified in Public Comments	4-6
5.0	CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS	5-9
6.0	STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS	6-1
6.1	Project Significant Impacts	6-1
6.1.1	Aesthetics	6-1
6.1.2	Biological Resources	6-2
6.1.3	Cultural Resources	6-2
6.2	Overriding Considerations.....	6-3

List of Tables

Table 1-1: LMR Project Sites Identified for Potential Construction 1-2

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Term
AB	California Assembly Bill
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
ALUP	Airport Land Use Plan
APE	Area of Potential Effect
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
Authority	Joint Powers Authority
B.A.	Bachelor of Arts degree
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGS	California Geological Survey
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
County	Los Angeles County
COW	cell on wheels
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DPR	California Department of Parks and Recreation
DPS	distinct population segment
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FRP	fiberglass reinforced plastic
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	greenhouse gas
HCP	habitat conservation plan
IC	Information Center
LACDPW	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LA-RICS	Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communication System
LMR	Land Mobile Radio
MHz	Megahertz
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Planning
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOC	network operations center
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O ₃	Ozone

Table of Contents

Acronym/Abbreviation	Term
ppv	peak particle velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
Project	the LA-RICS LMR Project
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
TOWAIR	FCC landing slope facility calculator tool
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UHF	ultra high frequency
U.S.	United States
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WEAP	Worker Environmental Awareness Program

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Certification

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABILITY COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (LA-RICS) LAND MOBILE RADIO (LMR) SYSTEM (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2014081025)

The LA-RICS Board hereby certifies the EIR for the LA-RICS LMR System, State Clearinghouse Number 2014081025. The EIR consists of the Draft EIR, dated January 2016 and Final EIR, dated March 2016. The EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines. The LA-RICS Board has received, reviewed, and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, all hearings, and submissions of testimony from officials representing the County of Los Angeles, as well as from other agencies, organizations, and private individuals with a particular vested interest in the ordinances.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, the Governing Board of the LA-RICS Joint Powers Authority, as lead agency pursuant to CEQA, certifies the following:

- (a) The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
- (b) The Final EIR was presented to the LA-RICS Board, and the LA-RICS Board, as the decision-making body for the LA-RICS Joint Powers Authority, reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the Project;
- (c) The Final EIR reflects the LA-RICS Joint Powers Authority's independent judgment and analysis.

The LA-RICS Joint Powers Authority has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21082.1(c) in retaining its own environmental consultant; directing the consultant in preparation of the EIR; and reviewing, analyzing, and revising material prepared by the consultant. These Findings of Fact (Findings) and Statement of Overriding Considerations have been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Division 13 Sections 21000-21178) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations section 15000 et seq.). The purpose of these Findings is to satisfy the requirements of PRC Section 21081 and Title 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 15090, 15091, 15092, 15093, and 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines, in connection with the approval of an alternative to construct and operate the LMR System.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the foregoing information and recommendations of the LA-RICS staff, as well as any and all other information in the record and Chapter 1 herein, the LA-RICS Board for the Joint Powers Authority hereby makes Findings pursuant to and in accordance with Section 21081

of the Public Resources Code as presented in Chapters 2 through 6 of these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

1.2 Project

The proposed Project as described in the Draft EIR is the installation, and operation of LMR facilities at up to 90 sites; however, the Authority considered a total of 94 sites to provide alternate site locations if some sites subsequently were determined not to be viable during site feasibility assessments, system engineering, geotechnical evaluations, and permitting process or in lease agreement discussions with the property owner. Of these 94 sites, the Authority previously determined that 40 sites are statutorily exempt from CEQA under PRC Section 21080.25, the statutory CEQA exemption adopted specifically for LA-RICS, which, as discussed in Section 1.3.2 of the Draft EIR, exempts certain elements of LMR System from CEQA review so long as they meet certain criteria set forth in the exemption. The Draft EIR includes the remaining 54 sites that did not qualify for the statutory CEQA exemption.

Following publication of the Draft EIR and consideration of all comments received on the Draft EIR, and in light of additional feasibility determinations and design considerations, the Authority has identified 73 sites, out of the 94 originally under consideration, for construction as part of the LMR system. Twenty-nine (29) of these sites are among those statutorily exempt sites already approved by the Authority. The remaining forty four (44) sites analyzed in the EIR, listed in Table 1-1, are the subject of these Findings.

Table 1-1: LMR Project Sites Analyzed in EIR and Identified for Construction

Site ID	Site Name	Address			Jurisdiction
		Street	City	Zip Code	
AGH	Agoura Hills	Unnamed road – nearest intersection Kimberly Dr.	Agoura Hills	91301	Agoura Hills
AJT	AeroJet	Unnamed road – nearest intersection Woodview Rd.	Chino Hills	91709	Chino Hills
ASD	Auto Square Drive	18605 Studebaker Rd.	Cerritos	90703	Cerritos
BJM	Black Jack Peak	Near Airport Rd.	Santa Catalina Island	90704	Los Angeles County
BUR1	Burnt Peak – 1	Angeles National Forest Pine Canyon Rd. to 7N23A	Three Points/Lake Hughes	93532	USFS
CPK	Castro Peak	928 Latigo Canyon Rd.	Malibu	90063	Los Angeles County
DPK	Dakin Peak	Avalon Canyon Rd.	Santa Catalina Island	90704	Los Angeles County
ENC1	Encinal 1 (Fire Camp 13)	1250 S. Encinal Canyon Rd.	Malibu	90265	Los Angeles County

Table 1-1: LMR Project Sites Analyzed in EIR and Identified for Construction

Site ID	Site Name	Address			Jurisdiction
		Street	City	Zip Code	
FRP	Frost Peak (Upper Blue Ridge)	Blue Ridge Rd. 3N06	Wrightwood	92397	USFS
FTP	Flint Peak	3600 Linda Vista Rd.	Glendale	91206	Glendale
GMT	Grass Mountain	San Francisquito Rd. to 6N04	Green Valley	91390	USFS
GRM	Green Mountain	Temescal Canyon Fire Rd.	Los Angeles	90272	Los Angeles
H-17A	H-17A	Intersection of Ridge Fire Rd. and Tank Fire E Rd.	Whittier	90601	Whittier
JOP	Josephine Peak	Angeles Forest Hwy/ Josephine Peak Road	Clear Creek/above La Cañada Flintridge	91011	USFS
JPK	Johnstone Peak - 1	Angeles National Forest	San Dimas	91741	USFS
LACF072	County FS 72	1832 S. Decker Rd.	Malibu	90265	Los Angeles County
LACFCP11	County CP 11	8800 W. Soledad Canyon Rd.	Santa Clarita	91350	USFS
LARICSHQ	LA-RICS Headquarters Building	2525 Corporate Place	Monterey Park	91754	Monterey Park
LEPS	Lower Encinal Pump Station	Intersection of Camino De Buena Ventura and Avenida De La Encinal	Malibu	90265	Malibu
LPC	Loop Canyon	Angeles National Forest – off Forest Route 3N17	Santa Clarita	91350	USFS
MMC	Mount McDill	Sierra Pelona West Mountainway	Palmdale	91390	Palmdale
MML	Magic Mountain Link	Santa Clarita Divide Rd.	above Santa Clarita	91387	USFS
MTL2	Mount Lukens-2	5150 Mount Lukens Truck Trail	Los Angeles	91011	USFS
OAT	Oat Mountain-1	Palo Sola Truck Rd.	Chatsworth	91311	Los Angeles County
PASPD01	Pasadena Police Department	214-290 Ramona St.	Pasadena	91101	Pasadena

Table 1-1: LMR Project Sites Analyzed in EIR and Identified for Construction

Site ID	Site Name	Address			Jurisdiction
		Street	City	Zip Code	
PDC	Pacific Design Center	8687 Melrose Ave.	West Hollywood	90069	West Hollywood
PHN	Puente Hills	Near Vantage Point Dr.	Rowland Heights	91748	Los Angeles County
PMT	Pine Mountain	Hwy 39 to 2N24	above Azusa	91702	USFS
PWT	Portshead Tank	5961 S. Cavalleri Rd.	Malibu	90265	NPS
RIH	Rio Hondo	Near Workman Mill Rd.	Whittier	90601	Los Angeles County
SDW	San Dimas	310 Via Blanca	San Dimas	91773	San Dimas
SGH	Signal Hill	2321 Stanley Ave.	Signal Hill	90755	Signal Hill
SIM	Simpsons' Building	Building 42, Fox Lot, 10201 West Pico Blvd.	Los Angeles	90064	Los Angeles County
SPN	Saddle Peak	24574 W. Saddle Peak Rd.	Malibu	90265	Los Angeles County
SUN	Sunset Ridge	Angeles National Forest	above Claremont	91711	USFS
TOP	Topanga Peak	Topanga Tower Mountain Way	Topanga	90290	Los Angeles County
TPK	Tejon Peak	37407 Gorman Post Rd.	Gorman	93243	Los Angeles County
TWR	Tower Peak	Banning House Rd.	Santa Catalina Island	90704	Los Angeles County
VPK	Verdugo Peak-2	Unnamed road - nearest intersection Hostetter Fire Rd.	Glendale	91214	Glendale
WAD	Walker Drive	409 Walker Dr.	Beverly Hills	90210	Beverly Hills
WMP	Whitaker Middle Peak	Whitaker Fire Rd.; Angeles National Forest	Castaic Lake	91384	USFS
WS1	100 Wilshire	100 Wilshire Blvd.	Santa Monica	90401	Santa Monica
WTR	Whittaker Ridge	Whitaker Fire Rd.; Angeles National Forest	Castaic Lake	91384	USFS
ZHQ	Zuma Life Guard HQ	30050 Pacific Coast Highway	Malibu	90265	Malibu

2.0 LA RICS – Land Mobile Radio System Project

2.1 Project Objectives

The Los Angeles region is designated as a high-threat area by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The LMR system would provide emergency responders with an improved communications system for an efficient and coordinated response to incidents and emergencies that presently is not possible in Los Angeles County.

Effective radio communication is critical in helping police officers prevent and respond to crimes, keeping firefighters safe as they fight blazes, facilitating life-saving exchanges of information between emergency medical service professionals and hospitals, and allowing public works and utility providers the opportunity to coordinate responses to disasters and special events. LMR would support a rapid, safe, and effective response during daily operations. Additionally, it would support a faster, better-coordinated, large-scale response to emergencies such as wildfires, earthquakes, civil disturbance, or other disasters. It would replace the existing aging patchwork of LMR systems with a single county-wide network and would improve overall system capacity and coverage for first and second responders region-wide.

In addition, most public safety entities currently use a portion the radiofrequency spectrum (ultra-high frequency [UHF] T-Band frequency spectrum at 470 to 512 megahertz [MHz]) that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has mandated be vacated by 2023. The LMR system would allow for phase-out of use of the UHF T-Band and transition to the use of the 700-MHz spectrums.

The objectives of the LMR Project are:

- 1) provide day-to-day voice and narrowband data radio communications for first and second emergency responders in the Los Angeles region;
- 2) enable interoperability among member agencies and mutual aid providers ;
- 3) support communication with regional, state, and federal agencies in the event of a natural or man-made disaster;
- 4) improve emergency communications within Los Angeles County;
- 5) add capacity, replace existing aging infrastructure with infrastructure that meets current building codes and telecommunications industry standards that better support modern technology, and provide for more technologically advanced equipment;
- 6) lessen the amount of interference resulting from multiple systems on the same tower by providing greater separation of different radio frequencies;
- 7) provide greater frequency flexibility and increase overall system coverage and capacity by providing greater separation of different radio frequencies; and

- 8) allow for transition from use of the UHF T-Band to the 700-MHz spectrum as mandated by the FCC.

2.2 Project Overview

The LMR system would consist of sites located in Los Angeles County and in adjacent portions of San Bernardino County in southern California that would contain the infrastructure and equipment necessary to provide voice communications coverage throughout Los Angeles County for emergency responders. The LMR Project would be a modern, integrated wireless voice and narrowband data communications system to serve law enforcement, fire service, health service, and public works professionals throughout Los Angeles County. The new system would provide day-to-day communications within and among agencies and allow seamless interagency communications for responding to routine, emergency, and catastrophic events. The LMR system would be composed of four different subsystems:

- 1) Digital Trunked Voice Radio System — provides first responders with radio communications utilizing digital technology. It seamlessly operates on two bands of spectrum (700 MHz and UHF)
- 2) Analog Conventional Voice Radio System — provides first responders with radio communications utilizing conventional analog technology
- 3) Los Angeles Regional Tactical Communications System — consists of local, state, and federal interoperability channels in four different bands of the spectrum in order to allow outside agencies responding to events in the County to have designated channels for communications
- 4) Narrowband Mobile Data Network — a data system that provides critical dispatch communications

The LMR system was designed to provide voice coverage throughout the Authority’s service area, which extends throughout Los Angeles County, with the fewest number of sites possible. Some LMR sites are outside Los Angeles County at locations with sufficient elevation and clear line of sight to achieve increased coverage within Los Angeles County. Locations were selected within or adjacent to existing communications facilities to the maximum extent feasible. The sites include a variety of types (e.g., water tanks, rooftops, police and fire stations, hospitals, mountain peaks, etc.). Most of these locations have existing communications equipment but do not necessarily have communication towers.

The LMR Project would include one or more network operations centers (NOCs) to provide for LMR system monitoring. The NOCs would have the capability of assessing equipment performance and remotely or locally managing the equipment and network to prevent degradation or failure of performance. The NOC(s) would operate 24 hours per day, seven days per week. NOC equipment would be installed internally in an existing facility, such as an existing commercial or public safety facility.

A detailed description of the site components, types, construction, and operation and maintenance is provided in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR.

2.3 Summary of CEQA Compliance

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft EIR accompanied by an Initial Study was distributed to the California State Clearinghouse and to other public agencies on August 26, 2014. The review period for the Initial Study was from August 26 to September 24, 2014. Scoping meetings were held September 11 through September 18, 2014, at the following California communities: Diamond Bar, Lancaster, Woodland Hills, San Pedro, and Lynwood.

Comments received on the Initial Study and during the scoping meetings were addressed in the Draft EIR where applicable.

The Authority published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on January 11, 2016, initiating a 45-day public review and comment period that ended on February 25, 2016. The State Agency review period ended on February 28, 2016. The NOA was published on the LA-RICS website (<http://www.la-rics.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/LA-RICS-LMR-DEIR-NOA-FINAL.pdf>). The availability of the Draft EIR and the dates of public meetings were advertised in the *Los Angeles Times* and other local newspapers.

Public meetings were hosted by the LA-RICS Authority from January 25 through February 16 in the following communities in California:

- Walnut: Walnut Senior Center, Assembly Room
21215, La Puente Road, Walnut CA
Monday January 25, 2016, 6:30 p.m.
- Canoga Park: Canoga Park Branch Library, Meeting Room
20939 Sherman Way, Canoga Park, CA 91303
Tuesday January 26, 2016, 6:30 p.m.
- Culver City: Culver City Veterans Memorial Building, Multipurpose Room
4117 Overland Ave., Culver City, CA 90230
Wednesday January 27, 2016, 6:30 p.m.
- Lancaster: Jane Reynolds Activity Center, Activity room
716 Oldfield St., Lancaster CA 93534
Thursday January 28, 2016, 6:30 p.m.
- San Pedro: Peck Park Community center, Auditorium
560 N. Western Ave. San Pedro, CA 90732
Tuesday February 2, 2016, 6:30 p.m.

- Avalon: Catalina Country Club, Dining Room
1 Country Club Drive, Avalon CA 90704
Monday February 16, 2016, 4:00 p.m.

A Final EIR for the project has been prepared in compliance with CEQA. The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, incorporates and responds to comments received on the Draft EIR, and includes corrections and clarifications to the Draft EIR.

3.0 CEQA Findings

3.1 Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant or No Impact

3.1.1 Aesthetics

AES-1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, ENC1, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PDC, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR, ZHQ

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.1 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which is incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.

AES-2: Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.1 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which is incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at all sites would not substantially damage scenic resources.

AES-3: Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, ENC1, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PDC, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR, ZHQ

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.1 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not substantially degrade existing visual quality or character at these sites or their surroundings.

AES-4: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rational for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.1 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at all sites would not create a new substantial source of light or glare.

3.1.2 Air Quality

AQ-1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Sites: FRP, MMC

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

AQ-2: Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Sites: FRP, MMC

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by

reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to any air quality violation.

AQ-3: Would the project 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)?

Sites: FRP, MMC

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not result in cumulatively considerable net increases of any criteria pollutant.

AQ-4: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at all sites would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

AQ-5: Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at all sites would not result in objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.

3.1.3 Biological Resources

BIO-1. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in

local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or on any species that meets the criteria in CEQA Guidelines Section 15380 for endangered, rare or threatened?

Sites: ASD, LARICSHQ, PDC, SIM, WS1

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would have no impact either directly or through habitat modifications on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or any species meeting criteria in CEQA guidelines 15380 for endangered, rare, or threatened.

BIO-2. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sites: ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, ENC1, FRP, GMT, JPK, LARICSHQ, MMC, MTL2, PASPD01, PDC, PMT, PWT, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TWR, VPK, WAD , WS1, WTR

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFW or USFWS.

BIO-3. Would the project 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by

reference herein. Construction and operation of all sites would not result in substantial adverse effects on federally protected wetlands.

BIO-4. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or impeded the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

BIO-5. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Sites: AGH, ASD, FTP, H-17A, LARICSHQ, MMC, PASPD01, PDC, SDW, SGH, SIM, VPK, WAD , WS1

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

BIO-6. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.

3.1.4 Cultural Resources

CUL-1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CCR §15064.5?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11 LARICSHQ, LEPS, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PDC, PHN, PMT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TPK, TWR, VPK, WMP, WS1, WTR,

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

CUL-2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CCR § 15064.5?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11 LARICSHQ, LEPS, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PDC, PHN, PMT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD ,WMP, WS1, WTR,

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

CUL-3: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Sites: BJM, BUR1, DPK, ENC1, FRP, FTP, GMT, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, PMT, SUN, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD ,WMP, WTR,

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would have no impact on unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.

CUL-4: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PDC, PHN, PMT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would have no impacts on any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries.

CUL-5: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Section 21074?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PDC, PHN, PMT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not impact Tribal cultural resources as defined in PRC Section 21074.

3.1.5 Geology / Soils

GEO-1: Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Strong seismic ground shaking?

Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Landslides?

Sites: AJT, LARICSHQ, PDC, SIM, WS1

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.5 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death, associated with faults, strong seismic shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides.

GEO-2: Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.5 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at all sites would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

GEO-3: Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Sites: AGH, AJT, BJM, BUR1, DPK, ENC1, FRP, GMT, JOP, LACF072, LARICSHQ, LPC, MMC, MML, OAT, PASPD01, PHN, PMT, PWT, SGH, SIM, SUN, TPK, TWR, WMP, WS1, WTR

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.5 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the project.

GEO-4: Would the project 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.5 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not create substantial risks to life and property due to expansive soils identified in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (UBC).

3.1.6 Green House Gases

GHG-1: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.6 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not directly or indirectly generate greenhouse gases (GHGs) that would result in a significant impact on the environment.

GHG-2: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.6 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions.

3.1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by

reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

HAZ-2: Would the project 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions resulting in a release of hazardous materials into the environment.

HAZ-3: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Only two sites (LARICSHQ and PSDPD01) are located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Construction and operation of all sites would not emit hazardous emissions. The use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, substances, or wastes will comply with federal, state, and local regulations.

HAZ-4: Would the project 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?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, ENC1, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR, ZHQ

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. The Project, at the sites identified above, would not be constructed or operated on hazardous material sites listed pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

HAZ-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, ENC1, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PDC, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR, ZHQ

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not result in a safety hazard for people because the sites are not located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

HAZ-6: 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not result in a safety hazard for people because the sites are not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

HAZ-7: Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not impair

implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evaluation plan.

HAZ-8: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Sites: ASD, LARICSHQ, PASPD01, PDC, SGH, WS1

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

3.1.8 Hydrology / Water Quality

WQ-1: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Sites: AJT, LARICSHQ, PDC, SGH, SIM WAD, WS1

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not violate any water quality standard or waste discharge requirement.

WQ-2: Would the project 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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

WQ-3: Would the project 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns of the site or area that would result in substantial erosions or siltation on or off site.

WQ-4: Would the project 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns of the site or area that would substantially increase surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site.

WQ-5: Would the project 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

WQ-6: Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

WQ-7: Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows.

WQ-8: Would the project 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

WQ-9: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PDC, PHN, PMT, RIH, SDW, SGH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR, ZHQ

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at these Project sites would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

3.1.9 Land Use

LU-1: Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.9 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the , adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

LU-2: Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.9 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not conflict with any applicable HCP or NCCP.

3.1.10 Noise

NOI-1: Would the project result in 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.10 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not expose persons to generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies.

NOI-2: Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WMP, WTR

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.10 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at these Project sites would not expose persons to or the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels.

NOI-3: Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WMP, WTR

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.10 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at these Project sites would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project.

NOI-4: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.10 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

NOI-5: 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?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.10 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

3.1.11 Recreation

REC-1: Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.11 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.

3.1.12 Transportation / Traffic

TRANS-1: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.12 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

TRANS-2: Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.12 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

TRANS-3: Would the project 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?

Sites: AGH, AJT, ASD, BUR1, CPK, ENC1, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LARICSHQ, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PASPD01, PDC, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SIM, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WS1, WTR, ZHQ

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.12 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

TRANS-4: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Sites: AGH, AJT, BJM, BUR1, CPK, DPK, ENC1, FRP, FTP, GMT, GRM, H-17A, JOP, JPK, LACF072, LACFCP11, LEPS, LPC, MMC, MML, MTL2, OAT, PHN, PMT, PWT, RIH, SDW, SPN, SUN, TOP, TPK, TWR, VPK, WAD, WMP, WTR

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.12 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not result in inadequate emergency service.

3.1.13 Utilities / Service Systems

UTL-1: Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Sites: AJT, LARICSHQ, PDC, SGH SIM, WAD, WS1

Finding: At the sites identified above, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.13 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of the Project at these sites would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

UTL-2: Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.13 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would not require or result in construction of new or expansion of existing stormwater drainage facilities.

UTL-3: Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in either no impact or less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.13 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would have sufficient water supplies based on existing entitlements and resources and would not require new or expanded entitlements.

UTL-4: Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.13 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation at all Project sites would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

UTL-5: Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Sites: All sites identified in Table 1-1.

Finding: At all sites identified in Table 1-1, the Project would result in no impacts.

Rationale for Finding: The above finding is made based on the analysis in Draft EIR Section 3.13 and applicable site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. Construction and operation of all Project sites would comply with federal, state, and local solid waste statutes and regulations.

3.2 Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Determined to Be Significant but Would Be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level

3.2.1 Aesthetics

AES-3: Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Sites: PASPD01 (discussed at Draft EIR, Pg. 4-1219)¹

Site PASPD01 is within the City of Pasadena’s historic civic center area. The project includes a new 70-foot monopole with attached antennas, along with the associated equipment and equipment shelter. These elements would not be compatible with the civic center’s distinctive Beaux Arts architectural style and feeling. The new structures would represent another “abandonment of architectural standards” that would not be consistent with the setting that led to formation of the historic district. Impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Section 3.1 of the Final EIR and site summary form in Chapter 4 of the DEIR. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure CUL MM 5: Architectural Resources Protection and Camouflage (see Section 3.2.4).**

Rationale for Finding: Architectural Resources Protection and Camouflage shall be sympathetic to the existing landscape, and visually compatible with the surrounding architecture, and acceptable to the property owner and/or host community and minimizing degradation of the character and quality of the site and surrounds. Implementation of CUL MM 5 would mitigate degradation of the existing visual character and quality associated with the construction and operation of the PASPD01 to below the level of significance.

3.2.2 Air Quality

AQ-1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all page numbers refer to pages in the Draft EIR that contain relevant site-specific analysis, which is incorporated by reference herein.

(Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Simultaneous construction of all these Project sites located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) would exceed significance thresholds for nitrogen oxides (NO_x), a precursor for ozone (O₃), and could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Plan. Impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1** below.

AQ MM 1: No later than 12:00 p.m. on the Thursday prior to each week of construction, the contractor shall submit a report to the Authority for review and approval which includes, at minimum, the following information: (1) a list of the types and numbers of pieces of on-site construction equipment that will operate at each Project site within the SCAB on each day of the following week of construction; (2) an estimate of the combined total of NO_x emissions from all construction activities at all Project sites in the SCAB for each day of the week and verification that the total does not exceed 100 pounds; (3) if combined NO_x emissions are forecast to exceed 100 pounds on any day during the week following submittal of the report, the report shall document this fact, and the contractor shall substitute equipment with Tier 4 engines that adhere to emissions standards listed in 40 CFR 1039.101 for all types of off-road equipment to which USEPA regulations apply to the extent necessary to reduce emissions to 100 pounds, or otherwise limit construction activity to the extent necessary to reduce daily basin-wide NO_x emissions to 100 pounds, to the satisfaction of the Authority. Compliance with this requirement shall be documented in the following week's report.

Rationale for Finding: The contractor will be required to forecast Project emissions based on actual equipment that would be operating. Data would be provided and verified by the Authority, and no exceedance of NO_x standards will be permitted. Implementation of AQ MM 1 would mitigate air emission from Project site construction so that the Project would not conflict or obstruct implementation with the SCAQMD Plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1 would reduce construction emissions to below the level of significance.

AQ-2: Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Simultaneous construction of these sites located in the SCAB would exceed significance thresholds for NO_x, a precursor for O₃, and would result in violation of the SCAQMD threshold for daily NO_x emissions during construction and would contribute to the SCAB nonattainment status for O₃. Impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1** previously discussed above under AQ-1.

Rationale for Finding: The contractor will be required to forecast Project emissions based on actual equipment that would be operating. Data would be provided and verified by the Authority; and no exceedance of NO_x standards will be permitted, which would ensure NO_x emissions do not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1 would reduce construction emissions to below the level of significance.

AQ-3: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN

(Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Simultaneous construction of these sites located in the SCAB would exceed significance thresholds for NO_x, a precursor for O₃, and would result in cumulatively considerable net increases in O₃ from the NO_x emissions. Impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1** previously discussed above under AQ-1.

Rationale for Finding: The contractor will be required to forecast Project emissions based on actual equipment that would be operating. Data would be provided and verified by the Authority, and no exceedance of NO_x standards will be permitted; therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any pollutant for which the SCAB is in nonattainment. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1 would reduce construction emissions to below the level of significance.

3.2.3 Biological Resources

BIO-1. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or on any species that meets the criteria in CEQA Guidelines Section 15380 for endangered, rare or threatened?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

The analysis included the review of 112 special status plant species and 74 special status wildlife species to determine potential impacts due to construction or operations at any of these Project sites. Impacts to special status species would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures BIO MM 1 through BIO MM 24** below.

BIO MM 1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Prior to construction, the Authority shall develop and implement or require the system contractor to develop and implement a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan (MMRP) for the Project. The MMRP would serve to organize environmental compliance requirements identified in best management practices, mitigation measures, permit requirements, real property agreement conditions, coordination with the land management agency(s), and other applicable sources. The MMRP shall contain an organization chart and communication plan for environmental compliance as it relates to the Project.

BIO MM 2 Worker Environmental Awareness Program

Prior to construction, the Authority shall develop and implement, or require the system contractor to develop and implement, including coordination with the respective land management agency, a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) for the Project. This mitigation measure would serve to institute and formalize an education program to increase awareness of environmental resources and measures and rules that are in place to help minimize impacts to those resources.

- a) A WEAP shall be developed and shall be required for all construction employees prior to placement of Project equipment, construction, or any ground-disturbing activities at the Project site. Training of additional workers, contractors, and visitors shall be provided, as needed.
- b) The WEAP is to inform on-site workers of the possible presence of special status species, the measures to be taken to protect these species, and the importance of minimizing impacts to the natural environment through the protection of native vegetation, adhering to required buffers and protection zones, staying on existing roads, and implementing best management practices that include containment of any spills, disposal of trash, and management of runoff and sediment transport.

- c) To assure long-term implementation of mitigation measures, an information sheet listing potential sensitive species and what to do if any are encountered shall be prepared, distributed to workers, and posted on site.

BIO MM 3 Biological Compliance Reporting

A biological monitor shall visit all active construction sites at least once weekly to document compliance and provide reports to the Project administrator on a weekly basis.

BIO MM 4 Site Sanitation

- a) The contractor shall keep a regulated work area free of litter and trash. Trash and discarded food items shall be contained within an appropriate receptacle and removed daily to avoid attracting wildlife to the construction site, contribute to habituation of wildlife to the presence of humans, or to attract avian or mammalian predators to the area.
- b) All construction debris (including nuts, bolts, small pieces of wire, etc.) shall be cleaned up (e.g., trash removed, scrap materials picked up) each day that work is conducted to minimize the likelihood of wildlife visiting the site and consuming microtrash, discarded food, or other substances.

BIO MM 5 Hazardous Materials Management

- a) A toxic substance management and spill response plan shall be prepared by the contractor for review and approval by the Authority.
- b) Hazardous materials shall be contained; spills shall be prevented; and any spills at the Project site or along access roads shall be contained and cleaned up immediately.
- c) All construction vehicles are required to carry at least one spill response kit.
- d) Any spills shall be accounted for in reports prepared by the biological/environmental monitor.

BIO MM 6 Anti-perch Devices

Anti-perch devices shall be affixed to any elevated, horizontal structure (this includes the top quarter-arc of disc antennas) suitable for perching or nesting by

raptors, ravens, vultures, gulls, or other large birds to deter the use of these facilities as perch or nest sites to avoid attracting avian predators to the area, and so as not to contribute to the habituation of condors to the presence of humans. Anti-perch devices shall be inspected annually and repaired as needed.

BIO MM 7 California Condor Protection

- a) As part of BIO MM 4 Site Sanitation, a written list of procedures shall be established and posted on site and/or kept in a site binder at all times. Specifically, the protocol shall list requirements including: all trash of any size shall be placed and contained in covered containers; and no trash of any kind shall be released to the environment. This includes any food items, small or large pieces of plastic or wire, and any small metallic objects (i.e., nuts, bolts, wire nuts).
- b) As part of BIO MM 2 WEAP, construction crews shall be informed of the possible presence of California condors. A qualified biologist shall prepare an informational handout to be presented at WEAP instruction. This program and handout shall provide, at a minimum, information concerning the biology and distribution of the California condor, legal status, and possible occurrence in the vicinity; measures to avoid impacts to condors; procedures to be implemented to eliminate microtrash from the site; and what to do in case of California condor encounters. The informational handout shall be posted at the Project site for continued reference by construction and maintenance workers.
- c) During construction and operations of the facility, all workers shall avoid any interaction with condors and shall immediately stop work if condors are present in the Project site. If condors are on site, USFWS would be contacted immediately (Ventura office: 805-644-1766) following internal chain-of-command communications protocol. Once condors leave on their own accord or as a result of techniques employed by permitted USFWS personnel, on-site work may continue.
- d) If condors are known to be present in the area and found roosting within 0.5 mile of the Project site, no construction activity shall occur between one hour before sunset and one hour after sunrise or until the condors leave the area.
- e) If condors are documented nesting within 1.5 miles of a Project site (as determined by nesting bird surveys, observations by the biological monitor, and/or information from USFWS condor program), no

construction activity shall occur until further authorization is received from USFWS.

- f) The Project site shall be maintained in a clean condition at all times.
- g) All wires, cables, and other items, either temporary or permanent, that could entangle a condor are to be securely fastened down or removed from site. No permanent guy wires will be used.
- h) As part of BIO MM 3 Biological Compliance Reporting, the environmental monitor shall verify at least once a week during active construction and upon completion of construction activities that the Project site is maintained in a clean condition.

BIO MM 8 Biological Monitoring

A qualified biological monitor shall be present at the site during construction activities that result in ground disturbance or removal of vegetation to ensure all mitigation measures are met. Duties of the biological monitor include checking for the presence of wildlife on the construction site, inspecting trenches or holes for trapped wildlife, surveying for the presence of nesting birds and adherence to nesting bird protection buffers, monitoring construction site boundaries, and checking that vegetation flagged for protection is not disturbed.

BIO MM 9 Protect Native Vegetation and Common Wildlife

- a) Minimize disturbance to native perennial plants; new ground disturbance shall be the minimum necessary and established and delineated prior to any earth-moving activities.
- b) If native perennial vegetation cannot be avoided and would be impacted or destroyed, the disturbance area is to be surveyed for the presence of special status plants and to remove common species of wildlife prior to destruction of the vegetation.
- c) At no time shall protected species be handled or moved. If a protected species is found within the construction area, all work that may impact that animal shall cease and the appropriate agency(s) shall be contacted (e.g., USFWS, CDFW, land management agency). The animal shall be allowed to leave the site on its own accord.

- d) Prior to construction or any ground-disturbance activities, mark the construction disturbance limits and monitor for adherence to these boundaries.
- e) Stay on existing roads.
- f) Do not remove native trees; construction limits shall be established to avoid walnuts, oaks, and any other sensitive species habitat and the limits shall be flagged by a biological monitor.
- g) Protect tree root systems by precluding paving, trenching, or other ground disturbing activities; and preclude heavy equipment from driving, parking, or staging within the tree's dripline.
- h) Any loss of native perennial vegetation, whether planned or unintentional, is to be accounted for in reports prepared by the biological monitor.

BIO MM 10 No Pets

Construction and maintenance workers shall be prohibited from bringing pets (especially dogs) to non-urban Project sites, as the domestic animal may harass or kill native wildlife present at the site.

BIO MM 11 Site Access

- a) On access roads operate all vehicles within the posted speed limits.
- b) If access road speed limits are not posted, do not exceed 15 miles per hour (mph).
- c) Adjust vehicle speed as appropriate to road conditions; avoid causing ruts and gullies; and minimize dust.
- d) Watch for wildlife on roads (including amphibians, snakes, rodents, and tortoises), especially during rainy periods, and avoid running them over.
- e) Look under parked vehicles for the presence of wildlife (especially desert tortoise) before pulling away to avoid running over wildlife.
- f) Do not park on or drive over native perennial vegetation.
- g) Avoid cutting corners on access roads and impacting vegetation when large equipment and trailers are brought to the Project site.

- h) Do not drive off the designated roadway or make any modifications to the road or road shoulders.

BIO MM 12 Coastal California Gnatcatcher Protection

- a) As part of BIO MM 2 WEAP, construction crews shall be informed of the possible presence of coastal California gnatcatchers in the area and the importance of maintaining coastal sage scrub vegetation.
- b) As part of BIO MM 9 Protect Native Vegetation and Common Wildlife, disturbance to native perennial vegetation, especially coastal sage scrub vegetation (e.g., California sagebrush, sage, laurel sumac, and California buckwheat), would be minimized. Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist for the presence of coastal sage scrub perennial vegetation, and plants not identified for removal within or near the construction zone shall be marked for protection.
- c) As part of BIO MM 3 Biological Compliance Reporting, the environmental monitor shall verify at least once a week during active construction and upon completion of construction activities that habitat protection measures have been followed.
- d) At Project sites H-17A, PHN, and RIH, a higher level of protection is required to ensure that gnatcatchers are not present when construction activities would occur and adverse effects would be avoided. For Project sites that include known or suspected gnatcatcher nesting or otherwise include suitable nesting habitat where the bird is expected to be present, the following mitigation measure is to ensure the highest level of protection to the bird. All the above measures (BIO MM 1 through BIO MM 3, and BIO MM 8 through BIO MM 12) apply as well as:

BIO MM 13 Coastal California Gnatcatcher Breeding Season Restrictions

Construction activities that include loud noises (e.g., trenching, drilling, concrete cutting), the use of large equipment (e.g., booms, cranes, drills, concrete pouring), or the removal of perennial vegetation shall be precluded between February 15 and August 30. This measure is applicable to identified Project sites where coastal California gnatcatchers are known to be or likely would be present, and construction activities may result in disturbance to the bird.

BIO MM 14 Coastal California Gnatcatcher Protocol Surveys

- a) To determine if coastal California gnatcatchers are present within 500 feet of specified Project sites and if breeding season restrictions would be required, surveys following the most recent version of the USFWS Coastal California Gnatcatcher Presence/Absence Survey Protocol (current revision issued by USFWS Carlsbad Office 1997) shall be conducted prior to initiating any construction activities that may result in ground disturbance or loud noises during the gnatcatcher breeding season (February 15 through August 30). This protocol requires call-playback surveys by a permitted biologist, conducting a minimum of six surveys at least one week apart between March 15 and June 30 (additional survey requirements are presented in the protocol).
- b) If adult, nesting, or fledgling gnatcatchers are detected even once within 500 feet of the Project site, or if surveys are not completed in compliance with the protocol, BIO MM 13 Coastal California Gnatcatcher Breeding Season Restrictions shall apply to the site, precluding any construction activities that include loud noises (e.g., trenching, drilling, concrete cutting), the use of large equipment (e.g., booms, cranes, drills, concrete pouring), or the removal of perennial vegetation between February 15 and August 30.
- c) If no adult, nesting, or fledgling gnatcatchers are detected within 500 feet of the Project site, construction activities may commence beginning July 1 through February 14.
- d) Survey requirements shall be applied each year that construction activities take place at the Project site.

BIO MM 15 Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Protection

- a) As part of BIO MM 2 WEAP, construction crews shall be informed of the possible presence of southwestern willow flycatchers in the area and the importance of maintaining riparian vegetation.
- b) As part of BIO MM 9 Protect Native Vegetation and Common Wildlife, disturbance to native perennial vegetation, especially riparian species (e.g., sycamore, cottonwood, willow), would be minimized; no ground-disturbing activities or removal of vegetation would occur within stream corridors or floodplains. Prior to construction, surveys for the presence of riparian vegetation shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, and

those plants within or near the construction zone not identified for removal shall be marked for protection and monitored for adherence to these boundaries.

BIO MM 16 Snowy Plover Protection

- a) As part of BIO MM 2 WEAP, construction crews shall be informed of the possible presence of western snowy plover in the area and the importance of not disturbing nesting birds.
- b) If construction occurs between February 1 and July 31, prior to beginning construction a biological monitor shall verify through coordination with USFWS and on-site surveys that no breeding western snowy plovers are using the Project site or are within 500 feet of any Project activity.
- c) If plovers are nesting in the vicinity, BIO MM 8 Biological Monitoring would apply, and a 500-foot protection buffer shall be required where no construction activities may occur while birds remain in the area.

BIO MM 17 Raptor Protection

- a) If construction activities occur during the American peregrine falcon, bald eagle, golden eagle, long-eared owl, or burrowing owl breeding period, January 1 through July 31, preconstruction surveys would be conducted in all suitable habitats within 500 feet of the Project site as well as within a species-appropriate distance beyond the 500-foot buffer based on line of sight between potential nesting habitat and the construction site.
- b) If construction takes place during the breeding period, the biological monitor shall contact appropriate land management and resource agencies to ascertain if they have any current information on raptor nesting activities in the general vicinity of the Project sites.
- c) If an active American peregrine falcon, bald eagle, golden eagle, long-eared owl, or burrowing owl nest is discovered within 500 feet of the construction site, work shall not be undertaken at that site until the nest is no longer active, with an additional five days to allow the fledging birds to disperse. An active nest is defined as one that is attended, built, maintained, or used by a pair of birds during a given breeding season, whether or not eggs are laid; a nest is considered inactive if not attended to for a period of 10 days or longer.

- d) If an active American peregrine falcon, bald eagle, golden eagle, long-eared owl, or burrowing owl nest is discovered between 500 feet and 0.5 mile of the construction site, the potential for disturbance of the nesting birds would be evaluated based on line-of-sight, degree of potentially disturbing activities, and other site-specific factors. If the CDFW and land management agency concur, the protection buffer distance may be reduced.

BIO MM 18 Nesting Bird Protection

- a) It is preferred that removal of trees or large tree limbs and other vegetation removal activities such as grubbing or shrub clearing avoid the typical bird nesting season of January 1 through September 15.
- b) If construction activities occur during the bird nesting season, and to prevent disturbance to or destruction of nests of protected native bird species that could occur as a result of vegetation removal, disturbance, or other on-site construction activities, preconstruction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biological monitor within 10 calendar days prior to on-site construction-related disturbance activities from March 1 through September 15 for non-raptors, and January 1 through July 31 for raptors.
- c) If nesting protected non-raptor species are detected, a 300-foot avoidance buffer shall be implemented; a 500-foot avoidance buffer would be applied to any active nest of a raptor or other species of special status bird.
- d) Appropriate site-specific buffers may be established with the approval of a Project designated avian expert, based in part on the species of nesting bird present, location of nest, nesting phenology, magnitude of potential disturbance, and other site conditions (e.g., levels of ambient noise; line-of-sight).
- e) If construction activities would occur within the general buffer distances for active nests (300 feet for non-raptors, 500 feet for raptors, and up to 1.5 miles for condors and eagles), a Biological Monitor must be present during those activities.
- f) No active nests may be destroyed; inactive bird nests may be destroyed as part of vegetation removal but may not be reduced to possession.

- g) Between September 16 and December 30, grubbing, shrub clearing, and tree/limb removal activities are not subject to restrictions based on the protection of migratory birds.
- h) Comply with the USFWS Office of Migratory Birds voluntary guidelines (USFWS 2013a) for communications tower placement, construction, and operation.
- i) For any towers that must exceed 199 feet in height, lighting requirements would be designed in cooperation with FAA and USFWS Office of Migratory Birds to minimize attraction and resulting mortality of migratory birds.

BIO MM 19 Trenches and Holes Management

- a) The contractor shall cover or backfill all trenches the same calendar day they are opened, where practicable.
- b) If trenches or holes cannot be closed the same day they are made, covers shall be firmly secured at ground level in such a way that small wildlife cannot slip beneath. At sites that require the presence of a biological monitor, trench covers shall be approved by the monitor.
- c) Open trenches shall be inspected regularly throughout the day and prior to filling to remove any trapped common wildlife (e.g., small mammals, reptiles, amphibians) and to check for the presence of protected wildlife species (e.g., arroyo toad) at Project sites that require the presence of a biological monitor.
- d) If a protected wildlife species is present in the trench, the on-site Biological Monitor shall contact USFWS immediately, ensure the protected species is not in immediate danger, and wait for instruction by USFWS.
- e) Covered trenches and holes at sites where biological monitors are present are to be inspected by the monitor at the end of the work day and prior to initiating construction activities the next day.
- f) In locating trenches or holes, disturbance to natural vegetation, including plant root systems shall be minimized.
- g) Prior to trenching, the construction disturbance limits and monitor for adherence to these boundaries shall be marked.

BIO MM 20 Santa Catalina Island Fox Protection

- a) As part of BIO MM 2 WEAP, construction crews shall be informed of the possible presence of the Santa Catalina Island fox and the measures to be taken to avoid impacts to the fox.
- b) Prior to initiation of construction activities, the Project site plus a 250-foot buffer shall be inspected by a qualified biologist for the presence of Santa Catalina Island fox dens; if a den is located, no construction activities may be initiated and USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted.
- c) As part of the BIO MM 8 Biological Monitoring, the biological monitor shall inspect the work area, including equipment storage sites and staging areas, for the presence of foxes each day prior to initiation of on-site work. Construction equipment that may be used as hiding cover by a fox (e.g., open pipes, equipment piles) shall be inspected prior to moving.

BIO MM 21 Protected Amphibian Protection

- a) As part of BIO MM 2 WEAP, construction crews shall be informed of the possible presence of protected amphibians (i.e., arroyo toad, California red-legged frog, mountain yellow-legged frog - southern California DPS) in the area and along access roads, and the measures to be taken to avoid impacts to these amphibians.
- b) As part of BIO MM 1 Biological Monitoring, the Biological Monitor shall be present during site preparation and placement of Project equipment. The monitor shall inspect the work area, including equipment storage sites and staging areas, for the presence of protected amphibians each day prior to initiation of on-site construction work following a measureable rain event (≥ 0.01 inch) while construction is ongoing.
- c) To protect dispersing frogs and toads, no Project-related on-site ground-disturbing activities or construction-related travel on access roads shall occur during the night or during rainy periods (within 24 hours of a measureable [≥ 0.01 inch] precipitation event or within 48 hours of a major [≥ 0.1 inch] precipitation event).
- d) To protect dispersing frogs and toads during normal site operations (non-emergency situations), these Project sites shall not be accessed by maintenance workers during the night or during rainy periods (within 24 hours of a measureable [≥ 0.01 inch] precipitation event or within 48

hours of a major [≥ 0.1 inch] precipitation event) (emergency situations are exempted).

- e) If a protected amphibian (i.e., arroyo toad, California red-legged frog, mountain yellow-legged frog - southern California DPS) is found within 50 feet of the construction site, all work that involves moving vehicles or ground disturbance shall cease until the animal moves on its own accord.
- f) If protected amphibians are present on the road, vehicles shall stop until the individual(s) move out of harm's way on their own accord.

BIO MM 22 Monarch Butterfly Protection

- a) Preconstruction surveys by a qualified biologist shall provide for a thorough examination of suitable roost trees to determine if butterflies are using the site for roosting; surveys shall be repeated once a week throughout the construction period.
- b) If butterflies are found roosting in the area, a protection buffer of 50 feet shall be established around each roost; and no construction activities would be undertaken within the buffer area while butterflies are roosting.
- c) Loss of trees or removal of large limbs on trees that may provide suitable roost habitat for monarch butterflies shall be avoided.

BIO MM 23 Prevent the Spread of Nonnative Vegetation

- a) All ground disturbed by construction activities that would not be paved, landscaped, or otherwise permanently stabilized (e.g., graveled, soil compaction) shall be seeded using species native to the Project vicinity.
- b) To prevent the introduction of invasive species seeds, all earthmoving and hauling equipment shall be inspected at the equipment storage facility to remove soil and vegetation; and the equipment shall be washed prior to entering the construction site.
- c) To prevent invasive species seeds from leaving the site, all construction equipment shall be inspected, and all attached plant/vegetation and soil/mud debris shall be removed prior to leaving the construction site.

BIO MM 24 Special Status Plants Surveys and Protection

- a) As part of BIO MM 2 WEAP, construction crews shall be informed prior to the onset of construction activities of the possible presence of special status plants in the area and the importance of maintaining native vegetation.
- b) At identified sites, surveys for special status plants shall be conducted by a qualified botanist prior to ground-disturbing activities, in the proper season and in suitable habitat surrounding the Project site or any area subject to ground disturbance, including access roads.
- c) If a special status plant is found to be present or if surveys are determined to be inconclusive, the areas requiring special protection would be marked prior to construction to provide a buffer to maintain the ecological context of the location at which the plant was found.
- d) Mitigation measure BIO MM 8 Biological Monitoring shall apply at Project sites where special status plants or their habitat are present, and protection buffers would be monitored for compliance.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, the Project would avoid substantial adverse effects on species and habitat through worker education, species and habitat identification, avoidance, and monitoring. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO MM 1 through BIO MM 24 would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

BIO-2. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Riparian habitat or sensitive communities occur within the study area of these sites, as recorded in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and/or verified during reconnaissance surveys of each study area. Impacts to these sensitive communities and associated species would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and

in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures BIO MM 1, BIO MM 3, BIO MM 5, BIO MM 6, BIO MM 8 through BIO MM 12, BIO MM 19, BIO MM 23, and BIO MM 24**, previously discussed above under BIO-1.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, the Project would avoid substantial adverse effects on riparian or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies regulations or by CDFW and USFWS through worker education and species and habitat identification, avoidance, and monitoring. Implementation of BIO MM 1, BIO MM 3, BIO MM 5, BIO MM 6, BIO MM 8 through BIO MM 12, BIO MM 19, BIO MM 23, and BIO MM 24 would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

BIO-5. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Sites: AJT (Pg. 4-38), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FRP (Pg. 4-452), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Development of these Project sites would impact biological resources protected by local policies or ordinances; impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures BIO MM 1 through BIO MM 24**, previously discussed above under BIO-1.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, the Project would avoid biological resources protected by local policies or ordinances through worker education and species and habitat identification, avoidance, and monitoring. Implementation of **BIO MM 1 through BIO MM 24** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.2.4 Cultural Resources

CUL-1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in PRC §15064.5?

Sites: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Construction of monopoles would cause adverse impacts on archaeological resources located within the vicinity of these Project sites.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 1, CUL MM 3, CUL MM 4, and CUL MM 5** below.

CUL MM 1: Archaeological or Native American Monitoring – Prehistoric Resources

At Project sites with known or potential presence of prehistoric archaeological material (artifacts and/or features) within the defined APEs, qualified archaeological or Native American monitors shall be present during all subsurface excavation for tower or monopole foundations and during grading for access roads and structure foundations. Monitors will also be responsible for restricting access by construction personnel to any identified archaeological resources as noted in Draft EIR Section 3.4 or Chapter 4. The direct and indirect APEs are defined in Section **Error! Reference source not found.**

The archaeological monitor will, at a minimum, have a B.A. in anthropology or related field or will have successfully completed an archaeological field methods school. The monitor will work under the supervision of an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (Project Archaeologist). The standards are published in CFR 36 Part 61 and found on the National Park Service website at http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm.

In the event that prehistoric archaeological material is unexpectedly discovered within the APE, the procedures set forth in CUL MM 3 shall be followed.

CUL MM 3: Unexpected Discovery of Archaeological Materials

In the event that previously unidentified prehistoric or historic-age archaeological resources are uncovered, the following actions shall be taken:

- 1) All ground-disturbing work within 165 feet (50 meters) of the discovery shall be halted. The qualified archaeological monitor will mark the immediate area with highly visible flagging and immediately notify the Project Archaeologist.

- 2) The Project Archaeologist shall inspect the discovery and determine whether further investigation is required. If the discovery can be avoided and no further impacts will occur, the resource shall be documented on California State Department of Parks and Recreation cultural resource record forms, and no further effort shall be required.
- 3) If the resource cannot be avoided and may be subject to further impact, the Project Archaeologist shall evaluate the resource and determine whether it is (1) eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and is thus a historic property for the purposes of the NHPA and NEPA; (2) eligible for the CRHR and thus a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA; (3) a “unique” archaeological resource as defined by CEQA; (4) a Tribal resource as defined by AB 52. If the resource is determined not to be significant under any of these four categories, work may commence in the area following collection (as appropriate) and recording, including mapping and photography, of the archaeological materials or features.
- 4) If the resource meets the criteria for any or all of the categories described in CUL MM 3, work shall remain halted, and the Project Archaeologist shall consult with LA-RICS Authority staff regarding methods to ensure that no substantial adverse changes occur. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred method of ensuring no substantial adverse impacts occur on historic properties/historical resources and shall be required unless other equally effective methods are agreed upon among the Project Archaeologist, the Authority, and any other stakeholders.

If the archaeological material appears to represent a site – defined as three or more artifacts and/or features in an intact deposit – an archaeological test program (Phase II) may be necessary. Associated mitigation measures include, but are not limited to, collection of the archaeological materials, recordation (e.g., DPR Primary Record and Site Forms), and analysis of any significant cultural materials in accordance with a Data Recovery Plan, and curation of artifacts at an approved curation facility. A curation agreement for this Project is already in place with the University of California, Los Angeles, Archaeological Collections Facility at the Fowler Museum. At the completion of the appropriate mitigation measures, a professional-level technical report shall be filed with the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Information Center (IC).

- 5) Work at the Project location may commence upon completion of the appropriate mitigation treatment(s).

CUL MM 4: Unexpected Discovery of Human Remains

In the event that human remains are unexpectedly encountered, the following procedures shall immediately be followed. This guidance is also provided on the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) website at <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/discovery-of-native-american-human-remains-what-to-do/>.

- 1) All construction activity shall stop immediately, and the Project Archaeologist shall be notified. The Project Archaeologist will contact the Los Angeles (or applicable) County Coroner. The list of California Coroners can be found on the NAHC website at <http://nahc.ca.gov/2015/06/implementation-of-ab52-sample-letters-request-for-formal-notification-and-request-for-consultation/>.
- 2) The Coroner has two working days to examine human remains after being notified by the responsible person. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC.
- 3) The NAHC will immediately notify the person it believes to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American.
- 4) The most likely descendent has 48 hours to make recommendations to the owner, or representative, for the treatment or disposition, with proper dignity, of the human remains and grave goods.
- 5) If the descendent does not make recommendations within 48 hours the owner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from further disturbance, or;
- 6) If the owner does not accept the descendant's recommendations, the owner or the descendent may request mediation by the NAHC.

CUL MM 5: Architectural Resources Protection and Camouflage

Attachment of Equipment to Historic Buildings and Structures

For historic buildings or structures where communications-related equipment will be attached, the following preservation practices shall be employed, as applicable, to ensure that impacts are less than significant:

- 1) When running new exterior wiring to a historic building, existing entry points shall be utilized. If a new entry point is required, the entry shall be placed at the rear of the building or in an area on the side of the building where it will be hidden by an existing architectural feature.
- 2) When wireless nodes, antennas, microwave or satellite dishes, etc. are installed on historic buildings, existing mounting points shall be utilized. For new mounts, non-penetrating mounts shall be used.
- 3) Equipment shall be placed where it does not detract from the building's overall appearance; roof-mounted equipment shall be placed where it will not be visible from accessible locations at grade. Adequate structural support for the new equipment and design shall be ensured, and a system that minimizes the number of cutouts or holes in structural members and historic material shall be installed. Existing building features shall be used to conceal equipment.
- 4) New equipment installations on a historic building that will be visible shall be painted or color-matched to the surrounding building materials. Concealment with color-matched FRP (fiberglass reinforced plastic) shrouds (boxes) is acceptable.
- 5) Any supports or brackets for new equipment shall be color-matched to the existing materials.
- 6) The installation of exterior wiring shall be minimized; where unavoidable, the wiring will be color-matched to the original building material to reduce the visual impact.
- 7) Equipment shall not be directly anchored into stone or brick; mortar joints for anchoring the equipment will be utilized.
- 8) Rust-resistant mounts to prevent staining of the building materials shall be used.
- 9) Reversible mounting techniques shall be used to avoid damage to building materials.
- 10) Installation of underground cable or conduit at a historical resource shall be undertaken in a manner that considers the stability of the historic building, including limiting any new excavations adjacent to historic foundations that could undermine the structural stability of the

building and avoiding landscape or other changes that could alter drainage patterns and cause water-related damage to the building.

- 11) New interior wiring shall utilize space in existing chases, closets, or shafts.
- 12) Equipment and systems shall be installed to cause the least alteration possible to the building's floor plan and the least damage to the historic building material.
- 13) Vertical runs of conduit and cables shall be placed in closets, service rooms, and wall cavities to create the least intrusion into the historic fabric of the building and to avoid major intervention into the wall and floor systems.

Architectural Camouflage

All new towers and monopoles or an increase in the height of existing towers and monopoles that would cause adverse visual impacts on historical resources that are adjacent to or within the viewshed shall be camouflaged. All camouflage implemented for the Project shall be sympathetic to the existing landscape (<http://www.generalcode.com/codification/sample-legislation/cell-towers>) and/or in accordance with applicable municipal codes (http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2009/09-2645_RPT_ATT_06-07-11.pdf).

Tower disguises may include, but are not limited to, painting and various types of concealments, including clock/water towers, flag/light poles, silos, trees, and unique site-specific designs. Such measures must be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards/Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties (see Attachment of Equipment discussion above).

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, Project visual impacts on historical resources within the APE would be minimized by disguising or camouflaging monopoles using paint or architectural screening. Additionally, monitoring during ground disturbing activities would ensure subsurface prehistoric archaeological resources are not disturbed. Implementation of **CUL MM 1**, **CUL MM 3**, **CUL MM 4**, and **CUL MM 5** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

CUL-2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to PRC § 15064.5

Sites: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Based on the location and type of Project activities and the extent of resources at these Project sites, construction impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 1, CUL MM 3, and CUL MM 4**, previously discussed above under CUL-1.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, monitoring during ground disturbing activities ensures that subsurface prehistoric archaeological resources are not disturbed. Implementation of **CUL MM 1, CUL MM 3, and CUL MM 4** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

CUL-3: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), ASD (Pg. 4-74), CPK (Pg. 4-296), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Project activities at these Project sites would have a significant impact on paleontological resources.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 6 and CUL MM 7**, below:

CUL MM 6: Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan

A Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan shall be developed and approved prior to construction to guide the activities of monitors during ground-disturbing activities. The plan would include, but not be limited to, a description of the Project location, the regulatory framework, site-specific impact mitigation requirements designed to reduce impacts to less than significant, specific locations and construction activities requiring monitoring and/or spot checking, and procedures to follow for construction monitoring and fossil discovery and recovery, and a repository agreement with the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or other accredited repository. Mitigation measures that may

be implemented to ensure that impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant may include but are not limited to the following:

- a) Worker awareness training on paleontological resources presented to construction personnel prior to the start of construction. The training should include at minimum, the following:
 - The types of fossils that could occur at the Project site
 - The procedures that should be taken in the event of a fossil discovery
 - Laws protecting paleontological resources
 - Penalties for destroying or removing paleontological resource
- b) Paleontological monitoring during ground disturbance at all sites with moderate/unknown or high paleontological potential
- c) Salvage of significant fossil resources
- d) Screenwashing of matrix samples for microfossils
- e) Laboratory preparation of recovered fossils to the point of identification and curation
- f) Identification of recovered fossils to the lowest possible taxonomic order
- g) Curation of significant fossils at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or other accredited repository
- h) Preparation of a final monitoring report that includes at a minimum the dates of field work, results of monitoring, fossil analyses, significance evaluation, conclusions, locality forms, and an itemized list of specimens.

The Plan shall be submitted to the Authority for review and approval and finalized at least 14 days prior to the start of construction.

CUL MM 7: Paleontological Resources Monitoring

Paleontological monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor who has demonstrated experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials. An undergraduate degree in geology or paleontology is preferable but is less important than documented experience performing paleontological

monitoring and mitigation. The monitor will work under the supervision of a Principal Paleontologist.

The qualified professional paleontological monitor shall be present during ground disturbance at all sites with moderate/unknown or high paleontological potential, and as specified in the Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan prepared in accordance with CUL MM 6. The monitor shall be present during all subsurface excavation for tower or monopole foundations and during grading for access roads and structure foundations. Any sites that require monitoring or mitigation within the Angeles National Forest will require a qualified paleontologist to have a U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service-Temporary Special-Use Permit for paleontology. Based on the specific site conditions observed during monitoring (type of sediment impacted, previous disturbances, nature of site conditions), the Principal Paleontologist may reduce or increase monitoring efforts in consultation with the Agency.

In the event that a previously unidentified paleontological resource is uncovered, the following actions shall be taken:

- 1) All ground-disturbing work within 50 feet of the discovery shall be halted. A qualified paleontologist shall divert or direct construction activities in the area of an exposed fossil in order to facilitate evaluation and, if necessary, salvage of the exposed fossil. Work shall not resume in the discovery area until authorized by the qualified paleontologist.
- 2) The paleontologist shall inspect the discovery and determine whether further investigation is required. If the discovery can be avoided and no further impacts will occur, no further effort shall be required.
- 3) If the resource cannot be avoided and may be subject to further impact, the paleontologist shall evaluate the resource and determine whether it is "unique" under CEQA, Appendix G, Part V. If the resource is determined not to be unique, work may commence in the area.
- 4) If the resource is determined to be a unique paleontological resource, work shall remain halted, and the paleontologist shall consult with LA-RICS Authority staff regarding methods to ensure that no substantial adverse change would occur to the significance of the resource. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred method of ensuring that no substantial adverse impacts occur to the

resource and shall be required unless other equally effective methods are available. Other methods include ensuring that the fossils are scientifically recovered, prepared, identified, catalogued, and analyzed according to current professional standards.

- 5) Due to the small nature of some fossils, a fine mesh screen may be used at the discretion of the paleontologist to screen matrix test samples on-site during monitoring. Additionally, bulk matrix samples may be collected and transported to a laboratory facility for processing.
- 6) Provisions for preparation and identification of any fossils collected shall be made before donation to a suitable repository.
- 7) All recovered fossils shall be curated at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, or a local accredited and permanent scientific institution according to Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standard guidelines standards. Work may commence upon completion of the appropriate treatment and the approval from the Authority.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, paleontological monitoring during ground-disturbing activities to ensure that any paleontological resources identified during are appropriately identified, characterized, and, as applicable, collected ensures that subsurface paleontological resources are not destroyed. Implementation of **CUL MM 6** and **CUL MM 7** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

CUL-4: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?

Sites: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Based on the location and type of Project activities and the extent of resources at these Project sites, construction impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 1, CUL MM 3, and CUL MM 4**, previously discussed above under CUL-1.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, monitoring during ground-disturbing activities is required to ensure that any human remains identified during ground-disturbing activities are appropriately identified, characterized, and reported to the

appropriate authorities. Implementation of **CUL MM 1**, **CUL MM 3**, and **CUL MM 4** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

CUL-5: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074?

Sites: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Based on the potential for tribal resources to occur and type of Project activities and the extent of resources at these Project sites, construction impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 1**, **CUL MM 3**, and **CUL MM 4**, previously discussed above under CUL-1.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, monitoring during ground-disturbing activities ensures that any tribal resources identified are appropriately protected. Implementation of **CUL MM 1**, **CUL MM 3**, and **CUL MM 4** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.2.5 Geology / Soils

GEO-1: Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Strong seismic ground shaking?

Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Landslides?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FRP (Pg. 4-452), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MMC (Pg. 4-1069), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP

(Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

These sites include new monopoles, new towers, and existing monopoles and towers that would be extended. Seismic shaking impacts would be significant at these sites without an evaluation of site-specific soils, geology, and seismic shaking probability.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.5 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure GEO MM 1**, below.

GEO MM 1 Prior to or concurrently with submittal of the application for a building permit for any portion of the Project site, the Contractor shall:

- 1) Submit to the appropriate municipality (County of Los Angeles or city having jurisdiction over the site) a site-specific, design-level geotechnical report reviewed and approved by both an engineering geologist licensed in the State of California and a civil engineer licensed in the State of California. The report shall comply with all applicable state and local code requirements and shall:
 - a) Include an analysis of the expected ground motions at the site from known active faults using accepted methodologies
 - b) Include an analysis of all potential geologic hazards including but not limited to, landslides, mudslides, liquefaction potential, identification of active faults, land spreading, and land subsidence. The report shall be prepared in accordance with and meet the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LACDPW) Manual for Preparation of Geotechnical Reports, July 1, 2013.
 - c) Specify liquefaction mitigations that shall use proven methods generally accepted by professional engineers to reduce the risk of liquefaction to a less than significant level such as:
 - i) subsurface soil improvement
 - ii) deep foundations extending below the liquefiable layers
 - iii) structural slabs designed to span across areas of non-support
 - iv) soil cover sufficiently thick over liquefaction soil to bridge liquefaction zones

- v) dynamic compaction
 - vi) compaction grouting
 - vii) jet grouting
 - viii) mitigation for liquefaction hazards suggested in the California Geological Survey's (CGS) Geology Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards (CGS Special Publication 117, 1997) including edge containment structures (berms, dikes, sea walls, retaining structures, compacted soil zones), removal or treatment of liquefiable soils, modification of site geometry, lowering the groundwater table, in-situ ground densification, deep foundations, reinforced shallow foundations, and structural design that can withstand predicated displacements
- d) Determine structural design requirements as prescribed by the most current version of the California Building Code, including applicable local county and local city amendments, to ensure that structures can withstand ground accelerations expected from known active faults
 - e) Determine the final design parameters for walls, foundations, foundation slabs, utilities, roadways, parking lots, sidewalks, and other surrounding improvements
- 2) Project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation shall incorporate all of the mitigations in the site specific investigations.
 - 3) The Project structural engineer shall review the site specific investigations, provide any additional necessary mitigation to meet Building Code requirements, and incorporate all applicable mitigations from the investigation in the structural design plans and shall ensure that all structural plans for the Project meet current Building Code requirements.
 - 4) Site construction shall not begin until:
 - a) The registered geotechnical engineer representing the applicable permitting municipality for the Project site (county or city), or third party registered engineer retained to review the geotechnical reports, has reviewed each site specific geotechnical investigation, approved the final report, and required compliance with geotechnical mitigations contained in the investigation in the plans submitted for the grading, foundation, structural, infrastructure and other relevant construction permits; and

- b) The applicable permitting municipality for the Project site (county or city) has reviewed all Project plans for grading, foundations, structural, infrastructure and other relevant construction permits to ensure compliance with the applicable geotechnical investigation and other applicable Code requirements

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR, a geotechnical report will be prepared for each of these sites. The report will be prepared in accordance with applicable regulations for the applicable jurisdiction for the location of the Project sites. The geotechnical report will assess site-specific seismic ground-shaking conditions to be considered and make recommendations on the design of the foundation to minimize seismic hazards. Implementation of **GEO MM 1** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

GEO-3: Would the project 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Sites: ASD (Pg. 4-74), CPK (Pg. 4-296), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

These sites are located within a designated potential landslide area or designated potential liquefaction zone. The ground under these sites has the potential for soils to become unstable; construction impacts would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure GEO MM 1**, discussed above under GEO-1.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR, a geotechnical report will be prepared for each of these sites. The report will evaluate subsurface soil and groundwater condition and make recommendations to ensure soil stability and make recommendations to minimize potential for lateral spreading subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Implementation of **GEO MM 1** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-4: *Would the project 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?*

Site: PDC (Pg. 4-1256)

Only Site PDC is located within an area identified as a hazardous materials site. Construction at this facility may include placement of new equipment structure and/or trenching for utilities that will disturb the ground. If potential contamination is not appropriately located and characterized prior to disturbance, disposal of excavated soil could result in a significant impact and create a significant hazard to the public or the environment at Site PDC and, thus, result in a significant impact.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure HAZ MM 1**, below.

HAZ MM 1: Prior to construction activity, the construction contractor prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment meeting the standards outlined in the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), Practice for Limited Environmental Due Diligence: Transaction Screen Process E 1528.

- Phase I documents shall be reviewed to determine if the lateral and vertical extent of impacted soil and/or groundwater will be encountered by construction activities.
- If construction activities will not encounter impacted soil or groundwater based on the documented vertical and lateral extent, no further action will be required.
- If it is determined that the construction footprint will encounter impacted soils or encounter impacted groundwater, the contractor shall prepare a site-specific Health and Safety Plan that meets the requirements of 29 CFR 1910 for worker safety.
- If the lateral and vertical extent or the nature of the impacted soil cannot be determined from available documents, a Phase II investigation shall be completed to determine if the soils and/or groundwater that may be encountered during construction (within the footprint any excavation) are impacted. The Phase II investigation shall also determine the nature of contaminations that may be encountered.

- The Phase II report should also address appropriate and available disposal alternatives and procedures for any impacted soil that may be encountered or groundwater which may need to be removed.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR, prior to construction activities, a Phase I Environmental Assessment will be prepared for the site. Based on the Phase I recommendations, additional sampling, testing, and characterization may be required to ensure proper worker notification, handling, and disposal of contaminated material. Implementation of **HAZ MM 1** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

HAZ-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?

Site: SDW (Pg. 4-1448)

Site SDW lies within Area E land use, as defined in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for Brackett Field. The approved Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) indicates that structures more than 100 feet tall within Area E need to be evaluated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to determine if the structure creates an air navigation hazard. Construction of the tower may result in a significant navigational hazard.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.7 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure HAZ MM 2**, below.

HAZ MM 2 Prior to issuance of building permits, the Contractor shall submit Form 7460–1 (Notice of Construction or Alteration) to the FAA, in the form and manner prescribed in 14 CFR Part 77. The Contractor shall also provide documentation to the appropriate city or county planning agency demonstrating that the FAA has issued a “Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation.”

The FAA regulates objects affecting navigable airspace according to 14 CFR Part 77. The federal and state Departments of Transportation also require the proponent to submit FAA Form 7460–1, Notice of Construction or Alteration. According to 14 CFR Part 77, notification allows the FAA to identify potential aeronautical hazards in advance, thus preventing or minimizing any adverse impacts on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace.

Per 14 CFR Part 77, notification requirements include sending one executed form set (four copies) of FAA Form 7460–1, Notice of Construction or Alteration,

to the Manager, Air Traffic Division, of the FAA Regional Office having jurisdiction over the area within which the construction or alteration will be located. The notice required must be submitted at least 45 days before the earlier of the following dates: (1) the date the construction or alteration is to begin, or (2) the date an application for a construction permit is to be filed.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR, completion of the FAA process for notice of alteration or construction and, as applicable, incorporating all FAA recommendations into the Project would prevent or minimize any adverse impacts on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace. Implementation of **HAZ MM 2** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

HAZ-8: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FRP (Pg. 4-452), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MMC (Pg. 4-1069), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

These Project sites are either located within or, in the case of sites on federal land, presumed to be within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Construction activities in these areas represent an elevated significant risk of igniting a wildland fire.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR Section 3.7 and site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure HAZ MM 3**, below.

HAZ MM 3: Fire Management Plan. Prior to construction activity, the Authority must work with the agency responsible for fire protection in the jurisdiction where the site is located to develop and implement a fire management plan for use during construction activity. The plan will identify Project locations, Project descriptions, anticipated construction activities, limitation of activities during periods of elevated fire risk (e.g., “red flag” days), level of suppression equipment required on site, training requirements, and points of contact.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR, construction in these zones will comply with local municipal code, including provisions for emergency vehicle access, use of approved building materials, design, and brush clearance. The fire management plan will document procedures for both fire prevention and response. Implementation of **HAZ MM 3** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.2.7 Hydrology /Water Quality

WQ-1: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FRP (Pg. 4-452), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MMC (Pg. 4-1069), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

At these sites, groundwater may also be encountered during excavation of deep foundations. Dewatering of an excavation would constitute a significant impact if the water is not discharged properly.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure UTL MM 1**, discussed below in Section 3.2.10.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR, the Authority will comply with all conditions and stipulations specified in the dewatering permit at each of these sites, as applicable. Implementation of **UTL MM 1**, would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

WQ-9: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Sites: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), PWT (Pg. 4-1371)

ENC1 and PWT are located in areas that may be subject to mudflows. Mudflows could result in loss and impacts that are significant at these sites.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.8 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure GEO MM 1**, discussed above in Section 3.2.5.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR, the geotechnical report will evaluate if a site is at risk for a mudflow and provide recommendations to be implemented to reduce the risk to the facility from mudflows. Implementation of **GEO MM 1** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.2.8 Noise

NOI-2: Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Sites: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799)

Impacts from construction of these sites would expose sensitive receiver locations to excessive groundborne vibration, and impacts of the Project would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.10 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure NOI MM 1**, below.

NOI MM 1 Prior to commencement of construction at sites ENC1 and LACF072, the contractor shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Authority, measures that will reduce construction vibration impacts to less than significant levels. Such measures may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Route heavily-loaded trucks away from residential streets, if possible, selecting streets with the fewest homes if no other alternatives are available.
- Operate earth moving equipment including excavators/mini excavators and dump trucks as far away from vibration-sensitive locations as possible.
- Phase demolition and earth-moving operations so as not to occur simultaneously. Total vibration could be significantly less when each vibration event occurs separately.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR, the contractor shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Authority, measures that will reduce construction

vibration perceivable motion velocity to less than 0.01 peak particle velocity (ppv) over the range of 1 to 100 Hertz at the receiver sites. Implementation of **NOI MM 1** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

NOI-3: Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Sites: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Construction noise at site WS1 would exceed the City of Santa Monica noise ordinance that sets a maximum 20-dBA temporary increase above acceptable exterior ambient noise levels. If night construction is required at sites ENC1, LACF072, PDC, SDW, or SGH, construction noise would exceed the 80-dBA threshold during nighttime hours. Construction noise at these sites would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR and site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure NOI MM 2**, below. Measure NOI MM 2 would be required at sites ENC1, LACF072, PDC, SDW, and SGH if nighttime construction were to occur, and at Site WS1 at all times.

NOI MM 2 Prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Authority, measures that will reduce construction noise impacts below the levels specified in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) nighttime threshold or applicable ordinance. Such measures may include but are not limited to the following:

- Use noise blankets or other muffling devices on equipment and quiet-use generators at noise-sensitive receivers.
- Use well-maintained equipment and have equipment inspected regularly.
- Operate construction equipment for periods of fewer than 15 consecutive minutes when possible.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR, the contractor shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Authority, measures that will reduce construction noise below the levels specified in the FTA nighttime threshold and Santa Monica noise ordinance at the receiver sites. Implementation of **NOI MM 2** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.2.9 Transportation / Traffic

TRANS-3: Would the project 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?

Sites: BJM (Pg. 4-110), DPK (Pg. 4-335), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487)

Based on distance, runway length, and TOWAIR results, these Project sites require FCC registration and FAA notification. Their construction would be a significant impact on navigation that could affect air traffic patterns or pose a substantial safety risk.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.12 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure HAZ MM 2**, previously discussed above in Section 3.2.6

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR, completion of the FAA process for notice of alteration or construction and, as applicable, incorporating all FAA recommendations into the Project would prevent or minimize any substantial safety risks. Implementation of **HAZ MM 2** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

TRANS-4: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Sites: ASD (Pg. 4-74), LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

At these Project sites, construction-related activities may require lane narrowing at a driveway or detours in the parking lots of existing facilities. These activities would have temporary significant impacts associated with impairing access on adjacent roadways, creating traffic hazards and limiting emergency access.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.12 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures TRANS MM 1 and TRANS MM 2**, below.

TRANS MM 1: The construction contractor shall maintain a minimum of one open lane of traffic at all site access roads during Project construction. Use of standard construction traffic control practices such as flagmen, warning signs, and other measures shall be implemented as necessary to ensure that traffic flow remains uninterrupted at all times.

TRANS MM 2: Any temporary road or lane closures that may affect state highways shall be coordinated with Caltrans prior to commencement of construction at the site that will require the road or lane closures. If construction requires temporary road or lane closures on roads and streets managed by local entities, a traffic management plan shall be prepared and submitted to the relevant county and/or city public works department or other appropriate department for approval prior to commencement of construction at the site. Encroachment permits would be obtained where applicable.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR, the contractor shall maintain a minimum of one open lane of traffic at all site access roads and prepare a traffic management plan for approval by the appropriate jurisdiction prior to any lane closures during Project construction. Implementation of **TRANS MM 1** and **TRANS MM 2** would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.2.10 Utilities / Service Systems

UTL-1: Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FRP (Pg. 4-452), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MMC (Pg. 4-1069), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

During construction of deep foundations associated with new monopole or new tower locations, groundwater may be encountered during excavation activities at these Project sites. Perched groundwater that may be encountered could be contaminated, have high levels of turbidity, or generally not meet other requirements for discharge to the environment. Unpermitted discharges to the environment could exceed treatment requirements of the RWQCBs and would be considered a significant impact.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.13 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure UTL MM 1**, below.

UTL MM 1: In the event groundwater in sufficient quantity is encountered to require dewatering, a discharge permit shall be obtained from the applicable RWQCB

prior to construction; and removal or discharge of water would be in accordance with the terms and conditions of the permit.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR, the Authority will comply with all conditions and stipulations specified in the dewatering permit at each of these sites, as applicable. Implementation of **UTL MM 1**, would reduce construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.3 Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Determined to Be Significant that Cannot be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level

3.3.1 Aesthetics

AES-1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Site: JOP (Pg 4-682)

Site JOP includes installation of a new 180-foot lattice tower mounted with whip and microwave antennas, an equipment shelter, and generator. Existing solar panels at the site would be replaced with larger panels. The new facilities would be located in an area with no existing tall structures. Given the height of Josephine Peak in relation to the surrounding national forest, the new structure would intrude upon scenic vistas in the area. Because the new lattice tower would introduce a new vertical intrusion onto the landscape, a substantial impact to scenic vistas would occur, resulting in a significant impact.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding: As discussed in Final EIR Section 2.3, there is no alternative site for JOP. As discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIR and site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the DEIR, the only potential measure to mitigate adverse effects on scenic vistas would be painting the towers to blend with their visual settings. However, this measure is infeasible because FAA guidelines (FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1L) require certain paint colors to be used on towers for aviation safety purposes. Additionally, the visual impact of the towers would remain significant if they were painted to blend with the site's visual setting. As such, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce the impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, impacts are significant and unavoidable at site JOP.

AES-3: Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

AES-3: Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Site: JOP (Pg 4-682)

Site JOP is located in the Angeles National Forest and the existing scenic attractiveness is designated B, which is considered typical. The new tower would contrast and be incompatible with the visual character of the landscape, which is primarily forested. The result would be a degradation of the visual character surrounding the site resulting in a significant impact.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding: As discussed in Final EIR Section 2.3, there is no alternative site for JOP. As discussed in Section 3.1 of the Final EIR and site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the DEIR, the only potential measure to mitigate adverse effects on scenic vistas would be painting the towers to blend with their visual settings. However, this measure is infeasible because FAA guidelines (FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1L) require certain paint colors to be used on towers for aviation safety purposes. Additionally, the visual impact of the towers would remain significant if they were painted to blend with the site's visual setting. As such, no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce the impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, impacts are significant and unavoidable at site JOP.

3.3.2 Cultural Resources

CUL-1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in PRC §15064.5?

Site: LPC (Pg. 4-1029)

Site LPC has two historical resources located within the direct and indirect Areas of Potential Effect (APEs). The first of these two resources is P-19-186535, which is considered a historical resource and is eligible for protection under CEQA for its cultural value as the first national forest created in California. The 346,000-acre mountainous area is California Registered Historical Landmark No. 717 and was dedicated as the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument on October 10, 2014. Both the direct and indirect APEs are completely encompassed by this California Landmark. The second of these two resources is U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Resource No. 05015500237. This resource consists of two of three separate loci of the Los Pinetos Nike Missile Site, which was constructed in 1955-1956 and deactivated in 1968. The loci are the locations of the administrative area (barracks and support structures) and the radar control facility; the third locus (the launch control facility) is situated just outside the southeast boundary of the indirect APE. The direct APE is completely encompassed by one of the Nike missile loci, and the remaining two are approximately 1,650 to 2,900 feet to the east. The

complex of Nike facilities was formally evaluated in 1987 and determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Based on the Project activities, direct and indirect (visual) impacts from construction and operation of the 70-foot monopole and the associated infrastructure features would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that substantially lessen the significant environmental effect, as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 2, CUL MM 3, and CUL MM 5**, below. Although **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 2, CUL MM 3, and CUL MM 5** (below) would minimize Project impacts, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

CUL MM 2: Archaeological Monitoring – Historic-Age Resources

At proposed Project sites with known or potential presence of historic-age archaeological material (artifacts and/or features) within the defined APEs, a qualified archaeological monitor shall be present during all subsurface excavation for tower or monopole foundations and during grading for access roads and structure foundations. Monitors will also be responsible for restricting access by construction personnel to any identified archaeological resources as noted in Draft EIR section 3.4 or Chapter 4. The direct and indirect APEs are defined at the beginning of this EIR section.

The archaeological monitor will, at a minimum, have a B.A. in anthropology or related field or will have successfully completed an archaeological field methods school. The monitor will work under the supervision of an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (Project Archaeologist). The standards are published in CFR 36 Part 61 and found on the National Park Service website at http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm.

CUL MM 3: Unexpected Discovery of Archaeological Materials

In the event that previously unidentified prehistoric or historic-age archaeological resources are uncovered, the following actions shall be taken:

- 1) All ground-disturbing work within 165 feet (50 meters) of the discovery shall be halted. The qualified archaeological monitor mark the immediate area with highly visible flagging and immediately notify the Project Archaeologist.

- 2) The Project Archaeologist shall inspect the discovery and determine whether further investigation is required. If the discovery can be avoided and no further impacts will occur, the resource shall be documented on California State Department of Parks and Recreation cultural resource record forms, and no further effort shall be required.
- 3) If the resource cannot be avoided and may be subject to further impact, the Project Archaeologist shall evaluate the resource and determine whether it is (1) eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and is thus a historic property for the purposes of the NHPA and NEPA; (2) eligible for the CRHR and thus a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA; (3) a “unique” archaeological resource as defined by CEQA; (4) a Tribal resource as defined by AB 52. If the resource is determined not to be significant under any of these four categories, work may commence in the area following collection (as appropriate) and recording, including mapping and photography, of the archaeological materials or features.
- 4) If the resource meets the criteria for any or all of the categories described in CUL MM 3, work shall remain halted, and the Project Archaeologist shall consult with LA-RICS Authority staff regarding methods to ensure that no substantial adverse changes occur. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred method of ensuring no substantial adverse impacts occur on historic properties/historical resources and shall be required unless other equally effective methods are agreed upon among the Project Archaeologist, the Authority, and any other stakeholders.

If the archaeological material appears to represent a site – defined as three or more artifacts and/or features in an intact deposit – an archaeological test program (Phase II) may be necessary. Associated mitigation measures include, but are not limited to, collection of the archaeological materials, recordation (e.g., DPR Primary Record and Site Forms), and analysis of any significant cultural materials in accordance with a Data Recovery Plan, and curation of artifacts at an approved curation facility. A curation agreement for this Project is already in place with the University of California, Los Angeles, Archaeological Collections Facility at the Fowler Museum. At the completion of the appropriate mitigation measures, a professional-level technical report shall be filed with the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Information Center (IC).

- 5) Work at the Project location may commence upon completion of the appropriate mitigation treatment(s).

CUL MM 5: Architectural Resources Protection and Camouflage

Attachment of Equipment to Historic Buildings and Structures

For historic buildings or structures where communications-related equipment will be attached, the following preservation practices shall be employed, as applicable, to ensure that impacts are less than significant:

- 1) When running new exterior wiring to a historic building, existing entry points shall be utilized. If a new entry point is required, the entry shall be placed at the rear of the building or in an area on the side of the building where it will be hidden by an existing architectural feature.
- 2) When wireless nodes antennas, microwave or satellite dishes, etc. are installed on historic buildings, existing mounting points shall be utilized. For new mounts, non-penetrating mounts shall be used.
- 3) Equipment shall be placed where it does not detract from the building's overall appearance; roof-mounted equipment shall be placed where it will not be visible from accessible locations at grade. Adequate structural support for the new equipment and design shall be ensured, and a system that minimizes the number of cutouts or holes in structural members and historic material shall be installed. Existing building features shall be used to conceal equipment.
- 4) New equipment installations on a historic building that will be visible shall be painted or color-matched to the surrounding building materials. Concealment with color-matched FRP (fiberglass reinforced plastic) shrouds (boxes) is acceptable.
- 5) Any supports or brackets for new equipment shall be color-matched to the existing materials.
- 6) The installation of exterior wiring shall be minimized; where unavoidable, the wiring will be color-matched to the original building material to reduce the visual impact.
- 7) Equipment shall not be directly anchored into stone or brick; mortar joints for anchoring the equipment will be utilized.

- 8) Rust-resistant mounts to prevent staining of the building materials shall be used.
- 9) Reversible mounting techniques shall be used to avoid damage to building materials.
- 10) Installation of underground cable or conduit at a historical resource shall be undertaken in a manner that considers the stability of the historic building, including limiting any new excavations adjacent to historic foundations that could undermine the structural stability of the building and avoiding landscape or other changes that could alter drainage patterns and cause water-related damage to the building.
- 11) New interior wiring shall utilize space in existing chases, closets, or shafts.
- 12) Equipment and systems shall be installed to cause the least alteration possible to the building's floor plan and the least damage to the historic building material.
- 13) Vertical runs of conduit and cables shall be placed in closets, service rooms, and wall cavities to create the least intrusion into the historic fabric of the building and to avoid major intervention into the wall and floor systems.

Architectural Camouflage

All new towers and monopoles, or an increase in the height of existing towers and monopoles that would cause adverse visual impacts on historical resources that are adjacent to or within the viewshed, shall be camouflaged. All camouflage implemented for the Project shall be sympathetic to the existing landscape (<http://www.generalcode.com/codification/sample-legislation/cell-towers>) and/or in accordance with applicable municipal codes (http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2009/09-2645_RPT_ATT_06-07-11.pdf).

Tower disguises may include, but are not limited to, painting and various types of concealments, including clock/water towers, flag/light poles, silos, trees, and unique site-specific designs. Such measures must be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards/Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties (see Attachment of Equipment discussion above).

Rationale for Finding: As discussed in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, site summary forms in Chapter 4 and Appendix B-4 of the Draft EIR, the mitigation measures described above would require the presence of archaeological monitors during all ground-disturbing activities at Site LPC. In

addition, camouflage of the monopole would be required because the monopole would be out of character with the Cold War-era Los Pinetos Nike Missile Site landscape. With implementation of **CUL MM 2**, **CUL MM 3**, and **CUL MM 5**, impacts would be minimized; however, given the magnitude of the ground disturbance and the extent of the resources present at this site, even with implementation of the required mitigation discussed above, impacts would not be reduced to less than significant levels. There are no other feasible mitigation measures that could reduce impacts at Site LPC below the level of significance. Therefore, impacts at Site LPC would be significant and unavoidable.

CUL-2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to PRC § 15064.5?

Site: LPC (Pg. 4-1029)

As discussed above under CUL-1 above, USFS Resource No. 05015500237 is within both the direct and indirect APEs. This resource consists of two of three separate loci of the Los Pinetos Nike Missile Site, which was constructed in 1955-1956 and deactivated in 1968. The loci are the locations of the administrative area (barracks and support structures) and the radar control facility; the third locus (the launch control facility) is situated just outside the southeast boundary of the indirect APE. The direct APE is completely encompassed by one of the Nike missile loci, and the remaining two are approximately 1,650 to 2,900 feet to the east. The complex of Nike facilities was formally evaluated in 1987 and determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Based on the Project activities, direct and indirect (visual) impacts from construction and operation of the 70-foot monopole and the associated infrastructure features would be significant.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.4 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures CUL MM 2** and **CUL MM 3**, previously discussed above under CUL-1. Although these mitigation measures would minimize Project impacts, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Findings: As discussed in Section 3.4, site summary forms in Chapter 4, and Appendix B-4 of the Draft EIR, the presence of archaeological monitors would be required during all ground-disturbing activities at Site LPC. With implementation of **CUL MM 2** and **CUL MM 3**, impacts would be minimized; however, based on the historical significance of this site and the extent and location of the resources, even with implementation of the required mitigation discussed above, impacts would not be reduced to less than significant levels. There are no other feasible mitigation measures that could reduce impacts at Site LPC below the level

of significance. Therefore, impacts at Site LPC on historic archeological resources would be significant and unavoidable.

3.4 Findings Regarding Cumulatively Considerable Impacts

3.4.1 Findings Regarding Cumulatively Considerable Impacts That Would Be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level

3.4.1.1 Air Quality

AQ-1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1**.

Rationale for Finding: The construction contractor will be required to forecast Project emissions based on actual equipment that would be operating. Data would be provided and verified by the Authority, and no exceedance of NOx standards will be permitted. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1**, NOx emission would be reduced below the level of significance and would not result in a cumulatively considerable significant impact that would conflict or obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

AQ-3: Would the project 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)?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), ASD (Pg. 4-74), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915),

LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.2 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1**.

Rationale for Finding: With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ MM 1, NOx emission would be reduced below the level of significance and would not result in cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutants.

3.4.1.2 Biological Resources

BIO-1. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Potential project-related impacts to special status wildlife and plant species were evaluated at the proposed Project sites evaluated in the Draft EIR. Continued habitat loss, mortality of wildlife, or disturbance to wildlife as a result of any project included on the cumulative projects list (see Draft EIR Table 2.7-1) would constitute a cumulatively considerable significant impact.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures BIO MM 1 – BIO MM 24**.

Rationale for Finding: As described in detail in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, the Project would avoid substantial adverse effects on species and habitat through worker education, species and habitat identification, avoidance, and monitoring. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO MM 1 through BIO MM 24 would reduce cumulatively considerable construction and operational impacts to below the level of significance.

3.4.1.3 Cultural Resources

CUL-3: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), ASD (Pg. 4-74), CPK (Pg. 4-296), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), LARICSHQ (Pg. 4-954), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PDC (Pg. 4-1256), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SIM (Pg. 4-1526), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), WS1 (Pg. 4-1952), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Finding: These Project sites are within geologic units with moderate to high paleontological potential, either at the surface or at depth. Each site, considered in combination with the specified projects listed in Draft EIR Table 2.7-1, would result in significant cumulative impacts and, given the location of each site within geologic units of moderate to high paleontological potential, the incremental contribution from each identified site would be cumulatively considerable.

Rationale for Finding: Paleontological monitoring implemented under mitigation measures **CUL MM 6** and **CUL MM 7** would ensure the protection of any unexpectedly encountered paleontological resources and to reduce the potential for cumulatively considerable paleontological impacts to less than significant levels.

CUL-5: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074.

Site: ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

Finding: Proposed Project site PWT has the potential for containing Tribal resources (see Draft EIR **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.**), and these types of resources have been noted within the 0.5-mile radius of this Project site. If Tribal cultural resources lay within the direct APE (project ground-disturbing areas) of this Project site, construction impacts would be significant. However, implementation of mitigation measures **CUL MM 1**, **CUL MM 3**, and **CUL MM 4** at site PWT would ensure that any unexpectedly encountered Tribal resources are protected and to reduce the potential for cumulatively considerable impacts to less than significant levels.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of mitigation measures **CUL MM 1**, **CUL MM 3**, and **CUL MM 4** at site PWT would ensure that any unexpectedly encountered Tribal resources are protected and to reduce the potential for cumulatively considerable impacts on tribal resources to less than significant levels.

3.4.2 Findings Regarding Cumulatively Considerable Impacts That Cannot Be Mitigated to a Less Than Significant Level

3.4.2.1 Biological Resources

BIO-1. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Sites: AGH (Pg. 4-1), AJT (Pg. 4-38), BJM (Pg. 4-110), BUR1 (Pg. 4-185), CPK (Pg. 4-296), DPK (Pg. 4-335), ENC1 (Pg. 4-372), FRP (Pg. 4-452), FTP (Pg. 4-490), GMT (Pg. 4-528), GRM (Pg. 4-566), H-17A (Pg. 4-604), JOP (Pg. 4-682), JPK (Pg. 4-721), LACF072 (Pg. 4-799), LACFCP11 (Pg. 4-915), LEPS (Pg. 4-989), LPC (Pg. 4-1029), MMC (Pg. 4-1069), MML (Pg. 4-1104), MTL2 (Pg. 4-1142), OAT (Pg. 4-1181), PASPD01 (Pg. 4-1219), PHN (Pg. 4-1294), PMT (Pg. 4-1332), PWT (Pg. 4-1371), RIH (Pg. 4-1410), SDW (Pg. 4-1448), SGH (Pg. 4-1487), SPN (Pg. 4-1563), SUN (Pg. 4-1603), TOP (Pg. 4-1722), TPK (Pg. 4-1762), TWR (Pg. 4-1799), VPK (Pg. 4-1836), WAD (Pg. 4-1872), WMP (Pg. 4-1913), WTR (Pg. 4-1990), ZHQ (Pg. 4-2026)

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) protects species of native migratory birds listed under the MBTA. The American Bird Conservancy reports an estimated 6.8 million birds annually are killed by collision with communication towers in the United States and Canada. The Department of Interior Office of the Secretary (2014) reports that impacts from non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation emitted by communication towers could be significant for birds, and that cell tower radiation could be a threat to nearby nesting birds. To address these concerns, the USFWS Office of Migratory Birds has issued voluntary guidelines for communications tower placement, construction, and operation. Guidelines emphasize collocation wherever possible, height limitations of 199 feet above ground level, designs that avoid guy wires, unlighted structures if FAA regulations permit, and avoidance of migratory pathways.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project that substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in Draft EIR Section 3.3 and in the site summary forms in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, which are incorporated by reference herein. These changes are set forth in **Mitigation Measures BIO-6** and **BIO MM 18**. Although these mitigation measures would minimize Project impacts, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce this cumulatively considerable impact to a less than significant level.

Rationale for Finding: The addition of LMR structures, as well as the vast array of existing towers and high rise buildings across Los Angeles County contributes to the cumulative loss of migratory birds. This loss would be less substantive for tower structures that implement the USFWS voluntary guidelines for communications towers. This incremental impact of bird mortality due to Project implementation is “cumulatively considerable”. Though the applicable standards for the construction of communication towers are being fully met (with the exception of Site DPK 200 feet tall vs. 199 feet tall), no additional mitigation measures are available to reduce the Project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on migratory birds to less than significant.

3.5 Findings Regarding Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR and Revisions to the Final EIR

The LMR Final EIR does not identify any new significant environmental impacts that were not already identified by the Draft EIR. No new mitigation measures were imposed on the Project that could result in a new significant environmental impact. The Final EIR also does not identify any increases in the severity of any environmental impacts discussed in the Draft EIR. In addition, public comment on the Draft EIR did not identify any new alternatives to the Project that are considerably different from those evaluated in the EIR and that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project.

Responses to comments made on the LMR Draft EIR and revisions made in the LMR Final EIR merely clarify and amplify the analyses presented in the Draft EIR document and do not amount to significant new information that changes the EIR in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the Authority has declined to implement. Therefore, the Authority finds that recirculation of the LMR EIR is not required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15088.5(b).

4.0 Findings on Alternatives to the Project

4.1 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Consideration

4.1.1 Collocation

This alternative would consist of limiting installation of LMR antennas to existing structures, including roof tops, monopoles, and towers, i.e., “collocation.”

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make this alternative infeasible, and the Authority rejects this alternative because it would not meet the objectives of the Project.

Rationale for Finding: Where feasible to support system performance and reduce the number of sites, the Authority included site design documentation and plans to support collocation and/or utilization of existing telecom tower/sites; however, installing the LMR antennas on existing structures is not possible at each potential LMR site (Draft EIR Section 2.6.1). LMR sites were identified at locations that would provide the maximum countywide coverage using the minimum number of sites. Existing structures for mounting LMR antennas are not present at all locations that are required to achieve countywide coverage. At some locations where towers are present, space is not sufficient on the existing tower to mount the LMR antennas. Therefore, construction of new lattice towers and monopoles would be required to complete the LMR system. Limiting the LMR locations to only those where collocation is possible would not provide the desired coverage; therefore, an alternative consisting entirely of collocation sites would not meet the Project objectives and was not considered further.

4.1.2 Use of Cell on Wheels

Cell on Wheels (COWs) are mobile, portable cell towers with self-contained equipment and generators, typically used to provide expanded cellular network coverage and/or capacity for temporary, short-term demands. COWs are not tall enough to provide the required line of sight at most LMR sites, especially those where new lattice towers are proposed, nor do they provide the type of permanent emergency communications capability envisioned for the proposed Project.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make this alternative infeasible. On this basis, the Authority has eliminated this alternative from further consideration because it would not meet the objectives of the Project.

Rationale for Finding: Although they are comparable in height to many of the monopoles for various LMR sites, most of which would be 70 feet tall, COWs are intended for temporary use and not large enough to support all the antennas required at LMR sites (Draft EIR Section 2.6.2). Therefore, use of COWs, either for all sites or at select sites, would not meet the Project objectives and, therefore, this alternative was not considered further.

4.1.3 Use of Satellites

LMR communication could be conducted by using a satellite-based system.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make this alternative infeasible. On this basis, the Authority has eliminated this alternative from further consideration because it would not meet the objectives of the Project.

Rationale for Finding: Satellite systems experience a significant lag time between sender and receiver that does not allow the quick communication required during an emergency response (Draft EIR Section 2.6.3). Therefore, use of a satellite system would not meet Project objectives and was not considered further.

4.1.4 Alternative Systems

As the governing board for the LA-RICS telecommunications system, the Authority reviewed various telecommunications options and worked with industry experts to modernize their systems and ease transition from the existing network to a hybrid of digital and analog networks to provide a mobile data system.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make this alternative infeasible. On this basis, the Authority has eliminated this alternative from further consideration because it would not meet the objectives of the Project.

Rationale for Finding: In November 2011, requests for proposals were developed to support the hybrid system. In January 2012, proposals were received and a vendor was chosen. Alternative systems to the hybrid system were not identified (Draft EIR Section 2.6.4). Therefore, use of a hybrid communication system would not meet Project objectives and was not considered further.

4.2 Alternatives Analyzed in the Draft EIR

As discussed in Section 2.1.2 of the Draft EIR, the Authority considered more sites than would ultimately be constructed. By considering more sites than would ultimately be constructed, the Authority effectively considered numerous alternative locations for the Project. Specific groups of sites considered alternates to each other were identified. Within each group, only one site would be constructed.

Sites BUR, BUR1, BUR2, and BUR3

These sites are alternate locations within the same telecommunications site complex within the Angeles National Forest. As analyzed in the Draft EIR and summarized in Table ES-1 of the Draft EIR, environmental impacts at each of these sites would be similar; and no one site is environmentally superior to the others. At sites BUR, BUR2 and BUR3 the FAA has imposed limitations on tower heights. Of these sites the Authority has selected BUR1.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make Sites BUR, BUR2, and BUR3 infeasible.

Rationale for Finding: BUR2 and BUR3 are proximate to the FAA beacon at the site. When originally submitting a tower notification request, the FAA determined that no tower that went above the height of the beacon would be permitted. BUR1's elevation is substantially lower (almost 200 feet) than the elevation of the beacon and thus allows the construction of a larger antenna support structure. Additionally, BUR1 is located next to an existing lattice tower. Therefore, due to the limitations imposed by the FAA at the other sites, the Authority has determined it is infeasible to construct at Sites BUR, BUR2 and BUR3, and has selected Site BUR1 as the Project Site.

Sites ENT, LACFCP08, and TOP

These sites are located in the Santa Monica Mountains. Although they cover similar geographic areas, these sites do not provide comparable communication area coverage. Specifically, if the TOP site is not constructed, the Authority would need to consider building both ENT and LACFCP08 to achieve similar communication area coverage. Of these three sites, the Authority has selected Site TOP.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make Sites ENT and LACFCP08 infeasible.

Rationale for Finding: Of these three sites, Site LACFCP08 is the only site that would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. Specifically, at Site LACFCP08, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur to cultural resources. Selection of either Site ENT or Site TOP would avoid these significant and unavoidable impacts and would not result in any other significant and unavoidable impacts. Additionally, Site LACFCP08 would not achieve the Project objectives to any greater extent than Sites ENT and TOP. Therefore, Site LACFCP08 has been eliminated from consideration because it is the least environmentally preferable among the three alternative sites.

As analyzed in the Draft EIR, impacts at Sites ENT and TOP would be similar. However, while no impacts would occur at either site that could not be reduced to less than significant with mitigation, Site TOP would require more mitigation measures for biological and cultural resources than Site ENT to reduce impacts to less than significant. Therefore, Site ENT is considered environmentally superior to Site TOP by a small margin. However, Site ENT would not provide communication coverage to an area as large (both geographically and by population) as Site TOP, and would provide coverage to an area that generally is served by other Project sites. Additionally, selection of Site ENT instead of Site TOP would leave portions of the Malibu area without LMR coverage. Therefore, Site ENT would not meet the Project objective of providing day-to-day voice and narrowband data radio communications for first and second emergency responders in the Los Angeles region to the same extent as Site TOP. Additionally, within that geographic area, there would be

- no interoperability among member agencies and mutual aid providers

4.0 - Findings on Alternatives to the Project

- no support of communications with federal state and local agencies in emergencies
- no improvement of emergency communications
- no additional capacity created or replacement of aging infrastructure that meets current public safety requirements
- no ability to increase separation of antennas on support structures to reduce interference
- no provision of increased frequency flexibility to increase system coverage or capacity
- no ability to transition from existing T-Band (where it exists) to 700 MHz systems.

The sites proposed in the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area and Topanga State Park provide coverage to serve population centers, transportation corridors, and areas of highest wildland fire, among other concerns. Physical, land use, and other constraints to development within these areas of concern within the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area and Topanga State Park substantially limit suitable sites that serve these areas, hence eliminating the availability of alternatives in many locales.

Sites FRP and TMT

Sites FRP and TMT are both within Angeles National Forest. Site FRP is south of Highway 2, and Site TMT is north of Highway 2, but the settings are relatively similar. As analyzed in the Draft EIR, there is no distinction between the two sites in terms of anticipated environmental impacts. Neither is environmentally superior to the other. Site FRP has been selected as the Project site from this group.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make Site TMT infeasible.

Rationale for Finding: The FRP site would provide superior communication area coverage in comparison to TMT. Additionally, the site contains larger existing structures for mounting Project components than TMT. Further, selection of Site FRP would avoid the environmental impacts and required mitigation at Site TMT. Therefore, from a Project implementation standpoint, and because FRP fulfills Project objective more effectively, the Authority has selected site FRP as the Project site.

Sites LACFCP09 and LPC

Sites LACFCP09 and LPC are both within Angeles National Forest and about 0.25 mile apart from one another. The environmental impacts of the two sites are similar for most resources. Of these two sites, the Authority has selected Site LPC.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make Sites LACFCP09 infeasible.

Rationale for Finding: Significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources would occur at both sites. While environmental impacts at the two sites would be similar, impacts to biological resources and

geology and soils would be slightly greater at Site LPC. Therefore, although impacts would be similar between the two sites, Site LACFCP09 is considered the environmentally superior site. However, Site LACFCP09 is not within a USFS-designated communication site. By contrast, Site LPC is within a USFS-designated communication site. To enhance compatibility with the Forest Land Management Plan governing land use on the Angeles National Forest, the USFS has encouraged the Authority to select the site that is within an existing designated communications site. Selection of site LPC would maintain project consistency with the Forest Management Plan, thereby ultimately reducing impacts. Therefore, the Authority has selected Site LPC for its consistency with the Forest Management Plan.

Sites H-69B and SPN

Site H-69B is on an undeveloped ridgeline. Implementation of the Project at Site H-69B would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics (AES-1, AES-3) and cultural resources (CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-4, CUL5) as described in DEIR Sections 3.1 and 3.4, respectively. Additionally Site H69-B would result in significant impacts to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Geology/Soils which require implementation of mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to below the level of significance. SPN is an existing communications site with at least five separate installations and towers on the site. Site SPN would also result in significant impacts to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Geology/Soils, also requiring implementation of mitigation measures to reduce these impact to below the level of significance; however, Site SPN would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. Of these two sites, the Authority has selected Site SPN.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make Sites H-69B infeasible.

Rationale for Finding: Significant and unavoidable impacts would occur at site H-69B to aesthetics and cultural resources. Selection of Site SPN would avoid these significant and unavoidable impacts and would not result in any other significant and unavoidable impacts; therefore, Site SPN is the environmentally superior alternative. Site SPN has been selected by the Authority as the Project site from this group.

Sites JPK and JPK2

These sites are alternate locations within the same telecommunications site complex in the Angeles National Forest. As summarized in Table ES-1 of the Draft EIR, environmental impacts at each of these sites would be similar. Neither site is environmentally superior to the other. Site JPK is closer to the existing LA County Communications facility and is located closer to power than JPK-2.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make Site JPK2 infeasible.

Rationale for Finding: The Authority has selected Site JPK, because Site JPK is closer to the existing LA County Communications facility and is located closer to power than JPK-2. Further, selection of Site JPK

would avoid the slightly greater biological resource impacts and required mitigation associated with construction of Site JPK2. Therefore, the Authority has selected site JPK as the Project site.

Sites SUN and SUN2

These sites are alternate locations within the same telecommunications complex in the Angeles National Forest. Site SUN is closest to the existing facility. As summarized in Table ES-1 of the Draft EIR, environmental impacts at each of these sites would be similar; and neither site is environmentally superior to the other. Site SUN has been selected as the Project site from this group.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make Site SUN2 infeasible.

Rationale for Finding: Although these locations are very close to each other, the SUN site is the closest to the existing facility and would allow the new site to mimic the existing coverage from this location as closely as possible. In addition, selection of Site SUN would avoid the environmental impacts and required mitigation at Site SUN2. Therefore, from a Project implementation standpoint, and because Site SUN fulfills Project objective more effectively, the Authority has selected site SUN as the Project site.

No Project Alternative:

Under the No Project Alternative, none of the LMR wireless voice and narrowband data communications system sites evaluated in the Draft EIR would be constructed.

Finding: Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make this alternative infeasible. On this basis, the Authority has eliminated this alternative from further consideration because it would not meet the objectives of the Project.

Rationale for Finding: Without the proposed Project, public safety agencies and emergency responders would continue to utilize their current radio systems, which increasingly are inadequate and/or antiquated and have exceeded their technologically useful life. In addition, most of the region's public safety telecommunications infrastructure (equipment shelters and communications towers) do not meet the technical or operational needs of the agencies that utilize them and do not provide the necessary coverage that all users need. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives.

4.3 Alternatives and Mitigation Measures Identified in Public Comments

No feasible alternatives that were not already considered in the EIR were identified in public comments to the Draft EIR. Several comments requested that alternate sites be considered, but no specific sites were identified for consideration by the Authority.

The City of Agoura Hills requested that alternatives to the construction of a new 70-foot monopole at Site AGH be considered. These alternatives included collocation on an existing structure at the site and installation of a shorter monopole. The Authority has determined that the existing towers at Site AGH do not meet current building codes. Therefore, collocation on existing towers at Site AGH is not feasible under existing conditions and would require retrofitting to ensure the existing towers meet current building codes, which would add extra expense and may not ultimately be possible. Even if upgrade of the tower were feasible, collocation on existing towers at Site AGH would require the Authority to upgrade another entity's infrastructure without compensation and would put the Authority in a position of a lessee on that tower, which would very likely increase the cost of the site to the Authority and by extension, the tax payers. Additionally, it would not be technically feasible to collocate equipment on existing towers at Site AGH because the lower height of the existing towers would limit the amount of equipment the Authority could place on the towers and lower the coverage performance, which would result in a decreased ability to meet the project objectives in this geographic area. Installation of a new monopole shorter than 70 feet would also be infeasible for the same reasons (i.e., the lower height would limit the amount of equipment the Authority could place on the monopole and lower the coverage performance).

The Catalina Island Conservancy requested that the Authority consider whether the existing towers at sites BJM, DPK, and TWR could be removed and replaced by larger towers than proposed (i.e., larger than the 180 foot towers proposed for sites BJM and TWR and the 200 foot tower proposed for Site DPK). The Authority has determined that the addition of existing antennas onto a new larger tower at each of the sites would require a substantially taller and larger tower to accommodate the minimum 25 antennas to be added to each site. The larger and taller towers would create a greater visual intrusion than the proposed addition of a second tower at each site, where from many vantage points one tower would block the other from view. The Authority also determined that the installation of a much larger tower would be seen from a greater distance at each of the three sites. For these reasons, the Authority has determined that placement of equipment on a larger tower would not reduce or avoid the visual impacts of the proposed project at these sites.

The Catalina Island Conservancy also requested that the Authority consider whether a new tower is required at each of the three proposed Project sites on Santa Catalina Island. The Authority determined that it would not be feasible to locate all the existing and proposed equipment on the existing towers and that new towers would be required for each of the three sites to accommodate the LMR equipment.

No new mitigation measures were identified in the public comments. The Catalina Island Conservancy did identify enhancements to existing mitigation measures and where appropriate, the Authority accommodated the Conservancy's comments. These enhanced measures included additional coordination between the Authority and the Conservancy during the permitting process, and the inclusion of sites BJM, DPK, and TWR among those sites where archaeological monitors would be

present during ground disturbing activity. These revisions resulted in no changes to the impact significant conclusions made in the Draft EIR.

5.0 Custodian of Records

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Project findings are based are located at the LA-RICS Headquarters, 2525 Corporate Place, Suite 100, Monterey Park, California 91754. The custodian for these documents is the LA-RICS Authority. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code § 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines § 15091(e).

6.0 Statement of Overriding Considerations

CEQA requires a public agency to balance the benefits of a Project against its unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the project.

Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines provides the following:

- (a) *CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”*
- (b) *When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.*
- (c) *If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.*

6.1 Project Significant Impacts

Of the 44 sites analyzed in the Draft EIR and identified for construction (Table 1-1) as part of the LMR system, Sites JOP and LPC are the only sites with significant and unavoidable impacts on a project level. These impacts would occur to aesthetics and cultural resources. Cumulatively considerable and unavoidable impacts would occur at all project sites to biological resources.

6.1.1 Aesthetics

Site JOP includes installation of a new 180-foot lattice tower mounted with whip and microwave antennas, an equipment shelter, and generator. Existing solar panels at the site would be replaced with larger panels. The new facilities would be located in an area with no existing tall structures. Given the height of Josephine Peak in relation to the surrounding national forest, the new structure would intrude upon scenic vistas in the area. Because the new lattice tower would introduce a new vertical intrusion onto the landscape, a substantial impact to scenic vistas would occur, resulting in a significant impact.

Site JOP is located in the Angeles National Forest and the existing scenic attractiveness is designated B, which is considered typical. The new tower would contrast and be incompatible with the visual

character of the landscape, which is primarily forested. The result would be a degradation of the visual character surrounding the site resulting in a significant impact.

No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels at Site JOP. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas and visual character would be significant and unavoidable.

6.1.2 Biological Resources

The addition of LMR structures, as well as the vast array of existing towers and high rise buildings across Los Angeles County contributes to the cumulative loss of migratory birds protected by the MBTA. This loss would be less substantive for tower structures that implement the USFWS voluntary guidelines for communications towers. These applicable standards for the construction of communication towers would be met for all project sites (with the exception of not exceeding the height limitations of 199 feet above ground level at Site DPK which would be 200 feet tall). Although changes or alterations set forth in **Mitigation Measures BIO-6** and **BIO MM 18** have been incorporated into the Project that substantially lessen the significant environmental effect, the incremental impact of bird mortality due to Project implementation would still be cumulatively considerable and significant. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts on migratory birds to less than significant.

6.1.3 Cultural Resources

Site LPC includes installation of a 70-foot monopole with a 15-foot lightning rod, construction of a new equipment shelter, and installation of a backup generator and fuel tank on a concrete pad. Two historical resources are located within the direct and indirect APEs of Site LPC. The two resources are P-19-186535, which is considered a historical resource and is eligible for protection under CEQA for its cultural value as the first national forest created in California. The 346,000-acre mountainous area is California Registered Historical Landmark No. 717 and was dedicated as the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument on October 10, 2014. Both the direct and indirect APEs are completely encompassed by this California Landmark. In addition, USFS Resource No. 05015500237 is within both the direct and indirect APEs. Impacts from construction of the monopole and associated infrastructure features at this Project site would directly and indirectly (visually) impact the existing Cold War-era resources associated with the Los Pinetos Nike Missile Site, which is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The Project site is completely encompassed by one of three discontinuous areas associated with the Nike site (westernmost locus), and installation of the monopole would both directly and visually impact the Nike landscape. With implementation of **CUL MM 2**, **CUL MM 3**, and **CUL MM 5**, impacts would be minimized; however, based on the historical significance of this site and the extent and location of the resources, even with implementation of the required mitigation discussed above, impacts (CUL-1 and CUL-2) would not be reduced to below significant levels. Therefore, impacts of construction and operation at Site LPC on historical and historical archeological resources would be significant and unavoidable.

6.2 Overriding Considerations

The Project offers numerous benefits that outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the Project. The LA-RICS Board recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts will result from implementation of the Project, as discussed above. Having (1) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (2) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (3) balanced the benefits of the Project against the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the LA-RICS Board finds that there are specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the Project that outweigh those impacts and provide sufficient reasons for approving the Project. These overriding considerations justify adoption of the Project and certification of the Final EIR. Each of the benefits set forth below constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project, independent of the other benefits, despite each and every unavoidable impact. These benefits are as follows:

The new system will enhance safety and emergency response for 10 million Los Angeles County residents and the over 40 million Los Angeles County tourists. The LMR system will provide emergency responders with an improved communications system that will enable efficient and coordinated response to incidents and emergencies that is currently not possible in Los Angeles County. The improved communications could reduce response times and ultimately save lives. The LMR system will support a rapid, safe, and effective response during daily operations. The new system will facilitate effective radio communication to prevent and respond to crimes, keeping firefighters safe as they fight blazes, facilitating life-saving exchanges of information between emergency medical service professionals and hospitals, and allowing third responders such as public works and utility providers the opportunity to coordinate responses to disasters and special events. Additionally, the Los Angeles region is disaster prone and is designated as a high-threat area by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The Los Angeles area is subject to 13 of 16 disaster types. The LMR system will support faster, better-coordinated, large-scale multi-agency response to emergencies such as terrorist attacks, earthquakes, civil disturbance, wildfire or other disasters, improving overall system capacity and coverage for first and second responders region-wide.

The new system will replace an outdated proprietary system with a standards-based communication system. The LA-RICS LMR system is a standards-based system that is designed to facilitate the use of standards-based radio equipment regardless of manufacturer. Legacy systems are proprietary; and, as such, each proprietary system must use proprietary equipment that is specific to that model and/or version of network. Interoperability with other vendors' systems and, in many cases, different models of networks by the same manufacturer requires third party equipment to "patch" the systems together. This patch introduces a potential point of failure during times of critical communications and does not solve the problem of proprietary equipment (radios) communicating directly on a different proprietary network. The LA-RICS network will provide first and secondary responders using standards-based equipment, regardless of model or manufacturer, the ability to communicate directly with each other and remove the point of failure that is introduced with a patch. Additionally, the LA-RICS network will

provide for a **standards-based interface with other manufacturers' standards-based networks, thus preserving direct interoperability within a system-of-system environment.**

The new system will meet the FCC mandate to vacate UHF T-Band frequency spectrum at 470 to 512 MHz for members of the LA-RICS Joint Powers Authority. The LA-RICS LMR system will provide a modern, integrated wireless voice and narrowband data communications system designed and built to serve law enforcement, fire service, health service, and public works professionals throughout Los Angeles County. The system does not operate on the FCC-mandated vacated spectrum. It seamlessly operates on two bands of spectrum, 700 MHz and UHF.

The new system will replace 40 aging radio networks with one state-of-the-art network, solely dedicated to emergency responders, that increases overall capacity for and speed of communication during local emergencies, special events, and disasters. The new system will provide day-to-day communications within and among agencies and allow seamless interagency communications for responding to routine, emergency, and catastrophic events. The system is composed of four different subsystems:

- 1) Digital Trunked Voice Radio System — provides first responders with radio communications utilizing digital technology. It seamlessly operates on two bands of spectrum (700 MHz and UHF)
- 2) Analog Conventional Voice Radio System — provides first responders with radio communications utilizing conventional analog technology
- 3) Los Angeles Regional Tactical Communications System — consists of local, state, and federal interoperability channels in four different bands of spectrum in order to allow outside agencies responding to events in the County to have designated channels for communications
- 4) Narrowband Mobile Data Network — a data system that provides critical dispatch communications