

Exhibit G

This page intentionally left blank.

County of Monterey
State of California
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FILED

APR 04 2017

STEPHEN L. VAGNINI
MONTEREY COUNTY CLERK
DEPUTY

Project Title:	Indian Springs Rch Prop Owners (Verizon Wireless)
File Number:	PLN150082
Owner:	Indian Springs Ranch Property Owners
Project Location:	22400 Indian Springs Road, Salinas
Primary APN:	139-111-011-000
Project Planner:	Anna V. Quenga, Associate Planner
Permit Type:	Combined Development Permit
Project Description:	Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) amendment to a Scenic and Conservation Easement and 2) Use Permit and Design Approval to allow a wireless communication facility consisting construction of a 34-foot tall mono-eucalyptus, equipment shelter, electric meter, and 30-kilowatt standby diesel generator surrounded by an 8-foot tall fenced security enclosure. The property is located at 22400 Indian Springs Road, Salinas (Assessor's Parcel Number 139-111-011-000), Toro Area Plan.

THIS PROPOSED PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT AS IT HAS BEEN FOUND:

- a) That said project will not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment.
- b) That said project will have no significant impact on long-term environmental goals.
- c) That said project will have no significant cumulative effect upon the environment.
- d) That said project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Decision Making Body:	Planning Commission
Responsible Agency:	County of Monterey
Review Period Begins:	April 5, 2017
Review Period Ends:	April 25, 2017

Further information, including a copy of the application and Initial Study are available at the Monterey County Planning & Building Inspection Department, 168 West Alisal St, 2nd Floor, Salinas, CA 93901/(831) 755-5025.

MONTEREY COUNTY

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY – PLANNING
168 WEST ALISAL, 2ND FLOOR, SALINAS, CA 93901
(831) 755-5025 FAX: (831) 757-9516



NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION MONTEREY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Monterey County Resource Management Agency – Planning has prepared a draft Negative Declaration, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, for a Combined Development Permit (Indian Springs Ranch Property Owners) at 22400 Indian Springs Road, Salinas (Assessor's Parcel Number 139-111-011-000), Toro Area Plan.

The Negative Declaration and Initial Study, as well as referenced documents, are available for review at Monterey County Resource Management Agency – Planning, 168 West Alisal, 2nd Floor, Salinas, California. The Negative Declaration and Initial Study are also available for review in an electronic format by following the instructions at the following link: <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-i-z/resource-management-agency-rma/-planning/resources-documents/environmental-documents/pending> .

The Planning Commission will consider this proposal at a meeting on a date to be determined in the Monterey County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 168 West Alisal, 2nd Floor, Salinas, California. Written comments on this Negative Declaration will be accepted from April 5, 2017 to April 25, 2017. Comments can also be made during the public hearing.

Project Description: Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) amendment to a Scenic and Conservation Easement and 2) Use Permit and Design Approval to allow a wireless communication facility consisting construction of a 34-foot tall mono-eucalyptus, equipment shelter, electric meter, and 30-kilowatt standby diesel generator surrounded by an 8-foot tall fenced security enclosure. The property is located at 22400 Indian Springs Road, Salinas (Assessor's Parcel Number 139-111-011-000), Toro Area Plan.

We welcome your comments during the 30-day public review period. You may submit your comments in hard copy to the name and address above. The Agency also accepts comments via e-mail or facsimile but requests that you follow these instructions to ensure that the Agency has received your comments. To submit your comments by e-mail, please send a complete document including all attachments to:

CEQAcomments@co.monterey.ca.us

An e-mailed document should contain the name of the person or entity submitting the comments and contact information such as phone number, mailing address and/or e-mail address and include any and all attachments referenced in the e-mail. To ensure a complete and accurate record, we request that you also provide a follow-up hard copy to the name and address listed above. If you do not wish to send a follow-up hard copy, then please send a second e-mail requesting confirmation of receipt of comments with enough information to confirm that the entire document was received. If you do not receive e-mail confirmation of receipt of comments, then please submit a hard copy of your comments to ensure inclusion in the environmental record or contact the Agency to ensure the Agency has received your comments.

Facsimile (fax) copies will be accepted with a cover page describing the extent (e.g. number of pages) being transmitted. A faxed document must contain a signature and all attachments referenced therein. Faxed document should be sent to the contact noted above at **(831) 757-9516**. To ensure a complete and accurate record, we request that you also provide a follow-up hard copy to the name and address listed above. If you do not wish to send a follow-up hard copy, then please contact the Agency to confirm that the entire document was received.

For reviewing agencies: Resource Management Agency – Planning requests that you review the enclosed materials and provide any appropriate comments related to your agency's area of responsibility. The space below may be used to indicate that your agency has no comments or to state brief comments. In compliance with Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines, please provide a draft mitigation monitoring or reporting program for mitigation measures proposed by your agency. This program should include specific performance objectives for mitigation measures identified (CEQA Section 21081.6(c)). Also inform this Agency if a fee needs to be collected in order to fund the mitigation monitoring or reporting by your agency and how that language should be incorporated into the mitigation measure.

All written comments on the Initial Study should be addressed to:

County of Monterey
Resource Management Agency – Planning
Attn: Anna V. Quenga, Associate Planner
168 West Alisal, 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: PLN150082 Indian Springs Rch Prop Owners (Verizon Wireless)

From: Agency Name: _____
Contact Person: _____
Phone Number: _____

____ No Comments provided
____ Comments noted below
____ Comments provided in separate letter

COMMENTS: _____

DISTRIBUTION

1. County Clerk's Office
2. Native American Heritage Commission, Sacramento Office
3. Louise Miranda-Ramirez, C/O Ohlone/Costanoan-Esslen Nation
4. Monterey Bay Air Resources District
5. California Department of Fish & Wildlife, Marine Region, Attn: Steven Rienecke
6. Monterey County Regional Fire Protection District
7. Monterey County Water Resources Agency
8. Monterey County RMA-Public Works
9. Monterey County RMA-Environmental Services
10. Monterey County Environmental Health Bureau
11. Indian Springs Ranch Property Owners, Owner
12. Verizon Wireless, Applicant
13. Tricia Knight, TEK Consulting Inc, Agent
14. The Open Monterey Project
15. LandWatch
16. Property Owners within 300 feet (**Notice of Intent only**)

Distribution by e-mail only (Notice of Intent only):

17. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (San Francisco District Office: Katerina Galacatos: galacatos@usace.army.mil)
18. Emilio Hipolito (ehipolito@nccrc.org)
19. Molly Erickson (Erickson@stamplaw.us)
20. Margaret Robbins (MM_Robbins@comcast.net)
21. Michael Weaver (michaelrweaver@mac.com)
22. Monterey/Santa Cruz Building & Construction (Office@mscbctc.com)
23. Tim Miller (Tim.Miller@amwater.com)

MONTEREY COUNTY

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

PLANNING

168 W ALISAL ST, 2nd FLOOR, SALINAS, CA 93901

PHONE: (831) 755-5025 FAX: (831) 757-9516



INITIAL STUDY

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Title:	Indian Springs Rch Prop Owners (Verizon Wireless)
File No.:	PLN150082
Project Location:	22400 Indian Springs Road, Salinas
Name of Property Owner:	Indian Springs Ranch Property Owners
Name of Applicant:	Tricia Knight, TEK Consulting Inc.
Assessor's Parcel Number(s):	139-111-011-000
Acreage of Property:	72.69 Acres
General Plan Designation:	Public/Quasi-Public Resource Conservation
Zoning District:	O-D (Open Space with Design Control)
Lead Agency:	Monterey County
Prepared By:	Michael Baker International
Date Prepared:	March 27, 2017
Contact Person:	Anna V. Quenga, Associate Planner
Phone Number:	(831)755-5175

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. Description of Project

The proposed project consists of construction and operation of a wireless telecommunication facility on a vacant parcel (APN 139-111-011-000) within the Indian Springs Subdivision off River Road in Salinas, California (**Figure 1**).



Figure 1. Parcel Map and Proposed Project Site Location

The proposed facility would be contained within a 1,120-square foot leased area surrounded by an 8-foot tall fenced security enclosure; consisting of a 34-foot tall monopole designed to visually resemble a eucalyptus tree, an equipment shelter, electric meter, and a 30-kilowatt standby diesel generator (**Figures 2 and 3**).



Figure 2. Location and Proposed Site Plan

The equipment shelter, electric meter, and standby generator would be located on a 400-square foot concrete pad. There would be four service lights on a timer on the northern side of the equipment shelter. The development area is relatively flat, but would require some grading and construction of a 4-foot tall retaining wall along the southern and eastern edges where there is a slight slope. Access to the enclosure would be gained from a proposed 12-foot wide access and utility easement right-of-way from Indian Springs Road, opposite Murietta Road.

The proposed project requires a Conditional Use Permit, Design Approval application, and an amendment to an existing Scenic and Conservation Easement.




Figure 4. Elevations

B. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting

The subject property on which the monopole facility would be located is within the Indian Springs Ranch subdivision. Existing development consists of horse stables, pasture, and other equine-related facilities. Uses and development on the parcel have been restricted to recreation. However, there are provisions for allowing the placement of utilities for water, sewer, electricity, cable, and telephone. The proposed site for the monopole facility is an undeveloped area, and the applicant proposes to place the monopole near an existing grove of eucalyptus trees west of the site, with the intent of diminishing the appearance of the monopole when viewed from River Road and adjacent uses.

The project site is designated Public/Quasi-Public and Resource Conservation by the 2010 Monterey County General Plan and it is zoned O-D (Open Space with Design Control Overlay Zoning) and LDR/B-6-D (Low Density Residential with Building Site and Design Control Overlay Zoning). The proposed project is located within the boundaries of a Scenic and Conservation easement on the west side of River Road.

Surrounding land uses consist of low-density residential to the southwest, west, and northwest; a baseball field and playground to the southwest; stables to the north; and Indian Springs Road to the east. Land to the north and east of the project site is designated Public/Quasi Public by the General Plan, land to the west is designated Residential Low Density, and land to the south is designated Resource Conservation. Land to the north, east, and south of the project site is zoned O-D (Open Space with Design Control Overlay), and land to the west is zoned LDR/B-6-D (Low Density Residential with Building Site and Design Control Overlay Zoning).



Photo 1: View from Indian Springs Road, facing west



Photo 4: View of project site from private access roadway



Photo 2: Project site and existing vegetation



Photo 5: Distant view of project site from Indian Springs Road



Photo 3: View to east from project site toward stables



Photo 6: Distant view of project site from River Road

Figure 5. Site Photos

C. Required Approval by Other Agencies

Subsequent to obtaining the necessary discretionary permit approvals, the project will require ministerial approval from RMA-Building Services. During that approval, additional review by Public Works, RMA-Environmental Services, and the Monterey County Water Resources Agency would occur to ensure the construction of the development is consistent with the approved project.

III. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STATE PLANS AND MANDATED LAWS

Use the list below to indicate plans applicable to the project and verify their consistency or non-consistency with project implementation.

General Plan/Area Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality Mgmt. Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water Quality Control Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Coastal Program-LUP	<input type="checkbox"/>

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION

A. FACTORS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as discussed within the checklist on the following pages.

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

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

☒ Check here if this finding is not applicable

FINDING: For the above referenced topics that are not checked off, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur from either construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed project and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

EVIDENCE: Section VI.2 – Agricultural and Forest Resources: The subject property is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance, under a Williamson Act contract, or zoned for agricultural use. It is not zoned for Timberland Production or designated and/or identified as forestland. Neither the proposed project site nor the surrounding land is designated or identified as Farmland or Forestland. (Source: 1, 3, 4, and 9) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.4 – Biological Resources: The subject property and surrounding area is not identified as habitat area for any identified candidate, sensitive, or special-status species by any local, regional, state, or federal plan, policy, or regulation nor contain habitat identified as riparian or sensitive by local, regional, state, or federal regulations. It does not contain any defined wetlands and is not within a defined wildlife migration corridor. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources because the project's physical footprint would not result in direct impacts to habitat or resources protected by such policies. The proposed project site is not located within a habitat or conservation plan area. (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 9) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.5 – Cultural Resources: Based on data from the Monterey County Geographic Information System, the subject property has been identified to have a low archeological sensitivity, and ground disturbance would be limited to a 1,120-square-foot lease area. In the unlikely event archeological and paleontological resources and/or human remains may be discovered during site preparation, project conditions of approval will require the developer of the proposed to comply with local and state law regarding the identification and preservation of archeological and paleontological resources and human remains. Although the immediate area contains an older date palm that is indicative of turn-of-the century homestead locations (see **Photos 2 and 4** in Project Description), the proposed project contains no intact historic structures and site has not been identified as a historical resource. (Source: 1, 3, and 4) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.6 – Geology and Soils: The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The proposed project involves construction and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility within a 1,120-square-foot lease area. Minor grading would be required to level the site for the facility, but due to the small size (1,120 square feet) and relatively flat topography, this would not result in substantial erosion or landslide hazard. The site would be subject to seismic hazards, but geologic and soils conditions on the site would not pose a substantial risk to the project, and the project would not cause or exacerbate any geological hazards or soil conditions. The project site is underlain by Placentia

sandy loam, which would not pose an expansive soil hazard. The proposed project would not generate wastewater. (Source: 1, 3, 4, and 5) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality: The proposed project includes the construction and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and would not result in discharge waters that would violate water quality standards. A minimal amount of water for landscaping (see Section VI.1 – Aesthetics of this Initial Study) would be required; however, it would not cause an impact to groundwater supplies. The project would create approximately 400 square feet of impervious surface for the equipment shelter pad. This would have a negligible, if any, effect on groundwater supplies and recharge. The proposed project includes installation of a 400-square-foot concrete pad for the equipment shelter, creating a new impervious surface. Although this would generate an increase in stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions, it would be minimal and would not affect drainage patterns due to its small size. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in changes surface runoff that would cause or exacerbate flooding, exceed storm drain capacity, or cause substantial erosion or siltation. The project requires minor grading and land disturbance that could result in temporary runoff or erosion of exposed soils, which could in turn result in minor impacts to runoff water quality. However, the County's existing requirements for new construction include best management practices to control on-site sources of pollutants or turbidity. Implementation of existing requirements will adequately address this issue. The proposed project is the construction and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility, which would not result in the creation of housing that could be subject to flood hazards. The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is not at risk of levee or dam failure, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8, and 9) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.11 – Mineral Resources: The project site is not located in an area mapped by the California Geological Survey or Monterey County as containing significant mineral resources. No mineral resources have been identified, or would be affected by the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not have impacts on minimal resources. (Source: 1, 2, 3, and 7) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.13 – Population/Housing: The proposed project is the construction and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility, which would not result in population growth. The site is vacant, and no existing housing would be affected. Electrical utility infrastructure to serve the project is available from Indian Springs Road. The project would not require extension of infrastructure that would be growth inducing. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in an increase of housing units on the subject property nor would it cause an increase demand for additional housing. The proposed project would not substantially induce population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, as no new infrastructure would be extended to the site. Therefore, the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to Population/Housing. (Source: 1, 2, 3, and 9) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.14 – Public Services: The proposed project would have no substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, where construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. (Source: 1 and 2) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.15 – Recreation: The proposed project would not result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities causing substantial physical deterioration. The proposed project does not include or require construction or expansion of recreation facilities. It will have no impact on nearby equestrian facilities or other recreational opportunities. No impacts will occur. (Source: 1, 2, 3, and 9) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.16 – Transportation/Traffic: The proposed project would not result in additional vehicle trips outside of a limited duration construction period and periodic maintenance activities. Therefore, it would not conflict with applicable plans or service standards. The project would not result in changes in air traffic patterns. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip or Airport Land Use Plan as the closest airport is Salinas Municipal Airport, 4.64 miles northeast of the project site. The proposed tower would be 34 feet tall, which would not pose a safety hazard. Access to the project site would be provided through an existing easement from a private road, Indian Springs Road, and would not impact vehicle, pedestrian, or bicycle transportation facilities or result in roadway design hazards or inadequate emergency access. (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 9) **Conclusion: No Impact**

Section VI.17 – Utilities: The proposed project would not require wastewater service. A small amount of water would be required to maintain landscaping (see Section VI.1 – Aesthetics of this Initial Study); however, this would have an immeasurable effect on water supply and treatment. The proposed 400-square-foot concrete pad on which the equipment shelter and standby generator would be located would minimally increase impervious surface compared to existing conditions and would generate a negligible increase in stormwater flows. It would not be a substantial source of stormwater runoff that would affect existing storm drainage system capacity. Operation of the proposed project would not generate solid waste, but construction of the proposed project may generate a limited amount of solid waste (e.g., concrete pad wooden forms, packaging materials, empty containers). The amount of solid waste generated during construction would be minimal and would have a negligible impact on material disposed of at landfill facilities in the county. (Source: 1, 3, 4, and 9) **Conclusion: No Impact**

B. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Signature

Anna V. Quenga



Date

Associate Planner

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).

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

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

The project site is within the Toro Area Plan, and Figure 16 of the Area Plan (Scenic Highway Corridors and Visual Sensitivity) identifies the area that includes the project site as “sensitive.” Policy T-3.1 of the Toro Area Plan states that development may be permitted within an area designated as visually sensitive if proposed development is designed in such a manner that the development will enhance the scenic value of the area.

1(b). Conclusion: No Impact.

The proposed project site is currently undeveloped and does not contain any trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings. The subject property is not within or adjacent to a state scenic highway. Therefore, the project would have no impact.

1(a), (c), and (d). Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact.

Although located in an existing Scenic and Conservation easement, the location of the project is several hundred feet from River Road, in an area that contains a backdrop of high hills and tall stands of trees (see **Photos 1 through 6**). Given the distance and surroundings, the project would not be visually prominent from River Road, based on field observations. To minimize visual intrusion and aesthetic impacts, the applicant proposes that the 34-foot-tall monopole be designed to resemble a eucalyptus tree. This design would blend in with the existing eucalyptus trees, which would help reduce its appearance in the visually sensitive area and thus would minimally, if at all, detract from the scenic value of the visually sensitive area identified in the Area Plan. The monopole would be substantially shorter than the approximately 100 foot-tall eucalyptus trees that form a dense visual background and will not create a skyline or be visible along a ridgeline. As illustrated in **Figure 4**, the monopole would include branches at the uppermost part of the pole that resemble those of a eucalyptus, which would partially obscure the

three 6-foot-long panel antenna “sectors” mounted to the pole. The fenced security enclosure containing the equipment shelter, standby generator, and related appurtenances would range from approximately 8 to 10 feet tall, and do not currently include visual screening. Consistent with Policy T-3.1 and regulations contained in Section 21.44 – Design Control District, of the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Title 21), a condition of approval will be incorporated requiring installation of landscape screening along the security fence enclosure. This would result in softening of the appearance and obscure the chain link fence and ground level electrical equipment, ensuring protection of the public viewshed as well as the visual integrity of the area.

The proposed facility would include four service lights that would be on a 6-hour timer. The lights would be approximately 8 to 10 feet off the ground and would not operate continuously. The lights would not be visible to residential areas to the west of the site because there is an intervening dense grove of eucalyptus trees that blocks views. The facility site is more than 600 feet from Indian Springs Road, and any incidental service lighting will not create glare conditions or light intrusion at that distance. Also consistent with Policy T-3.1, the project will be conditioned requiring submittal of an exterior lighting plan showing that all light are downlit, unobtrusive, and light only the area intended.

The project, as proposed and conditioned, would have a less than significant impact to a scenic vista, the existing visual character of the area, and nighttime views or glare.

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: 1, 2, & 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 1, 2, & 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 1, 2, & 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in significant construction-related air quality impacts? (Source: 1, 2, & 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 1, 2, & 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 1, 2, & 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

In order to provide protection and enhancement of Monterey County's air quality, Monterey County 1982 General Plan Policy No. 20.1.1 requires development decisions to be consistent with the natural limitation of the County's air basins. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) coordinates and oversees both state and federal air quality control programs in California. The CARB has established 14 air basins statewide and the project site is located in the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). The MBUAPCD is responsible for enforcing standards and regulating stationary sources through the *2008 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region* (AQMP) and *2009-2001 Triennial Plan Revision* ("Revision").

3(a), (e), and (f). Conclusion: No Impact.

Population-generating projects that are within the AQMP population forecasts are considered consistent with the plan and implementation of the project would not result in generation of additional population in the area. Air pollutant emissions would be generated during construction activities, but they would be minimal due to the small size of the project. Air pollutant emissions would be generated during project operation by maintenance vehicles. The emissions would be negligible. There are no sensitive receptors in proximity of the proposed development area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a violation of an air quality standard or contribute to any projected violation of air quality standards, nor would it result in emissions that would be cumulatively considerable, or expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

3(b), (c), and (d). Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction of the proposed project would involve heavy equipment use to grade the site for the facility, pouring the concrete pad, and installation of the tower, equipment shelter, and other features, along with construction worker trips. Operation of the project would require occasional vehicle trips to the facility for maintenance. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines identify threshold for construction activities with potentially significant impacts for PM₁₀ to be 2.2 acres of disturbance a day. The proposed construction would be contained within less than 2,000 square feet of the subject property, resulting in a less than significant impact. Furthermore, construction-related air quality impacts would be controlled by implementing Monterey County standard conditions for erosion control that require watering, erosion control, and dust control. These impacts are considered less than significant based on the foregoing measures and best management practices incorporated into the project design and which reduce the air quality impacts below the threshold of significance. Although Monterey County is in attainment for all federal air quality standards and state standards for Carbon monoxide (CO), Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂), Lead, and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), it is designated as “non-attainment-transitional” for respirable particulates (PM₁₀) for the state 2-hour ozone standard. The proposed project includes grading and construction activities (and similar projects occur within the vicinity of the subject property) the potential air emissions meet the standard for pollutants and the project would not create a situation where it adds a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Therefore, as noted by CEQA, air emissions would be less than significant for PM₁₀ due to the non-attainment designation.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5? (Source: 1, 3 & 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? (Source: 1, 3 & 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Source: 1, 3 & 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Source: 1, 3 & 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5) Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Landslides? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Chapter 18A of the 2016 California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Source: 1 & 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Source: 1 & 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

Although the State of California has provided guidance to lead agencies, it has yet to develop specific Green House Gas (GHG) thresholds of significance for analysis of projects during environmental review. Furthermore, the Monterey Bay Unified Air Quality Management District (MBUAQMD) has not adopted GHG thresholds to determine significance. Temporary construction activities of the proposed project would be the main contributor to GHG emissions. Unfortunately, quantifying project emissions at this time would be too speculative. Therefore, in lieu of State guidance or locally adopted thresholds, a primarily qualitative approach was used to evaluate possible impacts from the proposed project.

7(a) and (b). Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction of the proposed project would involve heavy equipment use and construction worker vehicle trips. Operation of the project would require occasional vehicle trips to the facility for maintenance. Greenhouse gas emissions would be generated during construction activities, but they would be minimal due to the small size of the project. GHG emissions would be generated during project operation by maintenance vehicles. The emissions would be negligible. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

The proposed project includes establishment of a wireless communication facility within an open space parcel of the Indian Springs residential subdivision.

8(c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h). Conclusion: No Impact.

There are no schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. There would be no impact related to hazardous emissions. The proposed project site is not listed on any state or federal list of hazardous waste sites. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip or Airport Land Use Plan. The closest Airport or private airstrip, Salinas Municipal Airport, is 4.64 miles northeast of the project site. The proposed project includes the construction of an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility on private, leased property and would be accessed by an access and utility easement right-of-way from a private road. As such, the proposed project would not result in any impact on local emergency evacuation plans or fire protection plans. As an uninhabited facility, the proposed wireless telecommunications facility will not expose people

to any existing wildland fire hazards. The facility itself, although containing electrical equipment and a backup generator, is not a source of ignition and does not pose a significant risk of wildland fire in this location.

8(a) and (b). Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed facility would include a 30-kilowatt diesel-powered standby generator. The amount of diesel stored on-site for the generator would be 132 gallons. Hazardous materials used and stored in quantities greater than 55 gallons are subject to Hazardous Materials Management Reporting under Section 25503.3(c) of the California Health and Safety Code. As a condition of project approval and prior to operation, the applicant will be required to prepare and submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan to the county. The county's Hazardous Materials Management Services – as the Certified Uniform Program Agency – has monitoring and enforcement authority for ensuring the fuel tank is maintained in accordance with applicable hazardous materials regulations. The fuel will be required to be stored and secured consistent with state and local codes, which includes National Fire Protection Association standards for protected steel tanks. In the unlikely event of a spill or release of fuel on-site of 42 gallons or more, in accordance with regulations, the project applicant would be responsible for notifying the county. With adherence to adopted regulations and safety codes, the quantity of fuel would not pose a significant hazard to people or the environment.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial <u>erosion</u> or <u>siltation</u> on- or off-site? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in <u>flooding</u> on- or off-site? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Source: 1, 3, 4, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

The proposed project is subject to the regulations contained within the 2010 Monterey County General Plan, Toro Area Plan, and the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Title 21).

10(a) and (c). Conclusion: No Impact.

The project site is a 1,120-square foot area situated on vacant land. The established Indian Springs community would not be divided or impacted by the proposal. Access to the site would be from a proposed access and utility easement right-of-way along a private roadway that leads to existing equestrian facilities north of the site. The proposed easement would not preclude or limit existing access to current land uses in the vicinity. The proposed project site is not located within a habitat conservation plan area or natural community conservation plan area.

10(b). Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact.

As described previously, the project site represents “development” within an existing Scenic and Conservation Easement. Figure 16 of the Toro Area Plan identifies the area as visually sensitive. Policy T-3.1 of the Area Plan states that development may be permitted within an area designated as visually sensitive if proposed development is designed in such a manner that the development will enhance the scenic value of the area. The intent of the policy, and the scenic easement, is to protect the rural visual appearance and scenic vistas present along River Road by requiring a high level of design within the built environment. Although the monopole may not “enhance” the scenic value of the area, the design ensures minimal visual intrusion of the facility by blending the development into the existing vegetation and topography of the site. As discussed in Section VI.1 – Aesthetics, of this Initial Study, the proposed project is consistent the Toro Area Plan policies by providing a high level of design and screening on this communication facility.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

12. NOISE		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:					
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 5, & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 5, & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 5, & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 5, & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 5, & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 5, & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

The proposed project would introduce a new use on the subject property. However, there are no foreseen noise impacts caused by the operational elements of project implementation

12(c), (e), and (f). Conclusion: No Impact.

Operation of the wireless telecommunication facility would not discernible generate noise or groundborne vibration. The proposed project site is not located within two miles of an airport or airstrip, and it is not within an airport land use plan. The closest airport, Salinas Municipal, is located 4.64 miles northeast of the project site.

12(a), (b), and (d). Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction of the proposed project would involve the use of heavy equipment such as a grader, crane, concrete truck, and other vehicles and equipment, which would result in temporary increases above ambient noise levels. The closest noise-sensitive receptors are residential uses approximately 250 to 300 feet to the northwest, west, and southwest. These residences are

topographically higher than the facility site, with a dense grove of tall eucalyptus trees that would tend to soften noise levels from construction equipment. The project applicant will be required through conditions of approval to adhere to the noise standards regarding acceptable noise levels and Best Practices for noise control listed in General Plan Policy S-7.10 and Chapter 10.60 of the Monterey County Municipal Code. This would ensure the proposed project would not exceed the county's noise standards or generate substantial increases in noise levels above existing conditions without the project, and the would be less than significant.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:					
Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
a)	Fire protection? (Source: 1 & 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Police protection? (Source: 1 & 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Schools? (Source: 1 & 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Parks? (Source: 1 & 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Other public facilities? (Source: 1 & 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

15. RECREATION		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Source: 1, 2, 3 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	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 non-motorized 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? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with the goals, objectives, and policies of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan for Monterey County, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) for designated roads or highways? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Source: 1, 3, 4 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

See previous Section II.B (Project Description) and C (Environmental Setting) and Section IV.A (Environmental Factor Potentially Affected), as well as the sources listed.

VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this initial study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9) ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

- a) Any potential impacts from proposed project would be limited to the 1,120-square-foot lease area of the project site and would therefore not result in the habitat degradation or species reduction of any fish or wildlife species. Given the size of project site, limited ground disturbance that would be required by the proposed project, and lack known or identified cultural or paleontological resources at the site, the proposed project would not eliminate any example of the major periods of California history or prehistory. **Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact**
- b) The proposed project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable due to the type of project and limited ground disturbance area. It does not include any growth-inducing attributes that would combine with future potential impacts of similar or nearby projects. **Conclusion: Less Than Significant Impact**

- c) Following the completion of construction and aside from periodic maintenance, the proposed project will not require personnel to be at the project site. In addition, the proposed project will not be next or immediately adjacent to any existing residences or any other inhabited structure. **Conclusion: No Impact**

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

VIII. FISH AND GAME ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FEES

Assessment of Fee:

The State Legislature, through the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 1535, revoked the authority of lead agencies to determine that a project subject to CEQA review had a “de minimis” (minimal) effect on fish and wildlife resources under the jurisdiction of the Department of Fish and Game. Projects that were determined to have a “de minimis” effect were exempt from payment of the filing fees.

SB 1535 has eliminated the provision for a determination of “de minimis” effect by the lead agency; consequently, all land development projects that are subject to environmental review are now subject to the filing fees, unless the Department of Fish and Game determines that the project will have no effect on fish and wildlife resources.

To be considered for determination of “no effect” on fish and wildlife resources, development applicants must submit a form requesting such determination to the Department of Fish and Game. Forms may be obtained by contacting the Department by telephone at (916) 631-0606 or through the Department’s website at www.dfg.ca.gov.

Conclusion: The project will be required to pay the fee.

Evidence: Based on the record as a whole as embodied in the Planning Department files pertaining to PLN150082 and the attached Initial Study / Proposed (Mitigated) Negative Declaration.

IX. REFERENCES

1. Project Application/Plans
2. Monterey County 2010 General Plan
3. Toro Area Plan
4. Monterey County Geographic Information System (GIS)
5. Title 21 of the Monterey County Code (Zoning Ordinance)
6. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, Revised February 2008
7. California Geological Survey, CGS Information Warehouse: Mineral Land Classification Maps Special Report 146
8. Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Rate Insurance Map Panel 06053C0360G, effective April 2, 2009.
9. Site Visit conducted by the project planner on December 28, 2016.