

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**NEGATIVE DECLARATION****Competitive Local Carriers' (CLCs)
Projects for Local Exchange Telecommunication Service throughout California.****PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The California Public Utilities Commission's Decision 95-07-054 enables various telecommunication companies to compete with local telephone companies in providing local exchange service. Previous to this decision, local telephone service was monopolized by a single utility per service territory. The Commission has received 66 petitions from companies to provide competitive local telephone service throughout areas presently served by Pacific Bell and GTE California.

The 66 petitioners include cable television companies, cellular (wireless) companies, long-distance service providers, local telephone service providers, and various other telecommunication companies that specialize in transporting data.

40 of the 66 petitions are for approval of facilities-based services, which means that the petitioners propose to use their own facilities in providing local telephone service. The remaining 26 petitions are strictly for approval of resale-based services, meaning that telephone service will be resold using another competitor's facilities. (Most of the facilities-based petitioners offer resale-based services as well.) The 40 facilities-based petitions indicate that physical modifications to existing facilities may be required, and construction of new facilities is a possibility in the long-term. (*See Appendix B for a list of the facilities-based petitioners.*) The 26 resale-based petitions are strictly financial and billing arrangements that involve no construction and are therefore considered to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.).

Since many of the petitioners are initially targeting local telephone service for areas where their telecommunication infrastructures are already established, very little construction is envisioned. In fact, approximately one-third of the 40 facilities-based petitioners indicate that no modifications or extensions are necessary since their facilities are already equipped to begin competition for local telephone services. For service areas that are beyond their current infrastructure, the petitioners generally plan to resell services, rather than build additional facilities.

The remaining facilities-based petitioners will need to make modifications to their facilities. Some of these modifications are minor in nature, the most common being the installation of a switch that connects potential customers to outside systems. Switch installation is necessary because customers receiving a particular type of service may not have access to local telephone networks. For example, customers receiving cable television service are presently unable to connect to local telephone networks because of the differences in modes of service. A switch installation by a cable television provider is one step that makes the connection possible. Switch installation is

considered a minor modification because it typically involves a single installation within an existing central communication facility or building.

Besides the minor modifications, a minority of companies are planning to install their own fiber optic cables to provide adequate service. Cables will be installed within existing utility underground conduits or ducts, or attached to utility poles with existing overhead lines whenever possible. Fiber optic cables are extremely thin, and existing conduits will likely be able to hold multiple cables. However, if existing conduits or poles are unable to accommodate additional cables, then new conduits or poles will need to be constructed by the petitioner. In this case, the petitioners will construct within existing utility rights-of-way. There is also the possibility that the petitioners may attempt to access other rights-of-way (such as roads) to construct additional conduits. Extension of existing rights-of-way into undisturbed areas is not likely, but a possibility.

The installation of fiber optic cables into underground conduits will vary in complexity depending upon the conditions of the surrounding area. For example, in urban, commercial areas, utility conduits can be accessible with minimal groundbreaking and installation simply requires stringing the cable through one end of the conduit and connecting it to the desired end. In this case, major excavation of the right-of-way is unnecessary. However, there may also be conditions where access to the conduit will require trenching and excavation.

Many of the petitioners have no plans to construct service boxes or cabinets which contain batteries for the provision of power or emergency power. The dimensions of the boxes vary, but basically range from three to five feet in height. Depending upon the type of technology and facilities operated by the petitioner, smaller service boxes (approximately 3 inches in height) would be used for power supply and backup power. Those petitioners who have no plans to use such boxes already have capable power and backup power within their existing facilities. The few petitioners who will need such boxes, have committed to placing the boxes in existing buildings, or in underground vaults. If conditions do not permit building or underground installation, the petitioners would use small low-profile boxes that are landscaped and fenced.

Cellular companies that wish to compete in providing local service are already required to comply with Commission regulations for the construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. The Commission's General Order (G.O.) 159 requires the cellular utilities to obtain all necessary local approvals and permits for a new or modified cell site before it receives approval from the Commission. This may involve an environmental review under CEQA.

All the petitioners state their intention to compete in the territories presently served by Pacific Bell and GTE California. These territories encompass many of California's 58 counties, and therefore include almost all types of zoning designations. However it is unclear at this time if all zoned areas will be affected by the projects since the petitioners are not specific where they intend to compete in the long-run.

It is expected that most of the petitioners will initially compete for customers in urban, dense

commercial areas and residential zones where their telecommunication infrastructures already exist. In general, the petitioners' projects will be in places where people live or work. Cellular companies are somewhat of an exception in that they are not limited to urban or residential zones. Cellular technology is wireless and therefore enables them to provide communication service in areas that could be less populated but contain major transportation thoroughfares. Thus in some limited instances, the targeted areas for cellular projects could potentially be in agricultural, industrial, or uninhabited forested zones, depending upon the proximity of roads, streets or highways. However, this is not anticipated in the near-term.

The California Public Utilities Commission is the lead agency in approving these petitioners' intent to compete in the local exchange market. Additional approvals by other agencies may be required depending upon the scope and type of construction proposed by the petitioner (e.g. federal, other state agencies, and ministerial permits by local agencies).

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

An Initial Study was prepared to assess the projects' potential effects on the environment, and the respective significance of those effects. Based on the Initial Study, the CLCs' projects for competitive local exchange service have the potential to cause significant adverse effects on the environment in the area of Land Use and Planning, Geological Resources, Water, Air Quality, Transportation and Circulation, Hazards, Noise, *Public Services*, Aesthetic and Cultural Resources. The projects will have less than a significant effect in other resource areas of the checklist. It should be noted that Findings 2 through 10 are for those projects which require work within existing utility rights-of-way for the purpose of modifying existing facilities or installing new facilities. Finding 1 is applicable for work outside of the existing utility rights-of-way.

In response to the Initial Study, the following specific measures should be incorporated into the projects to assure that they will not have any significant adverse effects on the environment. (See *Public Resources Code Section 21064.5*.)

As a general matter, many of the mitigation measures rely on compliance with local standards and the local ministerial permit process. Although local safety and aesthetic input is essential in minimizing the impact of the petitioner's construction, local jurisdictions cannot impose standards or permit requirements which would prevent petitioners from developing their service territories, or otherwise interfere with the statewide interest in competitive telecommunication service. Therefore, the petitioners' required compliance with local permit requirements is subject to this limitation.

The findings of the draft Negative Declaration were modified in response to comments filed during the public comment period. (See Appendix C for responses to comments.) Changes are marked by italics.

1. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental effects for all environmental factors if a proposed project extends beyond the utility right-of-way into undisturbed areas or into other rights-of-way. (*"Utility right-of-way" means any utility right-of-way, not limited to only telecommunication utility right-of-way.*) For the most part, the petitioners do not plan to conduct projects that are beyond the utility right-of-way. However, should this occur, the petitioner shall file a Petition to Modify its Certificate for Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN). An appropriate environmental analysis of the impacts of these site specific activities shall be done.

2. The proposed projects will not have any significant effects on Population and Housing, Biological Resources, Energy and Mineral Resources, and Recreation if the proposed projects remain within existing utility right-of-way. There are no potential environmental effects in these areas, or adequate measures are incorporated into the projects to assure that significant effects will not occur.

3. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental effects on Geological Resources because possible upgrades or installations to underground conduits may induce erosion due to excavation, grading and fill. It is unclear as to how many times underground conduits may be accessed by the petitioners, but it is reasonable to assume that constant excavation by various providers could result in erosion in areas where soil containment is particularly unstable.

In order to mitigate any potential effects on geological resources, the petitioners *shall* comply with all local design, construction and safety standards *by obtaining all applicable ministerial permits from the appropriate local agencies.* In particular, erosion control plans *shall* be developed and implemented for areas identified as particularly unstable or susceptible to erosion. If more than one petitioner plans to excavate geologically sensitive areas, coordination of their plans *shall* be necessary to minimize the number and duration of disturbances.

4. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental effects on Water Resources because possible upgrades or installation to underground conduits may be in close proximity to underground or surface water sources. While the anticipated construction will generally occur within existing utility rights-of-way, the projects have the potential to impact nearby water sources if heavy excavation is required as the method of access to the conduits.

In order to mitigate any potential effects on water resources, the petitioners *shall* comply with all local design, construction and safety standards. This will include consultation with all appropriate local and state water resource agencies for projects that are in close proximity to water resources, underground or surface. *The petitioners shall comply with all applicable local and state water resource regulations.* Appropriate *site specific* mitigation plans *shall* be developed by the petitioners if the projects impact water quality,

drainage, direction, flow or quantity. If there is more than one petitioner for a particular area that requires excavation, coordination plans *shall* be required to minimize the number *and duration* of disturbances.

5. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental effects on Air Quality because possible excavation efforts for underground conduits may result in vehicle emissions and airborne dust for the immediate areas of impact. This is especially foreseeable if more than one petitioner should attempt such work in the same locale. While the impact will be temporary, the emissions and dust could exceed air quality standards for the area.

The petitioners *shall* develop and implement appropriate dust control measures during excavation as recommended by *the applicable* air quality management district. *The petitioners shall comply with all applicable air quality standards as established by the affected air quality management districts.* If there is more than one petitioner for a particular area that requires excavation, coordination plans *shall* be required to minimize the number and duration of disturbances.

6. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental impacts on Transportation and Circulation and *Public Services* because uncoordinated efforts by the petitioners to install fiber optic cable could result in a cumulative impact of traffic congestion, insufficient parking and hazards or barriers for pedestrians. This is foreseeable if the competitors choose to compete in the same locality and desire to install their own cables. If the selected area is particularly dense with heavy vehicular or pedestrian traffic, the impacts could be enormous without sufficient control and coordination. *Uncoordinated efforts may also adversely impact the quality and longevity of public street maintenance because numerous excavation activity depreciates the life of the surface pavement.*

The petitioners *shall* coordinate their efforts to install fiber optic cables or additional conduits so that the number of encroachments to the utility rights-of-way are minimized. These coordination efforts *shall* also include affected transportation and planning agencies to coordinate other projects unrelated to the petitioners' projects. *Besides coordinating their efforts, the petitioners shall abide by all local construction, maintenance and safety standards by acquiring the necessary ministerial permits from the appropriate local agency. Examples of these permits are excavation, encroachment and building permits.* Appropriate construction start and end times, and dates if appropriate, *shall* be employed to avoid peak traffic periods and to minimize disruption, especially if the petitioners' work encroaches upon transportation rights-of-way.

7. The proposed projects could have potentially significant hazard-related effects because uncoordinated construction efforts described above could potentially interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. *There is also potential for an increase in*

overhead lines and poles which carry hazard-related impacts.

The same mitigation plan as described in the previous section is applicable here as well, and *shall* be augmented by *notice to and consultation with emergency response or evacuation agencies* if the proposed project interferes with *routes* used for emergencies or evacuations. The coordination efforts *shall* include provisions so that emergency or evacuation plans are not hindered. *If the projects result in an increase in overhead communication lines, the petitioner shall obtain the necessary ministerial permits to erect the necessary poles to support the lines. The Commission's Safety and Enforcement Division shall include these facilities as part of its overhead line regular inspections so that the requirements of G.O. 95 are met.*

8. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental effects on Noise because it is possible some projects may require excavation or trenching. Although the effect is likely to be short-term, existing levels of noise could be exceeded.

If the petitioner requires excavation, trenching or other heavy construction activities which would produce significant noise impacts, the petitioner *shall abide by all applicable local noise standards and shall* inform surrounding property owners and occupants (particularly school districts, hospitals and the residential neighborhoods) of the day(s) when most construction noise would occur. *Notice shall be given at least two weeks in advance of the construction.*

9. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental effects on aesthetics because it is possible that additional lines on poles in utility rights-of-way could become excessive for a particular area. *Moreover, there is potential for an increase in above grade utility service boxes or cabinets which also carry aesthetic impacts.*

Local aesthetic concerns shall be addressed by the petitioners for all facilities that are above-ground, in particular all types of service boxes or cabinets. The local land use or planning agency shall be consulted by the petitioner so that any site-specific aesthetic impacts are assessed and properly mitigated.

10. The proposed projects could have potentially significant environmental effects on cultural resources because situations involving additional trenching may result in uncovering unanticipated archaeological or historical resources.

Should cultural resources be encountered during construction, all earthmoving activity which would adversely impact such resources *shall* be halted or altered so as to avoid such impacts, until the petitioner retains the service of a qualified archaeologist who will do the appropriate examination and analysis. The archaeologist *shall* provide proposals for any procedures to mitigate the impact upon those resources encountered.

In summary, the Mitigation Measures recommended in this environmental determination are:

A) All Environmental Factors: if a proposed project extends beyond the utility right-of-way into undisturbed areas or other right-of-way, the petitioner shall file a Petition to Modify its Certificate for Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN). (*"Utility right-of-way" means any utility right-of-way, not limited to only telecommunications utility right-of-way.*) An appropriate environmental analysis of the impacts of these site specific activities shall be done.

If the projects remain within the utility right-of-way, the following Mitigation Measures are recommended:

B) General Cumulative Impacts: in the event that more than one petitioner seeks modifications or additions to a particular locality, the petitioners shall coordinate their plans with each other, and consult with affected local agencies so that any cumulative effects on the environment are minimized. These coordination efforts shall reduce the number and duration of disturbance to existing utility right-of-way. *Regardless of the number of petitioners for a particular locality, the petitioner shall consult with, and abide by the standards established, by all applicable local agencies. Each petitioner shall file a quarterly report, one month prior to the beginning of each quarter, that summarizes the construction projects that are anticipated for the coming quarter. The summary will contain a description of the type of construction and the location for each project so that the local planning agencies can adequately coordinate multiple projects if necessary. The reports will also contain a summary of the petitioner's compliance with all Mitigation Measures for the projects listed. The quarterly reports will be filed with the local planning agencies where the projects are expected to take place and the Telecommunications Branch of the Commission Advisory and Compliance Division (CACD). The CACD filing will be in the form of an informational advice letter. Subsequent quarterly reports shall also summarize the status of the projects listed in previous quarterly report, until they are completed.*

C) Geological Resources: the petitioners shall comply with all local design construction and safety standards *by obtaining all applicable ministerial permits from the appropriate local agencies including the development and approval of erosion control plans.* These shall be developed and implemented for areas identified as particularly unstable or susceptible to erosion. If more than one petitioner plans to excavate sensitive areas, coordination of their plans shall be necessary to minimize the number of disturbances. *The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.*

D) Water Resources: the petitioners shall consult with all appropriate local and state water resource agencies for projects that are in close proximity to water resources, underground or surface. *The petitioners shall comply with all applicable local and state*

water resource regulations including the development of site-specific mitigation plans should the projects impact water quality, drainage, direction, flow or quantity. If there is more than one petitioner for a particular area that requires excavation, coordination plans shall be required to minimize the number of disturbances. The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.

E) Air Quality: the petitioners shall develop and implement appropriate dust control measures during excavation as recommended by the applicable air quality management district. *The petitioners shall comply with all applicable air quality standards as established by the affected air quality management districts. If there is more than one petitioner for a particular area that requires excavation, coordination plans shall be required to minimize the number of disturbances. The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.*

F) Transportation and Circulation and Public Services: the petitioners shall coordinate their efforts to install fiber optic cables or additional conduits so that the number of disturbances to the utility rights-of-way are minimized. These coordination efforts shall include affected transportation and planning agencies to coordinate other projects unrelated to the petitioners' projects. *Besides coordinating their efforts, the petitioners shall abide by all local construction, maintenance and safety standards by acquiring the necessary ministerial permits from the appropriate local agency. Examples of these permits are excavation, encroachment and building permits. Appropriate construction start and end times, and dates if appropriate, shall be employed to avoid peak traffic periods, especially if the petitioners' work encroaches upon transportation rights-of-way. Notice to the affected area (surrounding property owners and occupants) shall be given at least two weeks in advance of the construction. The notice will provide the time and dates of the proposed construction and discussion of potential impacts on traffic and circulation. The notice required for Mitigation Measures F and H shall be consolidated. The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.*

G) Hazards: the petitioners shall use the Transportation and Circulation mitigation measure and augment it by informing and consulting with emergency response or evacuation agencies if the proposed project interferes with routes used for emergencies or evacuations. The coordination effort shall include provisions so that emergency or evacuation plans are not hindered. *If the projects result in an increase in overhead communication lines, the petitioner shall obtain the necessary ministerial permits to erect the necessary poles to support the lines. The Commission's Safety and Enforcement Division shall include these facilities as part of its overhead line regular inspections so that the requirements of G.O. 95 are met. The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.*

H) Noise: the petitioner shall abide by all applicable local noise standards and shall

inform surrounding property owners and occupants, particularly school districts, hospitals and the residential neighborhoods, of the day(s) when most construction noise would occur if the petitioner plans excavation, trenching or other heavy construction activities which would cause any significant noise. *Notice shall be given at least two weeks in advance of the construction. The notice required for Mitigation Measures F and H shall be consolidated. The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.*

I) Aesthetics: *All applicable local aesthetic standards will be addressed by the petitioners for all facilities that are above-ground, in particular all types of service boxes or cabinets. The local land use agency shall be consulted by the petitioner so that any site-specific aesthetic impacts are assessed and properly mitigated. The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.*

J) Cultural Resources: *Should cultural resources be encountered during construction, all earthmoving activity which would adversely impact such resources shall be halted or altered until the petitioner retains the service of a qualified archaeologist who will do the appropriate examination and analysis. The archaeologist will provide proposals for any procedures to mitigate the impact upon those resources encountered. The petitioner's compliance with this Mitigation Measure shall be included in its quarterly report.*

General Statement for all Mitigation Measures:

Although local safety and aesthetic input is essential in minimizing the impact of the petitioner's construction, local jurisdictions cannot impose standards or permit requirements which would prevent petitioners from developing their service territories, or otherwise interfere with the statewide interest in competitive telecommunication service. Therefore, the petitioners' required compliance with local permit requirements is subject to this limitation.

With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed in A) - J) above, the Commission should conclude that the proposed projects will not have one or more potentially significant environmental effects. The Commission should also adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Plan which will ensure that the Mitigation Measures listed above will be followed and implemented. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan will be included as an appendix in the Commission decision which adopts this final Negative Declaration.

Arthur Q. Mangels, Jr.
Douglas Long, Manager
Environmental and Energy Advisory Branch
Commission Advisory and Compliance Division

12/7/95
Date

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Project Title: Competitive Local Carriers' (CLCs) Petitions for Local Exchange Telecommunication Service throughout California.

B. Lead Agency and Contact Person: the Lead Agency for this project is the California Public Utilities Commission. The Commission contact person for this project is:

Bruce Kaneshiro
California Public Utilities Commission
Environmental and Energy Advisory Branch
Commission Advisory and Compliance Division
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298
(415) 703-1187

C. Project Location: throughout various counties in California where local telephone service is currently provided by Pacific Bell and GTE California. See Appendix A for map.

D. Project Sponsors' Names and Addresses: See Appendix B for list of all project sponsors.

E. Project Description: The California Public Utilities Commission's Decision 95-07-054 enables various telecommunication companies to compete with the two largest local telephone companies in providing local exchange service. Previous to this decision, local telephone service was monopolized by a single utility per service territory. The Commission has received petitions from 66 companies to provide competitive local telephone service throughout the areas presently served by Pacific Bell and GTE California.

The 66 petitioners include cable television companies, cellular (wireless) companies, long-distance service providers, local telephone service providers, and various other telecommunication companies that specialize in transporting data.

40 of the 66 petitions are proposed facilities-based services, which means that the petitioners propose to use their own facilities in providing local telephone service. (Most of the facilities-based petitioners offer resale-based services as well.) The remaining 26 petitions are strictly resale-based services, meaning that telephone service will be resold using another competitor's facilities. The 40 facilities-based petitions indicate that physical modifications to existing facilities may be required, and construction of new facilities is a

possibility in the long-term. The 26 resale-based petitions are strictly financial and billing arrangements that involve no construction and are considered to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act's (CEQA) regulations. (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.)

Since many of the petitioners are initially targeting local telephone service for areas where their telecommunication infrastructures are already established, very little new construction is envisioned. In fact, approximately one-third of the 40 facilities-based petitioners indicate that no modifications or extensions are necessary since their facilities are already equipped to begin competition for local telephone services. For service areas that are beyond their current infrastructure, the petitioners generally plan to use resell services, rather than build additional facilities.

The remaining facilities-based petitioners will need to make modifications to their facilities. Some of these modifications are minor in nature, the most common being the installation of a switch that connects potential customers to outside systems. Switch installation is necessary because customers receiving a particular type of service may not have access to local telephone networks. For example, customers receiving cable television service are presently unable to connect to local telephone networks because of the differences in modes of service. A switch installation by a cable television provider is one step that makes the connection possible. Switch installation is considered a minor modification because it typically involves a single installation within an existing central communication facility or building.

Besides the minor modifications, a minority of companies are planning to install their own fiber optic cables to provide adequate service. Cables (fiber or conventional) will be installed within existing utility underground conduits or ducts, or attached to utility poles with existing overhead lines whenever possible. Fiber optic cables are extremely thin, and existing conduits will likely be able to hold multiple cables. However, if existing conduits or poles are unable to accommodate additional cables, then new conduits and poles will need to be constructed by the petitioner. In this case, the petitioners will attempt to construct within existing utility rights-of-way. There is also the possibility that the petitioners may attempt to access other rights-of-way (such as roads) to construct additional conduits. Extension of existing rights-of-way is not likely, but a possibility.

The installation of fiber optic cables in underground conduits will vary in complexity depending upon the conditions of the surrounding area. For example, in urban, commercial areas, utility conduits can be accessed with minimal groundbreaking; installation simply requires stringing the cable through one end of the conduit and connecting it to the desired end. In this case major excavation of the right-of-way is unnecessary. However, there may also be instances where the lack of access to the conduit will require heavy trenching that involves large machinery and excavation.

Many of the petitioners have no plans to construct service boxes or cabinets which contain batteries for the provision of power or emergency power. The dimensions of the boxes vary, but basically range from three to five feet in height. Depending upon the type of technology and facilities operated by the petitioner, smaller service boxes (approximately 3 inches in height) would be used for power supply and backup power. Those petitioners who have no plans to use such boxes already have capable power and backup power within their existing facilities. The few petitioners who will need such boxes have committed to placing the boxes in existing buildings, or in underground vaults. If conditions do not permit building or underground installation, the petitioners would use small low-profile boxes that are landscaped and fenced.

Cellular companies that wish to compete in providing local service have no plans at this time expand or modify their existing facilities. However, should they need to do so, they are required to comply with Commission regulations for the construction of new facilities or modification of existing facilities. The Commission's General Order (G.O.) 159 requires the cellular utilities to obtain all necessary local approvals and permits for a new or modified cell site before it receives approval from the Commission. This may involve an environmental review under CEQA.

- F. Zoning:** All the petitioners state that their intention is to compete in the territories presently served by Pacific Bell and GTE California. These territories encompass many of California's 58 counties, and therefore include almost all types of zoning designations. However it is unclear at this time if all zoned areas will be affected by the projects since the petitioners are not specific where they intend to compete in the long-run.

It is expected that most of the petitioners will initially compete for customers in urban, dense commercial areas and residential zones where their telecommunication infrastructures already exist. In general, the petitioners' projects will be in places where people live or work. Cellular companies are somewhat of an exception in that they are not limited to urban or residential zones. Cellular technology is wireless and therefore enables them to provide communication service in areas that could be less populated but contain major transportation thoroughfares. Thus in some limited instances, the targeted areas for cellular projects could potentially be in agricultural, industrial, or uninhabited forested zones, depending upon the proximity of roads, streets or highways. However, this is not anticipated in the near-term.

- G. Surrounding Land Use and Setting:** All the petitioners state that their intention is to compete in the territories served by either Pacific Bell or GTE California which encompasses a variety of areas and settings. It is unclear at this time what specific surrounding land use areas will be affected by the projects. It is clear that in the short-term, the petitioners will focus their efforts where their infrastructure already exists. This is generally in commercial centers or residential communities.

H. Public Agency Approval and Permits: the California Public Utilities Commission is the lead agency in approving these petitioners' requests to compete in the local exchange market.

Permits from local planning agencies may be required depending on the scope and type of construction proposed by the petitioner.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

Note: For construction outside of the utility rights-of-way, potential environmental impacts are too variable and uncertain to be specifically evaluated in this Initial Study, but are addressed in Environmental Determination 1 and Mitigation Measure (A) in the Negative Declaration.

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed projects 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the projects. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed projects MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed projects MAY have a significant effect(s) 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 an earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Arthur C. Mangels for 12/6/95
Signature Date

Douglas Long _____
Printed Name For

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed projects are not anticipated to have any significant impacts on general or environmental plans, zoning, existing land usage, or agricultural resources. The projects are essentially modifications to existing facilities within established utility rights-of-way. Since these rights-of-way are already designed to be in compliance with zoning and land use plans, disruption of such plans are not foreseeable. In the event that the petitioners need to construct facilities that extend beyond the rights-of-way, see Mitigation Measure A in the Negative Declaration.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:				
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed projects will not have impacts upon population or housing. The purpose of the projects is to introduce competition into the local telephone service market. Since competition will be generally statewide and not centered in one locale, it is not anticipated that the projects will have an effect on population projections or housing availability of any particular area. The areas that will not initially receive the competition are rural, less populated areas; it cannot be seen that the initial lack of competitive services in these areas will result in significant movements of people to areas where competition will be heavy.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a) Fault rupture?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Landslides or mudflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Subsidence of land?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expansive soils?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Unique geologic or physical features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The projects will be constructed within existing utility facilities or established utility rights-of-way and will therefore not expose people to new risks for any of these impacts, except possibly erosion. Should additional cable facilities require the installation of new or upgraded conduits, trenching, excavation, grading and fill could be required. For appropriate mitigation, see Mitigation Measures (B) and (C) for details in the Negative Declaration.

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The projects will involve alterations to existing telecommunication facilities (underground conduits or overhead poles) but could expose additional risks if more than one petitioner decide to compete in the same locality. Efforts to install cables, or if necessary, new conduits, in utility rights-of-way that are in close proximity to an underground or surface water sources could carry significant effects for quality, flow, quantity, direction or drainage if done improperly and without coordination. See Mitigation Measures (B) and (D) in the Negative Declaration for details.

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create objectionable odors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If the projects do not require excavation or trenching of underground conduits, they will not have an effect upon air quality, movement, temperature or climate. However, should the projects require such work and, if more than one petitioner decide to work in the same locale, there is potential for an increase in dust in the immediate area. See Mitigation Measures (B) and (E) in the Negative Declaration for details.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.

Would the proposal result in:

a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The petitioners plan to modify existing utility conduits or poles within existing utility rights-of-way initially in urban, commercial zones and residential areas. Modification of these facilities by a single party does not present significant impacts upon traffic or circulation since the installation process is not expected to be lengthy. However, if more than one of the petitioners decide to compete in the same locality, their efforts to install their own cables will have a significant cumulative effect on circulation, especially in dense, urban commercial areas. As a result, increases in traffic congestion, insufficient parking, and hazards or barriers for pedestrian are possible.

See Mitigation Measures (B) and (F) in the Negative Declaration for details.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The projects will not affect any biological resources since all anticipated work will occur within existing utility facilities or established utility rights-of-way. Established utility rights-of-way are assumed to be outside of locally designated natural communities, habitats or migration corridors.

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.

Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The projects will no impact upon mineral resources or the use of energy. The projects provide competitive telecommunication services that have no direct relationship to efficient energy use or mineral resources. The installation of additional fiber optic cables are within existing facilities or rights-of-way that are assumed to have adequate mitigation designs to avoid impacts on any mineral resources within proximity.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The installation of fiber optic cables can be a quick, clean and simple procedure with little use of heavy machinery. However there may be situations where excavation and trenching of underground conduits is necessary if the conduits are not easily accessible. Should this occur, uncoordinated efforts by the petitioners in one concentrated area could potentially affect emergency response or evacuation plans for that locale. See Mitigation Measures (B) and (G) in the Negative Declaration for details. Once the project is completed, the additional cables do not represent any additional hazards to people nor do they increase the possibility of fires

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The anticipated projects can be a quick and simple procedure, but in some cases could require heavy machinery or construction activity such as excavation, trenching, grading and refill. There is also the possibility that uncoordinated efforts by the petitioners in one locale could increase existing noise levels, if their activities involve the construction described. See Mitigation Measures (B) and (H) in the Negative Declaration for details.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

- | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other government services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed projects will increase competition in the local telephone service. The construction associated with the projects have potential impacts on the maintenance of public streets and roads. Numerous disturbances to the street surfaces depreciates the quality and longevity of the pavement. Mitigation Measure F addresses this impact.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a) Power or natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Communication systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Sewer or septic tanks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Local or regional water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed projects could substantially alter communication systems in the event that existing facilities are unable to accommodate all of the participants in the market. If this should occur, additional conduits or poles for telecommunication equipment will need to be inserted in existing utility rights-of-way or the petitioners may seek entry to other rights-of-way. If the petitioners are forced to construct outside of the existing utility rights-of-way, Mitigation Measure A is applicable. For work within the rights-of-way, see Mitigation Measure B in the Negative Declaration.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

- b) Have a demonstrated negative aesthetic effect?
- c) Create light or glare?

The proposed projects will occur within utility rights of way that will be either be undergrounded or on existing poles. Undergrounded facilities will have no demonstrated negative aesthetic effects. Additional lines on the poles may be a concern, but the proposed cables are not easily discernable and will unlikely have a negative impact. The only scenario where an aesthetic effect can occur is if the number of competitors for a particular area become so heavy that the cables on the poles become excessive. There is potential for an increase in service boxes if the boxes cannot be installed within buildings or underground. Should this occur, the petitioners should follow Mitigation Measures (B) and (I) as described in the Negative Declaration.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources?
- b) Disturb archaeological resources?
- c) Affect historical resources?
- d) Have potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?
- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

The projects will involve existing utility facilities or established rights-of-way that are assumed to be clear from any paleontological, historical or archaeological resources. However, some projects may require excavation or trenching of utility rights-of-way, or outside the rights-of-way. If unanticipated cultural resources are encountered during such work, then the Mitigation Measures (B) and (J) should be followed. See Negative Declaration for details.

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?
- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?

The projects will have no impact on recreational facilities or opportunities since these resources have no direction relationship to increased competition in local telephone services.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

