

# Executive Summary

## ES.1 Overview of Proposed Project

This Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (Draft EIR/EA) for the Relocation of the Red Mountain Communication Site addresses the environmental impacts, environmental issues, and alternatives associated with the proposed decommissioning of the Red Mountain communication site and the relocation of the services provided by this site to three proposed sites, Rattlesnake Peak, Rodgers Peak, and Alder Camp (proposed project). Two additional proposed sites, Green Diamond 1 and Orick, were included in response to comments received during the scoping period, and a third additional proposed site, Green Diamond 2, was included in response to comments from the National Park Service (NPS) after the scoping period ended. The Draft EIR/EA also addresses removal of a fire lookout on Red Mountain operated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). These actions are necessary to maintain the functionality of the California State Emergency Notification System (911 System) and to provide consistent and reliable communications during an emergency for Federal, State, and local emergency service providers in portions of Del Norte and Humboldt counties.

On behalf of the State of California (State), Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), the California Department of General Services (DGS) prepared this Draft EIR/EA in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.); the document integrates National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements, as applicable, to satisfy NPS regulatory requirements.

Cal OES serves as the lead agency under CEQA and would be responsible for the funding, construction, operations, and maintenance of the proposed project or an alternative. NPS serves as the Federal lead agency under NEPA in response to the State's application to occupy and use NPS lands within the boundary of Redwood National Park. One of the proposed sites, Rodgers Peak, would require NPS authorization. The proposed Rodgers Peak site and the associated 1.6-mile access road are within the boundary of Redwood National Park. NPS is participating in the environmental review as a responsible agency as defined by CEQA because the proposed Rodgers Peak site would require the issuance of a right-of-way from the NPS. The NPS is participating in the environmental review in a manner that satisfies Federal requirements under NEPA to ensure that the Draft EIR/EA and underlying administrative record support the NPS decision-making and disclosure processes.

In 1993, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) issued a Special Use Authorization to the State to install and operate communication facilities for emergency service providers on the summit of Red Mountain. The authorization was issued prior to the approval of the Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) for the Six Rivers National Forest. Red Mountain is part of the Helkau Ceremonial District, a Native American Contemporary Use Area that is sacred to the Yurok Tribe and other Native Americans; the Helkau Ceremonial District is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. When the LRMP was approved in 1995, it included a requirement that all facilities at Red Mountain be removed by 2022 upon expiration of the special use permits issued for that site. This requirement ensures that the State facilities located on Red Mountain will be removed and that the site will be

rehabilitated in a manner that ensures that members of the Yurok Tribe and other Native Americans have the opportunity to use the site in a manner consistent with their cultural practices.

This Draft EIR/EA provides Federal, State, and local decision makers with detailed information concerning the environmental, social, economic, cultural, and other impacts associated with the proposed project and the alternatives considered in this Draft EIR/EA. All interested parties, including members of the public, are invited to play a role in both the CEQA and NEPA decision-making processes.

## **Project Summary**

The State initiated the planning process to identify and evaluate a range of options that would provide a level of emergency communication services similar to those provided by the Red Mountain communication site to Del Norte and Humboldt counties prior to taking it off-line. The planning process, which began in 1997, has entailed evaluations of radio coverage from potential new communication sites in Del Norte and Humboldt counties and designs of various options for the proposed communication sites.

The radio coverage evaluations considered access to the State's terrestrial microwave system at Horse Mountain in Humboldt County, which conveys signals from southern Humboldt County north into Del Norte County, including to Crescent City, and the ability to provide comparable communication coverage to service areas throughout Humboldt and Del Norte counties.

A direct line of sight between towers is required for microwave communication. Any new towers need to be located on prominent peaks to provide line-of-sight access. The towers would need to be accessed year-round for maintenance and to have a year-round power source. Remote locations were considered only if access to the site would be feasible. Once the general locations of the new sites were identified by Cal OES technical staff, the State worked closely with representatives of the Yurok Tribe to ensure that the new locations would not be in conflict with tribal interests. When the proposed Orick and Green Diamond 1 sites were added in response to scoping comments, the State communicated these changes to representatives of the Yurok Tribe and the Big Lagoon Rancheria. Subsequently, representatives of the Yurok Tribe were notified when the Green Diamond 2 site was incorporated into an alternative to the proposed project.

Design considerations included land ownership, access, tower size and appearance, power source, associated facility needs, environmental and land-based constraints, and the extent of vegetation removal and ground disturbance.

Cal OES's initial evaluation process resulted in the selection of three locations to replace the Red Mountain communication site: Rattlesnake Peak, Rodgers Peak, and Alder Camp. In response to the CEQA/NEPA scoping process, two additional sites—Orick and Green Diamond 1—were incorporated into an alternative to the proposed project (Alternative 3). Alternative 3a was added to exclude the Orick site at the request of the NPS, and Alternative 3b—Green Diamond 2—was added to enhance communication coverage to more of the service areas compared to Alternative 3a. The

Red Mountain site and the six proposed sites evaluated in this EIR/EA are shown on Figure 1-1 of the Draft EIR/EA<sup>1</sup>.

In conjunction with planning for the decommissioning of the Red Mountain communication site, the USFS communicated to the State that the CAL FIRE lookout constructed in 1963 on Red Mountain is also subject to the LRMP requirement to remove State-owned facilities from Red Mountain by 2022. This Draft EIR/EA addresses the decommissioning of all facilities owned and operated by the State that are currently in use at the Red Mountain site.

## Project Objectives

Communication facilities at the Red Mountain site provide vital public safety radio communications in Humboldt and Del Norte counties, serving approximately 250,000 people. Cal OES owns the communications equipment at this site, but many public safety agencies use it for mission-critical communications, including the USFS, NPS, California Highway Patrol, California Department of Transportation, California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and other local agencies.

The purpose of the proposed project as defined by Cal OES is to provide a primary public safety communications hub for State, Federal, and local law enforcement, transportation, and resource agencies to replace the current state communication facility at the Red Mountain site.

The State has identified the following objectives for the proposed project:

- Remove all public safety communications facilities and associated infrastructure owned by the State from Red Mountain and restore the site by December 31, 2022.
- Establish new sites in areas that are the least environmentally sensitive from a natural, cultural, or socioeconomic perspective.
- Provide acceptable access to the State's terrestrial microwave system as well as 100 percent public safety radio coverage to the service areas currently supported by Cal OES's Red Mountain site in Del Norte County and northern Humboldt County, including the communities of Crescent City, Klamath, and Orick, as well as main highways in the region (U.S. Highways 101 and 199 and State Highways 197 and 169).
- Provide facilities at new locations that will replace those removed from Red Mountain in a manner that ensures that the sites are integral to the primary public safety communications hub for State, Federal, and local law enforcement, transportation, and resource agencies at an equivalent level.
- Develop communication facilities at the fewest number of sites needed to replace the Red Mountain facility and provide equal or greater microwave and radio communication services.

---

<sup>1</sup> All figures referenced are in the Draft EIR/EA.

- Design new facilities with consideration for minimizing the visibility of the facilities, extent of grading and excavation, removal of vegetation, and long-term maintenance.
- Use existing access routes, where available, and establish new access routes along the most feasible, shortest route possible.
- Design the facilities to ensure compatibility with Federal, State, and local land management plans and guidelines.

Under NEPA, the purpose and need for the project with respect to NPS's role as the NEPA lead agency is to consider the request by the State for a right-of-way (ROW) to construct and operate a telecommunication site on Rodgers Peak in Humboldt County and to permit access over NPS roads to Rodgers Peak. NPS requested an alternative that would not be on NPS land; three alternatives—3, 3a, and 3b, were determined to be feasible and are therefore considered to meet the NEPA requirement for a full range of alternatives and the NPS guidelines for issuing ROWs on NPS lands.

The loss of emergency communication coverage (i.e., the 911 system) currently provided by Cal OES from the Red Mountain site would curtail direct emergency communication between the communities in northern Humboldt and Del Norte counties. If this coverage is not replaced, the State's first responders would not have the radio communications they rely on for emergency response or the radio dispatch support needed to deploy additional emergency services. The State is required to provide public safety radio communications in the area. Cal OES initiated the proposed project as part of its mission to protect lives and property, build capabilities, and support the State's communities.

The proposed project has been developed over the course of many years with input from emergency management agencies (e.g., Del Norte County Sheriff's Office, California Highway Patrol), land management agencies (e.g., USFS, NPS), and tribal governments (e.g., Yurok Tribe).

In developing the proposed project, the State determined that the combination of three sites—Rattlesnake Peak, Rodgers Peak, and Alder Camp—would provide a level of radio coverage equivalent to that currently provided by Red Mountain and meet the CEQA project objectives. Due to the rural and isolated nature of the areas served by Red Mountain, three types of service areas (community, road, and watershed) were selected for evaluation and analysis in the Draft EIR/EA.

## **Resource Topics Considered**

Cal OES determined at the onset of the scoping process that the proposed project could lead to impacts on specific natural resources and on the human environment. Based on the Initial Study (Appendix A) and additional information provided through scoping, the lead agencies identified the following resource topics for consideration in this Draft EIR/EA:

- Aesthetics/Visual Resources
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources
- Forest Resources

- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic
- Solid Waste

The Draft EIR/EA includes additional elements to ensure that it is fully compliant with NPS's NEPA requirements and Federal executive orders. These include:

- Environmental Justice
- Tribal Trust Assets
- Socioeconomics
- Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity
- Unavoidable Adverse Effects
- Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR/EA includes a detailed evaluation of the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed project and the alternatives with respect to these topics. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of cumulative impacts.

Based on the Initial Study, several resource topics were excluded from consideration in this Draft EIR/EA. These include:

- Agriculture
- Fisheries
- Paleontology
- Minerals
- Groundwater
- Flood Hazards
- Tsunami Hazards
- Population and Housing
- Recreation

## **ES.2 Overview of the Proposed Project and Alternatives**

The proposed project consists of the decommissioning of the Red Mountain communication site and the CAL FIRE lookout and the construction of three new communication sites—Rattlesnake Peak, Rodgers Peak, and Alder Camp—to replace the functions of the existing facilities at the Red Mountain site.

The State has committed to implementing the environmental commitments and design measures identified in Table 2-1 of the Draft EIR/EA to avoid or minimize the potential impacts associated with the proposed project and alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR/EA.

## Proposed Sites Considered under Alternatives 1 and 2

### Red Mountain

The Red Mountain site is on National Forest System (NFS) lands managed by the Six Rivers National Forest. The site is in Del Norte County about 6 miles east of the community of Klamath, California, at an elevation of 4,250 feet above mean sea level (msl) (Figure 2-1). Access to the site is provided on private roads through lands owned by the Green Diamond Resource Company (GDRC) and on USFS roads (Figure 2-2). The site encompasses approximately 1.5 acres and includes the State-owned facilities.

The site contains communication facilities maintained by Cal OES and a fire lookout tower maintained by CAL FIRE. There are other non-State facilities within the boundary of the site; these facilities are not considered in this Draft EIR/EA.

### Rattlesnake Peak

The proposed Rattlesnake Peak site is in Del Norte County about 7 miles northwest of Red Mountain on lands owned by the GDRC (Figure 2-3). It is the northernmost of the proposed sites and is at about 3,610 feet above msl. The proposed site is approximately 6.8 acres. Access to the site would use about 17.3 miles of existing GDRC roads and a new 1.4-mile extension of an existing road (Figure 2-4).

### Rodgers Peak

The proposed Rodgers Peak site is in Humboldt County about 7 miles northeast of the community of Trinidad and about 4 miles east of the community of Orick (Figure 2.5). This site is located on lands within the boundary of Redwood National Park administered by the NPS and encompasses about 1.5 acres associated with an existing clearing that has been occupied by a Humboldt County communication site for the past 30 years. The elevation of the site is about 2,700 feet above msl. Access to this site would require the use of about 6 miles of GDRC roads and approximately 1.6 miles of road managed by the NPS (Figure 2-6).

### Alder Camp

The proposed Alder Camp site is in Del Norte County about 2 miles southwest of the community of Klamath and south of the Klamath River (Figure 2.7). It is about 8 miles west of the Red Mountain site at an elevation of about 825 feet above msl and about 0.7 mile east of the Pacific Ocean. U.S. Highway 101 runs generally north-south about 1.25 miles east of the site. This site encompasses approximately 6.5 acres on the east side of the Alder Conservation Camp, which is managed by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. With the exception of an approximately 0.5-acre parcel owned by GDRC, the proposed site is on State land and within the administrative boundary of the camp. Inclusion of the GDRC parcel is required to provide line-of-site microwave coverage between this site and the proposed Rattlesnake Peak site. Access to this site from U.S. Highway 101 is via Klamath Beach Road and roads on GDRC lands; the segments of these roads that would be used to access the site total about 3.0 miles (Figure 2-8).

## Proposed Sites Considered under Alternative 3

Alternative 3 includes the proposed Rattlesnake Peak, Alder Camp, Green Diamond 1, and Orick sites. The proposed Rattlesnake Peak and Alder Camp sites are described above under Alternatives 1 and 2. The proposed Green Diamond 1 and Orick sites are described in the following paragraphs.

### Green Diamond 1

The proposed Green Diamond 1 site is in Humboldt County about 0.5 mile south of the proposed Rodgers Peak site and south of Redwood National Park on land owned by GDRC (Figure 2-10). This site covers 2.1 acres and is about 2,200 feet above msl, which is about 500 feet lower than the proposed Rodgers Peak site.

This site is associated with an existing road and an adjacent timber management unit that has recently been harvested. Access to this site would be from U.S. Highway 101 at the north end of the Big Lagoon Bridge through GDRC lands to an intersection just south of the boundary between GDRC lands and Redwood National Park. From that intersection, about 0.4 mile of GDRC road would be used to access the site.

### Orick

The proposed Orick site is in Humboldt County just south of the community of Orick and north of Freshwater Lagoon just east of U.S. Highway 101. This site is about 1.1 acres associated with two parcels, one owned by the California Department of Parks and Recreation and the other owned by a private party (Figure 2-12). This site is about 650 feet above msl. The proposed tower and associated infrastructure would be constructed adjacent to several other commercial communication facilities located on a privately owned parcel. Access to this site from U.S. Highway 101 would be east on Hiltons Road (Hiltons Road becomes NPS's Westside Access Road east of the proposed site). From Hiltons Road, a private road continues up the ridge for about 0.5 mile to the existing communication sites (Figure 2-13).

## Proposed Sites Considered under Alternative 3a

Alternative 3a includes the proposed Rattlesnake Peak, Alder Camp, and Green Diamond 1 sites. The proposed Rattlesnake Peak and Alder Camp sites are described above under Alternatives 1 and 2. The proposed Green Diamond 1 site is described above under Alternative 3.

## Proposed Sites Considered under Alternative 3b

Alternative 3b includes the proposed Rattlesnake Peak, Alder Camp, and Green Diamond 2 sites. The proposed Rattlesnake Peak and Alder Camp sites are described above under Alternatives 1 and 2.

The proposed Green Diamond 2 site is in Humboldt County northwest of Rodgers Peak (Figure 2-10). The site covers approximately 5.9 acres and is about 2,200 feet above msl, which is about 500 feet lower than the proposed Rodgers Peak site.

This site is associated with an existing road and an adjacent timber management unit that has recently been harvested. Access to this site would be from U.S. Highway 101 at the north end of the Big

Lagoon Bridge through GDRC lands to an intersection just south of the boundary between GDRC lands and Redwood National Park. From that intersection, about 0.4 mile of GDRC road would be used to access the site.

## **Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives**

The description of the proposed project (Alternative 1) and the five alternatives described and analyzed in this Draft EIR/EA was developed by the State with input from the NPS and consideration of the scoping comments received by the lead and responsible agencies. An element common to all of the alternatives, including the no-project alternative (Alternative 4), is the decommissioning of the State-owned facilities at the Red Mountain site.

The following summarizes the elements common to the alternatives followed by descriptions of the alternatives.

### **Red Mountain Site Activities**

All State-owned facilities at the Red Mountain communication site would be removed consistent with USFS requirements. These include a steel/wood communications tower and associated concrete foundation and guy wires, a concrete pad, two diesel generators and adjacent above-ground fuel tank (4,000-gallon), a radio vault, a controller box, a CAL FIRE lookout tower, a toilet facility, and associated State-owned infrastructure. Removal of other public and private facilities at the Red Mountain site is not included in any of the alternatives described in this Draft EIR/EA.

All alternatives would include the following components for the Red Mountain site.

- A decommissioning plan would be developed for the removal of all State-owned facilities and associated infrastructure. The plan would identify all of the facilities that will be removed and describe how they would be removed consistent with USFS direction and guidance. The plan would also include the elements necessary to guide site restoration and revegetation, with input from Tribal representatives.
- If determined necessary, hazardous materials (i.e., contaminated concrete) would be remediated, as directed by the USFS. The USFS has determined that additional testing, soil removal, and capping of previously disturbed areas at the Red Mountain site would result in an adverse effect to the Helkau Ceremonial District and would not be consistent with the Six Rivers National Forest LRMP.
- All facilities that would be removed would be reused by the State (or its delegates), disposed of at an approved facility, and/or recycled consistent with Federal, State, and local requirements. Facilities and associated infrastructure may be moved off-site either whole or in pieces.
- Removal of all State-owned facilities at the Red Mountain site is expected to take one construction season, likely between June and October, using heavy equipment (e.g., excavator, dump trucks) and cranes normally associated with development of communication sites. Heavy equipment would be transported to and from the site using low-boy transports.



- Qualified Tribal representatives would be used to monitor all phases of the decommissioning project. Tribal input would also be incorporated into the site restoration and revegetation elements.
- Decommissioning activities would primarily consist of removing all above-ground structures and leaving any items that are below ground or the removal of which would cause ground disturbance.

## Representative Activities Common to New Sites

The facilities and activities described below are common to all new communications sites: site preparation activities, towers, buildings and facilities, power sources, access roads, construction activities, operations and maintenance activities, and monitoring activities. There would be no use of the proposed Rodgers Peak site for commercial communications per NPS policy.

**Site Preparation Activities:** Sites would require vegetation removal that could include the cutting of vegetation, including shrubs and trees. Subsequent grading would occur to establish stable, either level or sloped, surfaces to accommodate foundation and drainage requirements.

**Towers:** Tower design would be a lattice<sup>2</sup> structure with antennas and a lightning rod with a maximum height of 199 feet above grade (180 feet plus 19 foot lightning rod)<sup>3</sup>. In addition to dishes and antennas, there may be utility boxes on the tower structure. Each tower would be placed on a concrete foundation<sup>4</sup> that extends a minimum of 6 feet below grade. On average, the excavation for the tower foundation would be about 50 feet square, including about 5 feet of layback, and 8 to 12 feet deep; about 750 cubic yards of excavated material would be removed. After the concrete foundation has cured (which typically takes about 30 days), additional backfill (e.g., crushed aggregate) will be placed to add weight and insulate the foundation and to inhibit establishment of vegetation. The towers would not be painted; their color would be that of galvanized steel with a flat non-shiny finish. The towers are designed so that there are no guy wires. The towers would meet Federal Aviation Administration requirements and USFWS recommendations for the protection of raptors and other avian species.

**Buildings and Facilities:** Vaults would be constructed on site or brought to the site. Each building would be placed on a concrete foundation designed to meet all Federal, State, and local requirements, including those specific to State's Essential Service Building Seismic Safety Act. On average, these buildings would be about 30 feet wide by 50 feet long (1,500 square feet) and up to 10 feet tall. For each foundation, excavation would occur to a depth of 2 to 4 feet and the foundation would be constructed to meet load-bearing requirements. The contents would include electronics, batteries, and a generator(s) with a maximum horsepower rating of 45. Power, fuel, control, and transmission cables would require trenching. Once the site has been developed, designated unpaved parking would be provided. A security fence would be installed around each site to deter climbing, vandalism, and

---

<sup>2</sup> Towers at the proposed Rattlesnake Peak and Alder Camp sites may be modified lattice structures with a height of less than 199 feet.

<sup>3</sup> Lighting of the towers would not be required because they are less than 200 feet high.

<sup>4</sup> Due to the height and size of the towers, the foundations would require a continuous concrete pour to ensure structural integrity.

impacts from wildlife (e.g., black bears). A single drive-through locked gate at the site would provide access for maintenance purposes.

**Power Sources:** Commercial power (Alder Camp – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 3a, and 3b; Orick – Alternative 3); solar arrays (Rattlesnake Peak – Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 3a, and 3b; Rodgers Peak – Alternative 2; Green Diamond1 – Alternatives 3 and 3a); and generators (Rodgers Peak – Alternative 1; Green Diamond 2 – Alternative 3b) would supply power and back-up power at each site. Each site would also require backup-generators fueled by either propane or diesel as a secondary power supply. Fuel for the generators would be stored in above-ground tanks (diesel) or vessels (propane) consistent with Federal, State, and local requirements. Power from primary and backup sources will be wired to the vaults and tower, and the power lines would be buried consistent with Federal, State, and local requirements.

**Access Routes:** For each new site, a primary access route would be designated using existing public and private roads; an existing GDRC road would be extended to access the proposed Rattlesnake Peak site. In addition, an emergency access route has been identified for each site except the proposed Orick site in the event the primary access route is closed at the time construction or maintenance of the site is required.

**Construction Activities:** Most construction would take place Monday through Saturday during daylight hours with the exception of short periods of time necessary for a continuous concrete pour for each tower foundation; the concrete pour would typically require less than 24 hours and could require temporary lighting. In the event that unanticipated construction is required at night, temporary lighting of the site may be necessary to ensure that activities can be performed safely and efficiently. For each new site, it is estimated that a construction crew of five (on average) would be involved for approximately 14 months, equaling about 1,400 person days. The estimated number of vehicle round trips during construction includes 50 equipment transport trips, 100 materials transport trips, and 800 construction worker trips.

Equipment would be staged on site and construction materials would be stockpiled on site and contained within the existing site boundaries. Concrete would be mixed on site or hauled to the site from Crescent City or Arcata using U.S. Highway 101 to the site access roads.

Any water that is needed during construction (e.g., water trucks, concrete) would come from existing commercial or permitted sources. There would be no pumping from surface water sources. During excavation and construction of the tower foundations, dewatering may be required. Dewatering efforts would use a pump and collection system that would be consistent with the requirements of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for control and containment of surface water releases.

During construction, no detours or road or lane closures are expected on haul routes, but traffic control coordination with GDRC would be required to ensure that its ongoing land management activities are not impaired. The State will work with representatives of GDRC to develop and implement a traffic management plan prior to authorization to use or occupy GDRC lands and facilities.

Welding or other activities would require fire prevention measures, including maintaining on-site equipment—water, fire extinguishers, hand tools, and hoses—required by the USFS, NPS, and CAL FIRE.

Typical tower site construction equipment that would be required over three building seasons (12 to 14 months) includes:

- excavator
- motor grader
- fork lift
- front end loader
- roller compactor
- water truck
- 10-wheel, 12-yard dump truck
- tower crane, 40-ton
- work crew with two pickup trucks
- trailer generator
- compressor
- trailer truck for equipment hauling
- concrete trucks

***Operations and Maintenance Activities:*** Continued functionality of the sites would require regular maintenance activities. The new sites would need to be inspected once a month by Cal OES staff. In the event that emergency maintenance is required at night, temporary lighting of the site may be necessary to ensure that maintenance activities can be performed safely and efficiently. The use of lights for emergency maintenance would occur in a manner that directs light to work locations in order to reduce impacts to wildlife and visual resources. Road maintenance required by the terms of the authorization(s) would be performed as needed to keep roads open and maintain access to the site.

Diesel and propane tanks used to supply generator fuel would be filled periodically. A commercial vendor, presumably from Arcata or Crescent City, would refill the tanks several times a year.

Solar power equipment would require annual inspections and cleaning. Water would be brought in by truck and used to hand wash the panels using personnel and equipment provided by Cal OES. Battery replacement and recycling would occur consistent with Federal, State, and local requirements.

***Monitoring Activities:*** The MRP in Appendix B will be used to monitor implementation of environmental commitments associated with the proposed project or an alternative. This MRP establishes criteria for documenting implementation and effectiveness of the commitments, identifying the responsible parties, and providing the basis for feedback in the event adjustments are necessary during the construction and operation phases.

## **Alternatives**

### **Alternative 1 (Proposed Project)**

Alternative 1 would consist of decommissioning State-owned facilities at the Red Mountain site and developing three new communication sites at the proposed Rattlesnake Peak, Rodgers Peak, and Alder Camp sites.

### **Alternative 2**

Under Alternative 2, the boundaries of the Rodgers Peak site would expand from 1.5 acres to about 3.9 acres, and a solar array would provide the primary power source. About 3.3 acres of vegetation would be cleared under this alternative to provide for adequate solar coverage. Under this alternative, all other features and activities described for this site would be consistent with Alternative 1, and no changes would occur for any of the other sites included under Alternative 1.

### **Alternative 3**

Under Alternative 3, the actions for the Red Mountain and the proposed Rattlesnake Peak and Alder Camp sites would be the same as under Alternative 1, and the proposed Green Diamond 1 and Orick sites would be developed. The Rodgers Peak site, which is on land managed by the NPS, would not be developed and the existing facilities used by Humboldt County and the U.S. Geological Survey would remain, as authorized by the NPS.

### **Alternative 3a**

Alternative 3a is identical to Alternative 3 except that the proposed Green Diamond 1 site would be developed and the Orick site would not be developed.

### **Alternative 3b**

Alternative 3b is identical to Alternative 3a except that the proposed Green Diamond 2 site would replace the proposed Green Diamond 1 site.

### **Alternative 4 (No-Project)**

Under the no-project alternative, decommissioning activities would be implemented at Red Mountain consistent with existing permits issued to the State by the USFS. None of the proposed sites would be developed.

## **Areas of Known Controversy and Issues Considered**

Public scoping in autumn 2016 generated a number of comments from Federal, State, and local agencies, non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders concerning potential impacts to the lands and resources managed by the NPS, alternatives to use of NPS land, the potential for adverse effects on cultural resources, potential impacts to special-status species, the desire to improve communication coverage in Del Norte and Humboldt counties, and potential conflicts with Federal, State and local land use plans. Appendix A of this Draft EIR/EA summarizes the scoping process and provides additional information on the comments received. As stated earlier, a wide array of

environmental commitments and design measures were developed based on input provided during scoping. These are listed in Table 2-1 of the Draft EIR/EA.

## Summary of Impacts

As the implementing agency for the proposed decommissioning and construction activities, Cal OES has committed to implementing the environmental commitments and design measures identified in Table 2-1 of the Draft EIR/EA to avoid or minimize the potential impacts associated with the action alternatives. In conjunction with design measures used to avoid sensitive areas and reduce the potential for significant impacts under CEQA, these environmental commitments have been incorporated into the action alternatives for purposes of the impact analysis in Chapter 4. There were no CEQA-specific mitigation measures identified during the analysis of resource topics in Chapter 4 and 5; however, to be consistent with CEQA terminology, a project-specific monitoring and reporting program (MRP) has been developed (see Appendix B).

Table ES-1 provides a summary of impacts by resource section and the corresponding disclosure of impacts for each alternative.

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3a	Alternative 3b	Alternative 4
<b>4.2 Land Use (LU)</b>						
<b>Impact LU-1: Decommissioning or construction activities associated with the proposed project and the alternatives would disrupt other land uses in or near Red Mountain and the proposed sites and associated primary access routes.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact LU-2: The operation and maintenance of the proposed project and the alternatives would conflict with adjacent land uses.</b>						
Final Level of Significance	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact LU-3: The proposed project and alternatives would be inconsistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Del Norte County General Plan.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	Significant and unavoidable
<b>Impact LU-4: The proposed project and alternatives would be inconsistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Humboldt County General Plan.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable
<b>Impact LU-5: The proposed project and alternatives would be inconsistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Redwood National Park General Management Plan.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3a	Alternative 3b	Alternative 4
<b>Impact LU-6: The proposed project and alternatives would be inconsistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Six Rivers National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	Less than significant
<b>Impact LU-7: The proposed project and the alternatives would be inconsistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the North Coast Area Plan of the Humboldt County Local Coastal Program.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	No impact	No impact	Less than significant	No impact	Less than significant	No impact
<b>4.3 Geology and Soils (GS)</b>						
<b>Impact GS-1: Surface erosion would occur from construction or decommissioning activities associated with the proposed project and alternatives.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact GS-2: Road surface erosion related to the construction or decommissioning activities associated with the proposed project and alternatives would occur.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>4.4 Water Resources (WR)</b>						
<b>Impact WR-1: Surface erosion from construction and decommissioning activities associated with the proposed project and alternatives would affect water quality.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 3a</b>	<b>Alternative 3b</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>
<b>Impact WR-2: Accidental spills of pollutants from construction and decommissioning activities associated with the proposed project and alternatives would affect water quality.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact WR-3: Decommissioning of the Red Mountain site would affect groundwater resources.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>4.5 Vegetation, Wildlife, and Wetlands (BR)</b>						
<b>Impact BR-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed project and the alternatives would affect special-status plants or their habitat through removal of individuals, habitat modification, or the spread of invasive plants.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact BR-2: Construction activities associated with the proposed project and alternative would affect special-status invertebrates (Western bumble bee) or their habitat.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact BR-3: Construction activities associated with the proposed project and the alternatives would affect special-status amphibians (Del Norte salamander, northern red-legged frog) or their habitat.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact



**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3a	Alternative 3b	Alternative 4
<b>Impact BR-4: Construction activities associated with the proposed project and the alternatives would affect special-status bats (Pallid bat) or their habitat.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact BR-5: Construction activities associated with the proposed project and the alternatives would affect special-status arboreal and terrestrial mammals (Sonoma tree vole, ring-tailed cat, Humboldt marten, and Pacific fisher) or their habitats.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact BR-6: Construction activities associated with the proposed project and the alternatives would affect nesting birds or their habitats, and potentially negatively affect the California condor reintroduction project at the activity areas.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact BR-7: Implementation of the proposed project and the alternatives would affect northern spotted owl individuals or suitable habitat.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact BR-8: Implementation of the proposed project and the alternatives would restrict movement of wildlife species through the activity areas.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact BR-9: Implementation of the proposed project and the alternatives would negatively affect surrounding wildlife and vegetation by exposure to electromagnetic energy.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3a	Alternative 3b	Alternative 4
<b>4.6 Cultural Resources (CR)</b>						
<b>Impact CR-1: The proposed project and alternatives would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable	Less than significant	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable	Less than significant
<b>Impact CR-2: The proposed project and alternatives would potentially result in disturbance of undiscovered prehistoric or historic resources.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>4.7 Air Quality (AQ)</b>						
<b>Impact AQ-1: The proposed project and alternatives would violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact AQ-2: The proposed project and alternatives would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact AQ-3: The proposed project and alternatives would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 3a</b>	<b>Alternative 3b</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>
<b>Impact AQ-4: The proposed project and alternatives would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact AQ-5: The proposed project and alternatives would conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>4.8 Environmental Justice (EJ)</b>						
<b>Impact EJ-1: Implementation of the proposed project and alternatives would adversely affect a minority or low-income population and/or community.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact
<b>4.9 Aesthetics (AES)</b>						
<b>Impact AES-1: The proposed project and alternatives would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact AES-2: The proposed project and alternatives would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings associated with a state scenic highway.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 3a</b>	<b>Alternative 3b</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>
<b>Impact AES-3: The proposed project and alternatives would substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the sites and their surroundings.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact AES-4: The proposed project and alternatives would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>4.10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (HM)</b>						
<b>Impact HM-1: The proposed project and alternatives would create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact HM-2: The proposed project and alternatives would physically interfere with, or impair implementation of, emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact HM-3: The proposed project and alternatives would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3a	Alternative 3b	Alternative 4
<b>Impact HM-4: The proposed project and alternatives would expose people to EMF created at one or more of the proposed sites.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>4.11 Noise (N)</b>						
<b>Impact N-1: The proposed project and alternatives would result in exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact N-2: The proposed project and alternatives would result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact N-3: The proposed project and alternatives would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact N-4: The proposed project and alternatives would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3a	Alternative 3b	Alternative 4
<b>4.12 Public Services and Utilities (PS)</b>						
<b>Impact PS-1: The proposed project and alternatives would affect consistent and reliable emergency communication to portions of Del Norte and Humboldt counties.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable
<b>Impact PS-2: The proposed project and alternatives would result in a disruption to utility services for an extended period because of relocating infrastructure, accidental disruption, or a reduction in energy delivered to customers.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact
<b>Impact PS-3: The construction of the proposed project and alternatives would encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel or energy, or use fuel or energy in a wasteful manner.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>Impact PS-4: The construction and operation of the proposed project and alternatives would result in the generation of increased solid waste.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
<b>4.13 Transportation/Traffic Circulation (TC)</b>						
<b>Impact TC-1: The proposed project and the alternatives would affect road and traffic conditions on U.S. Highway 101 and local roads.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact

**Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 3a	Alternative 3b	Alternative 4
<b>Impact TC-2: The proposed project and alternatives would increase traffic safety hazards during construction.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>Impact TC-3: The proposed project and alternatives would disrupt emergency access.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	No impact
<b>4.14 Climate Change (CC)</b>						
<b>Impact CC-1: The proposed project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or that would interfere with regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.</b>						
<b>Final Level of Significance</b>	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant