

CITY OF LOMPOC
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT



MEETING DATE: MARCH 8, 2004
TO: MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: *Ken* KEITH C. NEUBERT, ASSISTANT PLANNER
RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – CUP 04-02

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

A request by Tricia Knight of AFL Telecommunications, representing Sprint Spectrum L.P., for Planning Commission review and consideration of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP 04-02) to allow operation of an unmanned telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-082-09). The site contains an existing telecommunications facility that has been abandoned. The proposed project consists of the removal and replacement of equipment cabinets and three panel antennas, to be flush-mounted to the sides of the existing pole. The project will match the existing abandoned facility in size, placement, and color. The site is zoned Central Business District (C-2). A Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

AUTHORITY:

Zoning Ordinance Section 9403 requires a Conditional Use Permit for construction and installation of a telecommunications facility. The Planning Commission has the authority to approve, conditionally approve, modify, or deny a Conditional Use Permit (LCC Section 8882 d).

SITE DATA:

1. Property Owner. Kirk & Catherine Romain
2. Site Location. 119 East Walnut Avenue
3. Assessor Parcel Number. 85-082-09
4. Site Zoning. Central Business District (C-2)
5. General Plan Designation. Mixed Use
6. Site Use. Existing Telecommunications Facility
7. Surrounding Uses/Zoning. North: Commercial/Residential / C-2
South: Commercial / C-2
East: Commercial/Residential / C-2
West: Commercial / C-2

8. Site area. 7,000 square feet

BACKGROUND:


- June 21, 2000 – An application was received by the Planning Division for a telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue.
- July 17, 2000 – A Development Review Board (DRB) was held and a telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue was administratively approved with Conditions of Approval.
- November 22, 2000 – A building permit was issued for the construction of a telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue. The building permit was later finalized on February 19, 2001.
- April 3, 2001 – The City Council directed staff to initiate a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to establish a Telecommunications Ordinance.
- September 18, 2001 – The City Council adopted Ordinance 1467 (01) establishing guidelines for Wireless Communications Facilities.
- Between 2001 and 2003 – The telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue was abandoned without the City's knowledge.
- January 15, 2004 – An application for the current proposal was received by the Planning Division.

PROPOSAL:

Tricia Knight of AFL Telecommunications, representing Sprint Spectrum L.P., is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to allow operation of an unmanned telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue in the Central Business District (C-2). The site contains an existing telecommunications facility that was constructed in 2001. The facility was in operation for only a short period of time. Operation ceased between 2001 and 2003 without the knowledge of the City and was brought to the attention of staff along with the current proposal.

The proposed project consists of the removal and replacement of equipment cabinets and three panel antennas, to be flush-mounted to the sides of the existing pole. The project will match the existing abandoned facility in size, placement, and color.

The proposed telecommunications facility is unmanned. Testing and maintenance activities will be limited to once per month with the exception of unscheduled emergency repairs. The site contains one light that will be maintained. The lighting will be manually operated and only used during facility testing and maintenance. A lighting plan will be reviewed by staff at plan check.



Photos of the site will be available at the meeting for review.

CONFORMANCE WITH ZONING ORDINANCE:

The zoning for the site is Central Business District (C-2). The purpose of this zone is to *provide for the general business and commercial needs of the City. This zone shall be used as the business center in areas where a wide range of retail and service establishments are needed to accommodate the surrounding community.*

The telecommunications facility will provide a service to cellular phone customers in the Central Business District and throughout the Lompoc Valley.

Lompoc City Code Chapter 17 Wireless Communications Facilities – provides standards for the installation of Towers, Antennas, and other Wireless Communication Facilities.

The site contains an existing telecommunications facility, specifically an approximately 50 foot high pole with a three panel array at the top and equipment cabinets at the base. The current project consists of the removal and replacement of equipment cabinets and three panel antennas, to be flush-mounted to the sides of the existing pole. Standards that apply to the project as listed in Chapter 17 Wireless Communications Facilities are as follows:

1) Section 9409: Radio Frequency Radiation (RFR):

Facilities operating alone and in conjunction with other Facilities shall not result in human exposure to RFR exceeding the standards for permissible human exposure to RFR as adopted by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

A preliminary RFR report was submitted and is available for review, stating the maximum ambient RF level anywhere at ground level due to the proposed operation is calculated to be 8% of the applicable public exposure limit, well below the maximum level allowed by the FCC. A Condition of Approval (COA P21) is included to ensure the maximum RFR level does not exceed the maximum set by the FCC (1.00 mw/cm²).

2) Section 9410 Lighting:

Exterior lighting shall be manually operated, low wattage, shielded and directed downward and shall be allowed only for safety purposes. Exterior lighting shall not be illuminated except when maintenance or safety personnel are present at night.

A Condition of Approval (COA P16) is included requiring a lighting plan to ensure lighting is minimal and meets the requirements of ordinance. The lighting plan will be reviewed and approved, if acceptable, by staff at plan check.

3) Section 9413 Noise and Traffic:

- A. *Facilities shall operate in compliance with the noise exposure standards in this Code and the City's General Plan.*

The General Plan states that noise levels for utility uses shall not exceed 75 CNEL at the property line. A Condition of Approval (COA P18) is included to ensure noise levels are in compliance with the General Plan.

- B. *Normal testing and maintenance activities shall occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Mondays through Fridays, excluding emergency repairs. Normal testing and maintenance activities which do not involve the use or operation of telecommunications and maintenance equipment that is audible from residences and other nearby sensitive receptors may occur at any time.*

The proposed telecommunications facility is unmanned with the exception of personnel present during testing and maintenance. A Condition of Approval (COA P17) is included limiting the hours for facility testing and maintenance excluding emergency repairs. An easement is provided granting the carrier access and sufficient room for the parking of repair vehicles.

- C. *Back-up generators shall comply with the noise standards referenced in Subsections A and B and shall be operated only during power outages, in emergency situations, or for testing and maintenance in compliance with Subsections A and B, above. Back-up generators shall be equipped with noise attenuation devices to ensure that the generator, when operating, is not audible from residences and other nearby sensitive receptors.*

A Condition of Approval (COA P19) is included to ensure the back-up generators comply with the noise standards of the General Plan. The plans for the back-up generators will be reviewed by staff at plan check to ensure they are equipped with noise attenuation devices.

- D. *Traffic resulting from the operation and maintenance of a Facility shall be kept to a minimum. Conditions of project approval shall specify a maximum number of trips, based upon the Carrier's maintenance and testing schedule. Emergency repairs will be exempted from the trip limitations.*

Based upon the carrier's maintenance and testing schedule, a Condition of Approval (COA P23) is included limiting the facility to one (1) trip per month. One added trip per month is insignificant to traffic in the area. An easement is provided granting the carrier access and sufficient room for the parking of repair vehicles.

4) Section 9415 Performance Agreement Required:

Facility Carriers shall be required to enter into a standard performance agreement with the City which stipulates that the applicant and successors in interest shall properly maintain and, if required, ultimately remove the approved Facilities in compliance with the provisions of this Chapter and any conditions of permit approval. The Carrier shall provide financial security, in a form acceptable to the City, to ensure that the approved Facility is properly maintained and to guarantee that the Facility is dismantled and removed from the premises if it is inoperative, abandoned, or existing after permit expiration.

A Condition of Approval (COA P20) is included requiring a performance agreement and financial security, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney, to ensure the facility is properly maintained and removed from the premises if it is inoperative, abandoned, or existing after permit expiration. The pole, equipment cabinets, and any associated equipment shall be removed from the site within 90 days. The performance agreement and financial security shall be provided to the City prior to final sign-off of the building permit final.


5) Section 9419: Post Approval Procedures:

A. Validation of Proper Operation: *Within 90 days after commencement of operations, applicants for the Facility shall provide the Planning Division a report prepared by a qualified engineer, verifying that the operation of the Facility complies with the standards established by the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) for safe human exposure to radio frequency radiation (RFR).*

A Condition of Approval (COA P22) is included requiring a RFR report within 90 days after final sign off of the building permit final to ensure the facility complies with the standards established by the FCC.

B. Permit Duration: *A Conditional Use Permit for a Facility shall be valid for two years from the date of approval. The Conditional Use Permit may be extended at the request of the applicant for additional two-year increments at the discretion of the City Planner.*

A Condition of Approval (COA P11) stating that the Conditional Use Permit is valid for two years and applications for renewal shall be submitted to the Planning Division not later than 30 days prior to expiration of the two-year approval period.



Based upon the information provided on the plans and the conditions imposed upon the project, the project would be in conformance with the Lompoc City Zoning Ordinance.

General Plan:

The General Plan designation for this property is *Mixed Use* and the stated purpose is:

To provide areas for a mixture of pedestrian-oriented uses (e.g. commercial, residential, civic, cultural, and recreational) where each activity adds to the whole to produce a town center that is economically vibrant and socially inviting.

Goal 4 of the General Plan Land Use Element states *Maintain high-quality public facilities and services.*

The proposed telecommunications facility will provide better coverage for cellular phone customers in the area. Better coverage allows for a higher quality of service available to the residents of the City.

The proposed telecommunications facility would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation for the site and Goal 4 of the General Plan Land Use Element.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

An Initial Environmental Study has been performed for the proposed use. Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) a Negative Declaration has been prepared. It is recommended that the Commission review the document and certify the Negative Declaration for the proposal. A Notice of Determination will be filed following the Planning Commission action.

NOTICE:

Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Lompoc Record on February 13, 2004 and all property owners of record within 300 feet of the subject property were notified by U.S. Mail on February 27, 2004.

STAFF REVIEW:

A Development Review Board (DRB) meeting was held for this project on February 9, 2004. The applicant met with staff to discuss the proposal and draft Conditions of Approval were formulated.

The Development Review Board (DRB) has developed a series of standard conditions of approval (COA) to advise applicants of possible requirements during the development review process. Project specific conditions are included when staff can determine what they should be from the conceptual plans provided for Commission review. A complete plan check occurs after construction plans have been submitted to the Building Division for building permits. Please note that not all COA included with the Planning Commission Resolution for the project may be applicable. If the applicant has questions and/or concerns regarding specific conditions, he/she should contact the department/division that is recommending the condition. DRB members do not attend the Commission meeting and Planning staff cannot answer specific questions regarding conditions recommended by other departments/divisions.

The DRB recommends approval of CUP 04-02 subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

- 1) Certify the Negative Declaration; and,
- 2) Adopt Resolution No. 334 (04) approving CUP 04-02 for a telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue based on the Findings of Fact in the Resolution and subject to the draft Conditions of Approval.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft Resolution No. 334 (04) and Conditions of Approval
2. Initial Environmental Study and Negative Declaration
3. Site Plan and Elevations
(Planning Commission only – plans available in Planning Division for review)

H:\2004\PC-Staff Reports\CUP\CUP04-02.doc

RESOLUTION NO. 334 (04)

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOMPOC APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW OPERATION OF AN UNMANNED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT 119 EAST WALNUT AVENUE (CUP 04-02)

WHEREAS, a request was submitted by Tricia Knight of AFL Telecommunications, representing Sprint Spectrum L.P., for Planning Commission review and consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to allow operation of an unmanned telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-082-09); and

WHEREAS, the matter was considered by the Planning Commission at a duly-noticed public meeting on March 8, 2004; and

WHEREAS, at the meeting of March 8, 2004, _____ was present and answered Planning Commissioners' questions and addressed their concerns; and

WHEREAS, at the meeting of March 8, 2004, _____ spoke in favor of, and _____ spoke in opposition to, the proposal; and

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOMPOC RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: After hearing testimony, considering the evidence presented, and due deliberation of the matters presented, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed telecommunications facility, as conditioned, meets the requirements of the Lompoc City Code and is consistent with the applicable policies and development standards, therefore it can be found that:

- A. The proposed use, as conditioned, is consistent with the applicable policies and development standards set forth in Chapter 17 of the Lompoc City Code.
- B. The conditions stated in the decision are deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.
- C. The site of the proposed project relates to streets and highways adequate in width and pavement to carry the quantity and kind of traffic generated by the proposed use.
- D. The proposed project will have no adverse effect upon the abutting and surrounding property from the permitted use thereof.

SECTION 2. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21089 and Section 15074 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, the Initial Environmental Study and Negative Declaration which have been prepared for the proposal show no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore it can be found that:

- E. The proposed project, as conditioned, does not have a significant effect on the environment; and
- F. Any effect of the proposed use upon fish and wildlife is de minimis and therefore no filing fee is required pursuant to the Fish and Game Code Section 711.4.

SECTION 3: Based upon the foregoing, CUP 04-02 is approved as proposed on March 8, 2004, subject to the conditions attached as Exhibit A which are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

The foregoing resolution, on motion by Commissioner _____, seconded by Commissioner _____, was adopted at the regular Planning Commission meeting of March 8, 2004 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

Arleen T. Pelster, AICP, Secretary

Jack Rodenhi, Chair

Attachment: Exhibit A - Conditions of Approval

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
CUP 04-02 – SPRINT PCS WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY
119 EAST WALNUT AVENUE – APN: 85-082-09

The following Conditions of Approval apply to the plans for CUP 04-02, prepared by AFL Telecommunications, received by the Planning Division and stamped on January 15, 2004, and reviewed by the Planning Commission on March 8, 2004.

I. PLANNING

Planning - General Conditions

- P1. All applicable provisions of the Lompoc City Code are made a part of these conditions of approval in their entirety, as if fully contained herein.
- P2. The applicant is advised that certain fees and charges will be collected by the City prior to issuance of building permits and/or prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy.
- P3. These conditions of approval shall be noted on the construction drawings filed for any building permits, including the Planning Commission resolution number and the applicant's signed affidavit agreeing to comply with the conditions.
- P4. All revisions made by the Planning Commission and specified in the planning conditions of approval shall be shown on a revised site plan, which shall be reviewed by the Planning Division prior to submittal of construction drawings.
- P5. Minor changes to the plans shall be reviewed by the Community Development Director and approved if acceptable. Major changes to the plans shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved if acceptable.
- P6. Owner agrees to and shall indemnify, defend, protect, and hold harmless City, its officers, employees, agents and representatives, from and against any and all claims, losses, proceedings, damages, causes of action, liabilities, costs and expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees, arising from or in connection with, or caused by (i) any act, omission or negligence of Owner, or their respective contractors, licensees, invitees, agents, sublessees, servants or employees, wherever on or adjacent to the Property the same may occur; (ii) any use of the Property, or any accident, injury, death or damage to any person or property occurring in, or on or about the Property, or any part thereof, or from the conduct of Owner's business or from any activity, work or thing done, permitted or suffered by Owner or its sublessees, contractors, employees, or invitees, in or about the Property, other than to the extent arising as a result of City's sole active negligence or to the extent of any willful misconduct of the City; and (iii) any default in the performance of any obligations of Owner's part to be performed under the terms of this Agreement, or arising from any negligence of Owner, or any such claim or any action or proceeding brought thereon; and in case any action or proceedings be brought against the City, its officers, employees, agents and representatives, by reason of any such claim, Owner, upon notice from City, shall defend the same at its expense by counsel reasonably satisfactory to City.

Owner further agrees to and shall indemnify, defend, protect, and hold harmless the City, its officers, employees, agents and representatives, from and against any and all actions brought by any third party to challenge the Project or its approval by the City, including environmental determinations. Such indemnification shall include any costs and expenses incurred by Agency and City in such action(s), including reasonable attorney's fees.

Planning - Conditional Use Permit Conditions

- P7. The right to use an occupancy permit shall be contingent upon the fulfillment of any general and special conditions imposed by the conditional use permit procedure.
- P8. All of the special conditions shall constitute restrictions running with the land and shall be binding upon the owner of the land, his successors or assigns and a covenant to the effect may be required.
- P9. All of the conditions shall be consented to in writing by the applicant.
- P10. The resolution granting the application, together with all consent forms and a description of the property shall be recorded by the Recorder of the County of Santa Barbara.
- P11. This Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for two years from the date of approval and will expire on March 8, 2006. The Conditional Use Permit may be extended at the request of the applicant for additional two-year increments at the discretion of the City Planner. Applications for renewal shall be submitted to the Planning Division not later than 30 days prior to expiration of the two-year approval period.
- P12. This Conditional Use Permit may be reviewed and reconsidered by the Planning Commission at any time for the purpose of imposing new conditions to mitigate a nuisance or to revoke the permit to abate a nuisance.

Planning – Project Specific Conditions

- P13. The conditions hereby imposed supercede the conditions imposed by DR 00-15.
- P14. Antennas shall meet all manufacturers specifications, be of noncombustible and corrosive-resistant material and be erected in a secure, wind-resistant manner.
- P15. No advertising signage or identifying logos shall be displayed, except small identification plates used for emergency notification.
- P16. The applicant shall submit a lighting plan, indicating location and type of exterior lighting fixtures, which incorporates the following:
 - a. Exterior lighting shall be manually operated, low wattage, shielded and directed downward and shall be allowed only for safety purposes. Exterior lighting shall not be illuminated except when maintenance or safety personnel are present at night. The adequacy and design of the on-site lighting and shielding shall be reviewed by staff at plan check.

- P17. Normal testing and maintenance activities shall occur between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm, Mondays through Fridays, excluding emergency repairs.
- P18. The facility shall operate in compliance with the noise exposure standards in the City's General Plan. Noise levels shall not exceed 75 CNEL at the property line.
- P19. Back-up generators shall comply with the noise standards of the City's General Plan and shall be operated only during power outages, in emergency situations, or for testing and maintenance. Back-up generators shall be equipped with noise attenuation devices to ensure that the generator, when operating, is not audible from residences and other nearby sensitive receptors.
- P20. The facility carrier shall enter into a performance agreement with the City which stipulates that the applicant and successors in interest shall properly maintain and, if required, ultimately remove the approved facility. The carrier shall provide financial security, in a form acceptable to the City, to ensure that the approved facility is properly maintained and to guarantee that the facility is dismantled and removed from the premises if it is inoperative, abandoned, or existing after permit expiration. The performance agreement and financial security shall be provided to the City prior to final sign-off of the building permit final.
- P21. The facility shall not result in human exposure to RFR exceeding the standards for permissible human exposure to RFR as adopted by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
- P22. Within 90 days after commencement of operations, the applicant shall provide the Planning Division with a report prepared by a qualified engineer, verifying that the operation of the Facility complies with the standards established by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for safe human exposure to radio frequency radiation (RFR).
- P23. Traffic resulting from the operation and maintenance of the facility shall be kept to a minimum. Based upon the Carrier's maintenance and testing schedule, a maximum of one (1) trip per month shall be allowed. Emergency repairs are exempt from this limitation.
- P24. Hours of construction shall be limited to:
Monday through Friday - between the hours of 8 am and 5 pm
Saturday - between the hours of 8 am and 5 pm
Sunday - None
Minor modifications to the hours of construction may be granted by the Community Development Director.

II. BUILDING AND FIRE SAFETY

Building - General Conditions

- B1. Project shall comply with the most recent adopted City and State building codes.
- B2. Plans shall be submitted by a California licensed architect and/or engineer.

- B3. Dimensioned building setbacks and property lines, street centerlines, and between buildings or other structures shall be designated on plot plans.
- B4. All property lines and easements must be shown on the plot plan. A statement that such lines and easements are shown is required.
- B5. The Title Sheet of the plans shall include:
 - a. Occupancy group
 - b. Description of use
 - c. Type of construction
 - d. Height of the building
 - e. Floor area of building(s)

III. FIRE

Fire - Access Conditions

- F1. All permanent gates on required access roads shall have a means for Fire Department access either: 1) an approved key box containing appropriate keys or gate combination, or 2) if electrically operated, an approved key operated switch. Provisions must be made to open electrically operated gates in the event of a power failure.
- F2. Fire Department access shall comply with UFC Appendix 3-D and UFC Chapter 9.

IV. PARKS & URBAN FORESTRY

No General or Project Specific Conditions

V. AVIATION/TRANSPORTATION

No General or Project Specific Conditions

VI. POLICE DEPARTMENT

No General or Project Specific Conditions

VII. ENGINEERING

No General or Project Specific Conditions

VIII. SOLID WASTE

No General or Project Specific Conditions

IX. ELECTRIC

Electric – General Conditions

- EL1. The Developer shall sign a line extension agreement and pay all costs for the City to furnish and install electric power lines to and within the proposed development. These costs shall include all labor, labor overhead, material, material handling charge and equipment/vehicle rental necessary for the City to extend the City's electric distribution system to serve the project.
- EL2. The Developer shall provide a single line diagram showing voltage, phase, load requirements and size of planned switchboard.

Three-phase electric services up to 200 Amps shall have 7-jaw meter sockets. Three-phase electric services above 200 Amps shall have 13-jaw meter sockets and provisions for a test switch and for current transformers.

The main switchboard shall conform to Electric Utility Service Equipment Requirements approved by the City of Lompoc.

The developer shall pay the Meter Installation Fee prior to the issuance of the building permit.

- EL3. Electric meters and main disconnect switches shall be located on the exterior of the building, or in an enclosure opening only to the exterior of the building. Meter enclosures shall be accessible at all times to Electric Division personnel. If the enclosure is to be locked, the lock shall be keyed to Schlage Lock No. C38587.
- EL4. The Developer shall provide all necessary trenching and backfilling to Electric specifications. This shall include trenching for primary cable, secondary cable, street light wiring and associated vaults and boxes. The developer shall provide transformer pads as required. The project shall be at final grade prior to trenching for installation of underground electric facilities.
- EL5. The Developer shall furnish and install the service wire and conduit from the service panel to the transformer or secondary box. Upon approval of the building inspector, the City shall make the final connections to the transformer and energize the transformer.
- EL6. For three-phase electrical service over 200 Amps, the Developer shall run a telephone service wire to the meter location for remote meter readings.

X. WATER

No General or Project Specific Conditions

CITY OF LOMPOC
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

A. PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Title: Conditional Use Permit	Project No: CUP 04-02
Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza, Lompoc, CA 93436 P.O. Box 8001, Lompoc, CA 93438-8001	Contact Person and Phone Number: Keith Neubert Assistant Planner (805) 875-8277
PROJECT DESCRIPTION / LOCATION: A request by Tricia Knight of AFL Telecommunications, representing Sprint Spectrum L.P., for Planning Commission review and consideration of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP 04-02) to allow operation of an unmanned telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-082-09). The site contains an existing telecommunications facility that has been abandoned. The proposed project consists of the removal and replacement of equipment cabinets and three panel antennas, to be flush-mounted to the sides of the existing pole. The project will match the existing abandoned facility in size, placement, and color. The site is zoned Central Business District (C-2).	
Public Agencies with Approval Authority (including permits, funding, or participation agreements): City of Lompoc	
Project Applicant, Name and Address: Sprint Spectrum L.P. 6580 Sprint Parkway Overland Park, KS 66251	Project Consultant: Tricia Knight AFL Telecommunications 368 Santa Fe Avenue Pismo Beach, CA 93449 Phone: (805) 448-4221
General Plan Designation: Mixed Use	City Zoning Designation: Central Business District (C-2)
Surrounding Land Use Designation: North – Mixed Use South – Mixed Use East – Mixed Use West – Old Town Commercial	Surrounding Land Uses: North – Commercial South – Commercial East – Commercial West – Commercial
Environmental Setting: Existing urbanized area.	
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 type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic	

B. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Identify the potential for significant adverse impacts below. Note mitigation measures, if available, for significant adverse impacts.

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

Comments:

- a) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista as there is no scenic vista in the immediate area identified on the City of Lompoc Urban Design Features Map in the Urban Design Element of the City's General Plan, adopted in October of 1997.
- b) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, as the site is not located adjacent to a state scenic highway.
- c) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, as the site contains an existing telecommunications facility and the proposed project will match the existing facility in size, placement, and color.
- d) The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, as no new lighting is proposed and existing lighting will be reviewed by staff at plan check.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				X

Comments:

- a) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use as the site is within the existing City limits and was previously developed.
- b) The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract as the site was previously developed.
- c) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not involve changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, as the site was previously developed.

III AIR QUALITY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Comments:

- a-d) The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, or violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The project is limited to the removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas, therefore, no construction will take place that will violate any air quality standard.
- e) The telecommunications facility will not create any objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish				X

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

Comments:

a-d) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a sensitive species in local or regional plans or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, nor will the project affect federally protected wetlands, nor will the project affect migratory wildlife corridors, nor will the project affect biological resources, because the project is proposed on a site that was previously developed in an urbanized area and is not identified in the Lompoc General Plan as being in an area of biological significance.

e) The site is not identified on the "Biologically Significant Areas" Map located in the City of Lompoc General Plan adopted October 1997.

f) The use is proposed on property within an urbanized area on a site that was previously developed. The City of Lompoc Biological Resources Study, prepared by Arthur D. Little in February 1987, identifies no biological resources that will be impacted by the project.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				X

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Comments:

a-b) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, as identified in Section 15064.5, because the subject site is not identified in the City of Lompoc Cultural Resource Study as having a historical or archaeological resource on the site.

c) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature. The site is not identified on the "Archeological Sensitivity Zones" Map located in the City of Lompoc General Plan adopted October 1997.

d) The proposed project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The site is not identified on the "Archeological Sensitivity Zones" Map located in the City of Lompoc General Plan adopted October 1997.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral				X

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
reading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Comments:

a) The site is not identified on the City of Lompoc General Plan "Geologic and Soils Hazards" Map as being located in an area subject to liquefaction, landslides, or seismic activity, therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.

b-e) Based upon the 1987 study by the Morro Group, "City of Lompoc Seismic and Geologic Conditions Study", the area is not subject to unusual geologic activity nor does it have unique features.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people				X

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
residing or working in the project area?				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Comments:

a-c) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as no hazardous materials will be used or stored on the site.

d) The proposed project will not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, based on a check of the lists prepared by the Certified Unified Program Agency of unauthorized releases and fuel tank locations.

e-f) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas is not located within the Lompoc Municipal Airport land use plan nor is the site located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, based on a review of the Lompoc Airport Master Plan and the Lompoc General Plan. The Lompoc Municipal Airport, at approximately 1.5 miles away, is the closest airfield to the project site.

g) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the project will not involve the installation of permanent barriers to travel.

h) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands, because the project site is located in the urbanized area of the City of Lompoc.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would				X

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

Comments:

a-e) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; the project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge; the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area; the project will not create or contribute run-off water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off.

f) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. There are no rivers or creeks within the project area.

g) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas is located in Zone X of Community Panel No. 060334-0003D, revised 05 June 97 outside the 500-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.

h) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

i-j) The proposed project will not create a threat of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The subject site is located approximately 8 miles from the ocean, so tsunamis are very unlikely. The site is also not located near a water body or a significant slope or volcano, so mudflows and seiches are very unlikely.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Comments:

- a) The proposed use will not physically divide an established community as it is located within the existing City limits in an established neighborhood.
- b) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect as the proposed use is consistent with the City General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The City Planning Commission will review the plans to assure conformance with the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- c) There is not a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, which applies to the site, therefore, there will be no conflict with such a plan.

X MINERAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Comments:

- a-b) The proposed project will not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state as the "Mineral Resources" Map in the Lompoc General Plan, adopted October 1997, does not identify the project area as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance. or applicable standards of other				X

XI. NOISE Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
agencies?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Comments:

a-b) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, nor will it expose persons to excessive groundborne noise levels.

c) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

d) The proposed project will not create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

e-f) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private air strip.

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

Comments:

- a) The proposed use will not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads and other infrastructure), as the site was previously developed.
 b-c) The proposed project will not displace any people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				X
b) Fire Protection?				X
c) Police protection?				X
d) Schools?				X
e) Parks?				X
f) Other public facilities?				X

Comments:

a-f) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for Fire, Police, Schools, Parks, or other public services, because the site is currently within an urbanized area which is already adequately served by City services. The City has sufficient resources to provide required services.

XIV. RECREATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Comments:

a-b) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Comments:

a) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial, in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) because the use will not induce a substantial increase in traffic or impact street capacity.

b) The proposed project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, because the project will not substantially increase the amount of traffic in the area.

c) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks because the project is located a substantial distance from the Lompoc Airport and the Vandenberg Air Force Base Airfield.

d) The proposed project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment) as the site is currently being utilized as a telecommunications facility.

e-f) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity, as the project will not result in blocked roadways and the telecommunications facility will be unmanned.

g) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not conflict with policies, plans or programs which support alternative transportation, including buses and bicycles, as the project will not result in blocked roadways, bikeways or reduced parking.

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

Comments:

a) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Region of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.


b-c) The removal and replacement of telecommunication equipment cabinets and three panel antennas will not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities.

d-e) The project will not have an impact on water supplies or wastewater facilities, as the project will not require water and will not result in additional wastewater.

f-g) The project will not require the need for solid waste disposal.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b) 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 probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

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


 Keith Neubert
 Assistant Planner

2/9/04
 Date



CITY OF LOMPOC

CITY OF LOMPOC NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended to date, a Negative Declaration is hereby made on the following project:

Title: Conditional Use Permit – CUP 04-02

Location: 119 East Walnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number: 85-082-09)

Description: A request by Tricia Knight of AFL Telecommunications, representing Sprint Spectrum L.P., for Planning Commission review and consideration of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP 04-02) to allow operation of an unmanned telecommunications facility at 119 East Walnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-082-09). The site contains an existing telecommunications facility that has been abandoned. The proposed project consists of the removal and replacement of equipment cabinets and three panel antennas, to be flush-mounted to the sides of the existing pole. The project will match the existing abandoned facility in size, placement, and color. The site is zoned Central Business District (C-2).

The Planning Division of the City of Lompoc has determined that:

There are no significant adverse environmental impacts created by this project.

There are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with this project if the following conditions/mitigation measures are met.

February 9, 2004

Date

Keith Neubert, Assistant Planner
for Planning Division