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## SECTION 1 <br> INTRODUCTION

## A. PURPOSE

This document is a $\square$ policy-level, $\boxtimes$ project level Initial Study for evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting with the proposed Conditional Use Permit \#23-0010 (Refer to Exhibit " A " \& " B "). For purposes of this document, the Conditional Use Permit will be called the "proposed project".

## B. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPERIAL COUNTY'S GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING CEQA

As defined by Section 15063 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and Section 7 of the County's "CEQA Regulations Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, as amended", an Initial Study is prepared primarily to provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration, or Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate for providing the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for any proposed project.

According to Section 15065, an EIR is deemed appropriate for a particular proposal if the following conditions occur:

- The proposal has the potential to substantially degrade quality of the environment.
- The proposal has the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- The proposal has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposal could cause direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings.

According to Section 15070(a), a Negative Declaration is deemed appropriate if the proposal would not result th any significant effect on the environment.

According to Section 15070(b), a Mitigated Negative Declaration is deemed appropriate if it is determined that though a proposal could result in a significant effect, mitigation measures are available to reduce these significant effects to insignificant levels.

This Initial Study has determined that the proposed applications will not result in any potentially significant environmental impacts and therefore, a Negative Declaration is deemed as the appropriate document to provide necessary environmental evaluations and clearance as identified hereinafter.

This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et. seq.); Section 15070 of the State \& County of Imperial's Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et. seq.); applicable requirements of the County of Imperial; and the regulations, requirements, and procedures of any other responsible public agency or an agency with jurisdiction by law.

Pursuant to the County of Imperial Guidelines for Implementing CEQA, depending on the project scope, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and/or Planning Director is designated the Lead Agency,
in accordance with Section 15050 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Lead Agency is the public agency which has the principal responsibility for approving the necessary environmental clearances and analyses for any project in the County.

## C. INTENDED USES OF INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are informational documents which are intended to inform County of Imperial decision makers, other responsible or interested agencies, and the general public of potential environmental effects of the proposed applications. The environmental review process has been established to enable public agencies to evaluate environmental consequences and to examine and implement methods of eliminating or reducing any potentially adverse impacts. While CEQA requires that consideration be given to avoiding environmental damage, the Lead Agency and other responsible public agencies must balance adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including economic and social goals.

The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, prepared for the project will be circulated for a period of 20 days (30-days if submitted to the State Clearinghouse for a project of area-wide significance) for public and agency review and comments. At the conclusion, if comments are received, the County Planning \& Development Services Department will prepare a document entitled "Responses to Comments" which will be forwarded to any commenting entity and be made part of the record within 10-days of any project consideration.

## D. CONTENTS OF INITIAL STUDY \& NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This Initial Study is organized to facilitate a basic understanding of the existing setting and environmental implications of the proposed applications.

## SECTION 1

I. INTRODUCTION presents an introduction to the entire report. This section discusses the environmental process, scope of environmental review, and incorporation by reference documents.

## SECTION 2

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM contains the County's Environmental Checklist Form. The checklist form presents results of the environmental evaluation for the proposed applications and those issue areas that would have either a significant impact, potentially significant impact, or no impact.

PROJECT SUMMARY, LOCATION AND EVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS describes the proposed project entitlements and required applications. A description of discretionary approvals and permits required for project implementation is also included. It also identifies the location of the project and a general description of the surrounding environmental settings.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS evaluates each response provided in the environmental checklist form. Each response checked in the checklist form is discussed and supported with sufficient data and analysis as necessary. As appropriate, each response discussion describes and identifies specific impacts anticipated with project implementation.

## SECTION 3

III. MANDATORY FINDINGS presents Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.
IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED identifies those persons consulted and involved in
preparation of this Initial Study and Negative Declaration.
V. REFERENCES lists bibliographical materials used in preparation of this document.

## VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION - COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

VII. FINDINGS

## SECTION 4

## VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)

## IX. MITIGATION MONITORING \& REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)

## E. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

For evaluation of environmental impacts, each question from the Environmental Checklist Form is summarized and responses are provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. Impacts and effects will be evaluated and quantified, when appropriate. To each question, there are four possible responses, including:

1. No Impact: A "No Impact" response is adequately supported if the impact simply does not apply to the proposed applications.
2. Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed applications will have the potential to impact the environment. These impacts, however, will be less than significant; no additional analysis is required.
3. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: This applies where incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact".
4. Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed applications could have impacts that are considered significant. Additional analyses and possibly an EIR could be required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

## F. POLICY-LEVEL or PROJECT LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration will be conducted under a $\square$ policy-level, $\boxtimes$ project level analysis. Regarding mitigation measures, it is not the intent of this document to "overlap" or restate conditions of approval that are commonly established for future known projects or the proposed applications. Additionally, those other standard requirements and regulations that any development must comply with, that are outside the County's jurisdiction, are also not considered mitigation measures and therefore, will not be identified in this document.

## G. TIERED DOCUMENTS AND INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Information, findings, and conclusions contained in this document are based on incorporation by reference of tiered documentation, which are discussed in the following section.

## 1. Tiered Documents

As permitted in Section 15152(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, information and discussions from other documents can be included into this document. Tiering is defined as follows:
"Tiering refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as the one prepared
for a general plan or policy statement) with later EIRs and negative declarations on narrower projects; incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and concentrating the later EIR or negative declaration solely on the issues specific to the later project."

Tiering also allows this document to comply with Section 15152(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, which discourages redundant analyses, as follows:
"Agencies are encouraged to tier the environmental analyses which they prepare for separate but related projects including the general plans, zoning changes, and development projects. This approach can eliminate repetifive discussion of the same issues and focus the later EIR or negative declaration on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an EIR prepared for a general plan, policy or program to an EIR or negative declaration for another plan, policy, or program of lesser scope, or to a site-specific EIR or negative declaration."

Further, Section 15152(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states:
"Where an EIR has been prepared and cerified for a program, plan, policy, or ordinance consistent with the requirements of this section, any lead agency for a later project pursuant to or consistent with the program, plan, policy, or ordinance should limit the EIR or negative declaration on the later project to effects which:
(1) Were not examined as significant effects on the environment in the prior EIR; or
(2) Are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means."

## 2. Incorporation By Reference

Incorporation by reference is a procedure for reducing the size of EIRs/MND and is most appropriate for including long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background information, but do not contribute directly to the specific analysis of the project itself. This procedure is particularly useful when an EIR or Negative Declaration relies on a broadly-drafted EIR for its evaluation of cumulative impacts of related projects (Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation v. County of Los Angeles [1986, 177 Ca.3d 300]). If an EIR or Negative Declaration relies on information from a supporting study that is available to the public, the EIR or Negative Declaration cannot be deemed unsupported by evidence or analysis (San Francisco Ecology Center v. City and County of San Francisco [1975, 48 Ca.3d 584, 595]). This document incorporates by reference appropriate information from the "Final Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Assessment for the "County of Imperial General Plan EIR" prepared by Brian F. Mooney Associates in 1993 and updates.

When an EIR or Negative Declaration incorporates a document by reference, the incorporation must comply with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines as follows:

- The incorporated document must be available to the public or be a matter of public record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[a]). The General Plan EIR and updates are available, along with this document, at the County of Imperial Planning \& Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 Ph. (442) 265-1736.
- This document must be available for inspection by the public at an office of the lead agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[b] ). These documents are available at the County of Imperial Planning \& Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 Ph. (442) 265-1736.
- These documents must summarize the portion of the document being incorporated by reference or briefly
describe information that cannot be summarized. Furthermore, these documents must describe the relationship between the incorporated information and the analysis in the tiered documents (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[c]). As discussed above, the tiered EIRs address the entire project site and provide background and inventory information and data which apply to the project site. Incorporated information and/or data will be cited in the appropriate sections.
- These documents must include the State identification number of the incorporated documents (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[d]). The State Clearinghouse Number for the County of Imperial General Plan EIR is SCH \#93011023.
- The material to be incorporated in this document will include general background information (CEQA Guidelines Section $15150[f]$. This has been previously discussed in this document.

1. Project Title: Conditional Use Permit \#23-0010 Variance \#23-0010 Initial Study \#23-0004
2. Lead Agency: Imperial County Planning \& Development Services Department
3. Contact person and phone number: Evelia Jimenez, Planner II, (442) 265-1747
4. Address: 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
5. E-mail: ejimenez@co.imperial.ca.us
6. Project location: 673 Sidewinder Rd N., Winterhaven, CA., further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 056-470-002-000 and legally described as POR SBE 872-13-9-3 OF SEC 21 16-21.
7. Project sponsor's name and address: CitySwitch

1900 Century Place NE, Suite 320
Atlanta, GA. 30345
8. General Plan designation: Recreation
9. Zoning: S-2 (Open Space/Preservation)
10. Description of project: The applicant, CitySwitch, is proposing to install a $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ tall monopole tower with a $10^{\prime}-$ 0 " lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0$ " to be located within a leased 57 ' x 45' fenced area. The parcel is owned by Union Pacific Railroad Company and is within its railroad right-of-way. The proposed telecommunications tower, to be located at 673 Sidewinder Rd N., Winterhaven, Ca., would be erected, owned and operated by CitySwitch. CitySwitch has a commitment with Union Pacific and AT\&T Mobility, a wireless services provider, for this site. Additionally, the facility will be open for co-location to other wireless providers and any other communication carriers that have a need for a facility in the area. The project requires a Conditional Use Permit (\#23-0010) for the monopole tower and a Variance (\#23-0004) to exceed the 100-foot height limitation for the Open Space/Preservation (S-2) zoned area by 80 feet.

The proposed facility is designed to house the equipment necessary to provide Union Pacific and AT\&T's critical communications for the railroad line and uninterrupted AT\&T wireless services to the residents and visitors of Winterhaven, Imperial County, and surrounding areas, including wireless telephone service, voice paging, messaging, and wireless internet and broadband data transmission. All registered wireless providers' technology operates at various radio frequency bands allocated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) as part of their license.

After construction, the proposed wireless telecommunications facility would be unmanned and would only require service technicians, in a pick-up or van sized vehicle, to visit the site approximately once a month. Access would be provided via an easement with the proposed access entry point off of Sidewinder Rd $N$. The only utilities required to service the facility are power and fiber. The site is entirely self-monitored through a sophisticated alarm system, which is connected to a main switch station. The system alerts personnel of any equipment malfunction or breach of security. Additionally, there will be no impacts on County's water and sanitation (sewer) utilities as they would not be used at the site.

In accordance with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations, the proposed wireless telecommunications facility, if approved, the project would be designed and constructed to meet and/or exceed all applicable government and industry safety standards. Specifically, CitySwitch would comply with all Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) construction requirements and technical
standards. The proposed wireless communication facility's Radio Frequency (RF) emissions would comply with the Federal Communications Commissions's (FCC) Radio Frequency emission standards. Additionally, the proposed wireless communication facility would comply with the Federal Aviation Agency's (FAA) height, lighting and marking requirements.
11. Surrounding land uses and setting: the proposed project is surrounded by Medium Commercial (C-2) to the South; Open Space/Preservation (S-2) to the West, North and East. The setting surrounding the project is vacant desert landscape. Although the proposed project is consistent with the S-2 zone under an approved Conditional Use Permit (Division 5, Section 90519.02(d)), it is determined that it is in conflict with Division 24, Section 92401.00Purpose, "...This Section standards are intended to protect, and promote public health, safety, community welfare and the unique visual character of the Imperial County [by] minimizing the number of towers throughout the community..." as the proposed telecommunications tower would be situated approximately 2,000 feet northwest of an existing telecommunications tower owned by SBA Towers, Inc., operating under Conditional Use Permit \#19-0029.

## 12. Other public agencies whose approval is required: Planning Commission

13. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentially, etc.?
Consultation letters were sent to the Quechan and Campo Band of Mission Indian Tribes. The AB 52 Notice of Opportunity to consult on the proposed project letter was mailed via certified mail on August 2, 2023 to the Campo Band of Mission Indians and the Quechan Indian Tribe. No comments have been received from the Quechan and Campo Band of Mission Indians Tribes for this project.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.2). Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code, Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code, Section 21082.3 (c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

## 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.

| $\square$ | Aesthetics | $\square$ | Agriculture and Forestry Resources | $\square$ | Air Quality |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | Biological Resources | $\square$ | Cultural Resources | $\square$ | Energy |
| $\square$ | Geology /Soils | $\square$ | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | $\square$ | Hazards \& Hazardous Materials |
| $\square$ | Hydrology / Water Quality | $\square$ | Land Use / Planning | $\square$ | Mineral Resources |
| $\square$ | Noise | $\square$ | Population / Housing | $\square$ | Public Services |
| $\square$ | Recreation | $\square$ | Transportation | $\square$ | Tribal Cultural Resources |
| $\square$ | Utilities/Service Systems | $\square$ | Wildfire | $\square$ | Mandatory Findings of Significance |

## ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE (EEC) DETERMINATION

After Review of the Initial Study, the Environmental Evaluation Committee has:
Found that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
$\square$ Found that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
$\square$ Found that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Found 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.
$\square$ Found 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.
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE DE MINIMIS IMPACT FINDING: Yes

EEC VOTES
PUBLIC WORKS
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SVCS
OFFICE EMERGENCY SERVICES APCD
AG
SHERIFF DEPARTMENT


Jim Minnick, Director of Planning/EEC Chairman


ABSENT


Date:

## PROJECT SUMMARY

A. Project Location: The proposed project is located at 673 Sidewinder Rd N., Winterhaven, CA; a railroad right-of-way parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company with Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 056-470-002000.
B. Project Summary: The applicant, CitySwitch, is proposing to install a 170 -foot, monopole tower with a $10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ to be located within a lease $57^{\prime}$ x $45^{\prime}$ fenced parcel. The parcel is owned by Union Pacific Railroad Company and is within its railroad right-of-way. The proposed telecommunications tower will be erected, owned and operated by CitySwitch. CitySwitch will be offering it as a shared facility to Union Pacific, with whom CitySwitch has a commitment with as well as with AT\&T Mobility. Additionally, the facility will be open for co-location to other wireless providers and any other communication carriers that have a need for a facility in the area.

The proposed facility is designed to house the equipment necessary to provide Union Pacific and AT\&T's critical communications for the railroad line and uninterrupted AT\&T wireless services to the residents and visitors of Winterhaven, Imperial County, and surrounding areas, including wireless telephone service, voice paging, messaging, and wireless internet and broadband data transmission. All registered wireless providers' technology operates at various radio frequency bands allocated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) as part of their license. After construction, the proposed wireless telecommunications faciity will be unmanned and will only require service technicians, in a pick-up or van sized vehicle, to visit the site approximately once a month. Access will be provided via an easement with the proposed access entry point off of Sidewinder Rd $N$. The only utilities required to service the facility are power and fiber. The site is entirely self-monitored through a sophisticated alarm system, which is connected to a main switch station. The system alerts personnel of any equipment malfunction or breach of security. Additionally, there will be no impacts on County's water and sanitation (sewer) utilities as they would not be used at the site.

In accordance with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations, the proposed wireless telecommunications facility will be designed and constructed to meet and/or exceed all applicable government and industry safety standards. Specifically, CitySwitch will comply with all Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) construction requirements and technical standards, as well as, Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) Radio Frequency emission standards. Additionally, the proposed wireless communication facility will comply with the Federal Aviation Agency's (FAA) height, lighting, and marking requirements.
C. Environmental Setting: The proposed project site is located within a vacant parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company zoned S-2 (Open Space/Preservation) within its railroad right-of-way. The proposed project site is relatively flat, in an unincorporated portion of the County of Imperial approximately 36.53 miles east from the City of Holtville. Surrounding parcels to the North, East, South and West are vacant desert land.
D. Analysis: The proposed project is for a 170 -foot monopole telecommunication tower with a 10 -foot lightning rod for a total height of 180 feet. The parcel is zoned S-2 (Open Space/Preservation) per Zoning Map \#70, of the Imperial County Land Use Ordinance, which designates areas that are suitable for Communication Towers. The proposed height of the tower exceeds the maximum height limit of the project site's S-2 zone requirements, which allows a communication tower up to 100 ft . in height. For this reason, the project was reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission on July 19, 2023, and was found to be consistent with the 1996 Airport Land Use Compatibiity Plan.
E. General Plan Consistency: Under the Land Use Element of the Imperial County General Plan, the project site is designated "Open Space/Preservation". The proposed project could be consistent with the County's Communication Ordinance (Division 24) since a Communication Facility (Tower) is a permitted use on the S-2 (Open Space/Preservation) zone with an approved Conditional Use Permit. No changes to the General Plan are

## proposed.

Exhibit "A"
Vicinity Map


## Exhibit "B" Site Plan



## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

|  | Potentially |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than |  |
| Significant | Unless Mitigation | Significant |  |
| Impact | Incorporated | Impact | No Impact |
| (PSI) | (PSUMI) | (LTSI) | (NI) |

## I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?
a) The project site is not located near any scenic vista or scenic highway according to the Imperial County General Plan Circulation and Scenic Highway Element ${ }^{1}$ and California State Scenic Highway System Map²; therefore, no impact is expected.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
b) As previously stated, the proposed project is not located near a Scenic vista or Scenic Highway and would not substantially damage scenic resources. Therefore, no impact is expected.
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surrounding? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
c) The proposed self-supported monopole communications tower is anticipated to blend with the existing natural environment and would not significantly or physically degrade the visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. It is also consistent with the Aesthetic requirements as specified on the County's Communication Ordinance (Division 24), Section 92404.01(R). No impacts are anticipated.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
d) The proposed project would not create a substantial source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime view in the area. The proposed tower is going to be galvanized metal which is a non-reflective material. Additionally, per Imperial County's Communication Ordinance (Division 24), Section 92404.01(I), states that all towers shall be lit with approved lighting as required by FAA and the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) standards. The project was heard by the Imperial County Airport Land Use Commission on July 19, 2023, it was found to be consistent with the 1996 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, a white daytime beacon and a red night time beacon will be required for this project. Compliance with FAA and ALUC standards would bring any impacts to less than significant.

## II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. --Would the project:
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 nonagricultural use?
a) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunications tower with associated remote and unmanned equipment located within an undeveloped parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company and within its railroad right-of-way. The proposed project site is not listed on the Califomia Important Farmland Finder: Imperial County 20203, the proposed project will not convert any type of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. No impacts are expected.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?
b) The County of Imperial has no current active Williamson Act contracts. Additionally, according to the California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder ${ }^{4}$, Imperial County status is Non-Participating or Withdrawn from the 2022 Williamson Act; therefore, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. No
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Impacts are expected.
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?
c) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunications tower with associated remote and unmanned equipment located on a parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company and within its railroad right-of-way. The proposed project does not expect nor anticipate to conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 5114(g)). No impacts are expected.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
d) As explained under item c) above, the proposed project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact is expected.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
e) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunications tower with associated remote and unmanned equipment located on a parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company and within its railroad right-of-way. Although the land use designation for the proposed project site is Open Space/Preservation, development of the proposed project would not result in the loss or conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

## III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to the following determinations. Would the Project:
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
a) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower with associated remote and unmanned equipment located on a parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company and within its railroad right-of-way, and is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Per the Air Pollution Control District letter dated, June 15, 2023, the project must comply with all Air District rules and regulations and would emphasize Regulation VIII. Regulation VIII is a collection of rules designed to maintain fugitive dust emissions below $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ visual opacity. If the project includes a generator it may be subject to permitting requirements, generally generators greater than 50 -bhp require permits. Per the Environmental Health Department email dated, May 30, 2023, if the project intends to have generator(s) or storage equipment storing 1,320 -gallons of petroleum based product, applicant is to contact EHS. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any
criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?
b) The proposed project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant since, as mentioned above under item a), it would require to adhere to the Air District's Regulation VIII. It is expected that compliance with Imperial County Air Pollution Control District requirements would bring any impact to less than significant.
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations?
c) Diesel exhaust and volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions which are typically related to construction trucks and machinery are the pollutants that could possibly affect the nearest sensitive receptors, but the impacts would be temporary and would be lessened by showing compliance with APCD's rules and regulations regarding construction pollutants during construction activities. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors
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adversely affecting a substantial number of people?
d) The proposed project does not anticipate creating objectionable odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. Although some poilutants may be emitted during construction activities and as previously stated on item (III) (a) above, compliance with Air Pollution Control District's Regulation VIII, Environmental Health Service's requirements, and adherence to the California Building Code would bring any impacts to less than significant.

## IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
a) According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Elements, Figure 1 "Sensitive Habitat Map," the project is not located within a sensitive habitat area. Additionally, in accordance to Figure 2 "Sensitive Species Map," the project is located within the Burrowing Owl Species Distribution Model area. In accordance to Figure 5 "Areas of Heightened Historic Period Sensitivity Map," the project is located within the Phillip Cooke Exploration and Trail Routes, 1770-1890. However, the proposed project does not expect nor anticipate any substantial physical changes to the environment. Consequently, it does not appear to have a substantially adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, or to any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or of special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service. Should any additional developments be proposed on site, the applicant shall contact ICPDS; therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
b) The proposed project site is not located within a sensitive or riparian habitat, or on other sensitive natural community area as depicted on Figure 3 "Agency-Designated Habitats" from the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element ${ }^{8}$. Additionally, the proposed project site is within a parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company and within its railroad right-of-way; therefore, it does not appear to have a substantial effect in local regional plans, policies, and regulations with respect to sensitive natural communities or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
c) According to the National Wetlands Inventory: Surface Waters and Wetlands ${ }^{9}$, National Water Information System: Mapper ${ }^{10}$, and California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Data Viewer11, the proposed project is not located within a riparian habitat and which will not cause a substantial adverse effect on federal protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
d) Interfere substantially with the movernent of any 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?
d) The project site is not located within a Sensitive Habitat; therefore, it would not interfere substantially with the movement of any 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. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
e) The proposed project is not expected to conflict with any local policy or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance. No impacts are expected.
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or
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other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation
plan?
f) The proposed project site is not located within a designated sensitive area according to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element ${ }^{8}$, therefore, it would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

## v. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to $\S 15064.5$ ?
a) According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 5, "Areas of Heightened Historic Period Sensitivity Map," the proposed project site may be located within the Phillip Cooke Exploration and Trail Route (1770-1890). Additionally, in accordance to Figure 6 "Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity" the proposed project site is not located within the immediate vicinity of a known area of cultural sensitivity to Native Americans. Additionally, the AB 52 letter was sent on August 2, 2023 to the Quechan Indian Tribe and The Campo Band of Mission Indians, no comments to the proposed project were received. Therefore, any impact is expected to be less than significant.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to $\$ 15064.5$ ?
b) The proposed project is located on disturbed land and it is not likely to cause a substantial adverse change to an archeological resource. Any impact is expected to be less than significant.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?
c) As previously stated on items $(\mathbb{V})(a)$ and $(\mathrm{V})(\mathrm{b})$ above, the proposed project site is not located within or adjacent to any cemeteries, therefore, the proposed self-supported monopole telecommunications tower with associated remote and unmanned equipment project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. The proposed project site is located within a railroad right-of-way parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company and not in a known area of cultural sensitivity; therefore it is not expected to result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. Less than significant impacts are expected.

## VI. ENERGY Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
a) The proposed telecommunications tower facility will not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, insufficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during the project construction or operation. Additionally, the proposed project site is located within a railroad right-of-way parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company. Should any new developments occur, said developments would require compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code and ministerial building permits with the Imperial County Planning and Development Services Department. Furthermore, per comment letter received from the Imperial Irrigation District dated June 8, 2023, if the proposed communication tower requires electrical services, the applicant should contact IID. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

As previously stated on item (VI)(a) above, the proposed project is for a telecommunications tower facility located within a railroad right-of-way parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company. New future developments would require compliance with the latest energy efficiency and renewable energy standards and regulations. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse
effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
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a) The proposed telecommunications tower facility does not appear to conflict with the geology and soil of adjacent parcels in the area. Construction of the proposed self-supported monopole telecommunications tower with associated remote and unmanned equipment will be subjected to comply with the latest edition of the California Building Code ${ }^{14}$ as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving. Regarding geology, adherence and compliance to these standards and regulations would bring any impacts to less than significant.

1) 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?
2) According to the most recent California Department of Conservation, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation and the United States Geological Survey's Quaternary Faults Map the proposed project is not located within a known fault zone. Compliance with the previously referenced Building Codes and/or any other applicable requirement should reduce impacts to less than significant.
3) Strong Seismic ground shaking?
4) Ground shaking is expected to occur since the project site is located in the seismically active Imperial Valley, however, the project's design and subsequent construction should adhere to the latest edition of the California Building Code and go through a ministerial building permit review. Furthermore, compliance with applicable state and local regulations would cause for potential impacts to be reduced to less than significant levels.
5) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seicheltsunami?
6) The proposed project is not located in a Tsunami inundation area per the California Tsunami Inundation Map, additionally, the design and subsequent construction should adhere to the latest edition of the California Building Code and go through a ministerial building permit. Furthermore, compliance with applicable state and local regulations would cause for potential impacts to be reduced to less than significant levels.
7) Landslides?
8) According to Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ${ }^{18}$, "Landslide Activity Map ${ }^{186}$," Figure 2, the proposed project site is not located within the immediate vicinity of a landslide activity area. The topography within the proposed project site is generally flat. However, the construction of the proposed telecommunications facility will be subject to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code and through a ministerial building permit review. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
b) According to Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ${ }^{18}$, "Erosion Activity Mapp ${ }^{18 c}$," Figure 3, the proposed project is not located within the immediate vicinity of a substantial soil erosion area. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
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 landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
c) As previously stated on sections $(\mathrm{VII})(\mathrm{a})(1)-(\mathrm{VII})(\mathrm{a})(4)$ and $(\mathrm{VII})(\mathrm{b})$ above, the proposed project site is not located on a geological unit that would become unstable or collapse as a result of the proposed telecommunications facility project. Any construction will be subject to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Adherence and compliance to these standards and regulations would bring any impacts to less than significant levels.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the latest Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property?
d) As previously stated on section (VII)(c), the proposed project design and subsequent construction will require adherence and compliance to the latest edition of the California Building Code standards and regulations, as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review which would bring any impacts to less than significant.
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of
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septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems
where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste
water?
e) The proposed project is for the construction of a monopole telecommunication tower, which does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Additionally, should any septic systems be proposed in the near future, the applicant should adhere and comply with the Imperial County Public Health Department, Division of Environmental Health standards and regulations. No Impacts are expected.
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f) The proposed project is within a railroad right-of-way owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company and does not appear to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Additionally, in the event of any paleontological findings on site during construction, all work shall be stopped and applicant shall contact a qualified paleontological specialist to inspect the site. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

## VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
a) The construction and maintenance of the proposed project may generate green house emissions; however, it is not expected to generate greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact. Additionally, as previously stated on item (III) (a) above, adherence and compliance to APCD's and EHS' rules, regulations, and requirements will bring any impacts to less than significant.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
b) The proposed project would not conflict with any regulations under AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020 provided that the applicant adheres to APCD's and EHS' rules, regulations and requirements. Less than significant impacts are expected.

## IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
a) The proposed project is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as it does not involve the handling of any hazardous materials. Per comment email received from the Imperial County Division of Environmental Health dated May 30, 2023, if the applicant intends to have generator(s) or storage equipment storing 1,320 gallons of petroleum-based products, applicant should contact EHS. If not, the Division of Environmental Health does not have any comments at this time. Adherence to EHS' requirements should bring any impacts to less than significant.
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
b) As previously stated on section (IX)(a) above, the proposed project is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment as no hazardous materials are anticipated as part of the project. Additionally, adherence to EHS' requirements should bring any impacts to less than significant.
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
c) The proposed project does not anticipate the emitting of hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste as previously stated on items (IX)(a) and (IX)(b) above. Additionally, the project site is not located within a $1 / 4$ mile of any schools. The nearest school in the vicinity is Holtville High School, which is located approximately 35 miles west of the proposed project site; therefore, it would not represent a risk to educational facilities. No
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impacts are expected.
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?
d) The proposed project is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites according to California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor ${ }^{21}$. Additionally, per Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ${ }^{18}$, "Hazardous Material Sites Map ${ }^{18 d}$," Figure 5, the proposed project site is not located within an identified hazardous materials site; therefore, no impacts are expected.
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?
e) The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan per Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Maps ${ }^{222}$. Additionally, on July 19, 2023, the Imperial County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) heard and evaluated the proposed self-supported monopole telecommunication tower with associated remote and unmanned equipment project and found it to be consistent with the 1996 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. A white daytime beacon and a red night beacon will be required for this proposed project. Compliance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and ALUC standards, regulations, and recommendations would bring any impacts to less than significant.
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
f) The proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, per Imperial Valley Emergency Communications Authority (IVECA) comment letter dated June 12, 2023, future IVECA or Imperial County communication needs could necessitate tower space on the proposed tower and other related onsite infrastructure. This would include, but not limited to, multiple antenna spaces, guaranteed antenna heights, and shelter space, all at no cost to Imperial County or IVECA with the inclusion of a Local/Public Benefit Agreement. Furthermore, the applicant will meet any requirements requested by the Fire/OES Department. Compliance with IVECA's and Fire/OES Department's standards and requirements would bring any impacts to less than significant.
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?
g) According to Cal Fire "Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas - Imperial County23" adopted June 15, 2023, the proposed project site is not located within a fire hazard severity zone designated as Local Responsibility Area (LRA) classified as unzoned area, therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires. Future facility expansions may be subject to the inclusion of fire sprinklers and have either a private water or public source as pressurized hydrants for fire suppression. Compliance to Imperial County Fire Department (ICFD) standards would bring any impacts to less than significant

## X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?
a) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment and would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?
b) As previously stated on item $(X)$ (a) above, the proposed telecommunications facility does not expect to substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
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c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious suffaces, in a manner which would:
c) The proposed project does not anticipate a physical alteration to the site that would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course or a stream or river or though the addition of impervious surfaces. Furthermore, any proposed grading will require drainage review and approval from the Imperial County Public Works Department. Adherence to IID and ICPWD requirements would bring any impacts to less than significant.
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite;
(i) According to Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ${ }^{18}$, "Erosion Activity Map ${ }^{18}$," Figure 3, the proposed project site is not located within an area of substantial soil erosion or siltation on- or offsite. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
(ii) The proposed communications tower project is not expected to substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite. Any proposed grading will require drainage review and approval from the Imperial County Department of Public Works. Adherence to Imperial County Department of Public Works would bring any impacts to less than significant impact.
(iii) 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; or;
(iii) The proposed project does not anticipate creating or contributing runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. As previously stated on items $(X)(c)$ and (X)(c)(ii) above, Any proposed grading or planned stormwater drainage systems will require drainage application, review, and approval from the Imperial County Public Works Department and Imperial Irrigation District. Compliance with Imperial County Public Works Department and Imperial Irrigation District standards and requirements would ensure that any runoff water impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?
(iv) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunications tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment and is not expected to impede or redirect flood flows. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service Center ${ }^{24}$, Flood Insurance Rate Map, the proposed project site is located within "Zone X" of flood map 06025C1875C, effective September 26, 2008. Additionally, a reviewed and approved grading/drainage letter is to be required by the Imperial County Department of Public Works. Therefore, compliance with ICDPW's standards would bring any impacts to be less than significant.
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release
of pollutants due to project inundation?
d) The proposed self-supported monopole telecommunications tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment project is not located within the proximity of a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones; therefore, impacts related to risk release of pollutants due to project inundation are considered to be low. Additionally, as previously stated on item (X)(c)(iv) above, the proposed project site is located within "Zone X" of flood map 06025C1875C. Compliance with ICDPW's standards would contribute to lower any impacts to less than significant.
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?
e) The proposed project does not expect to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. As previously stated on item (X)(c) above, the proposed project would require a drainage and grading letter approved by the Imperial County Public Works Department and adherence to Imperial Irrigation District requirements. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
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## XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?
a) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment which would not physically divide an established community; therefore, it does not anticipate changing the existing land use designation and zoning established. Furthermore, the nearest established community, Holtville, is approximately 36 miles to the west of the project site. No land use nor planning impacts are expected.
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
b) The proposed project is consistent with the Imperial County General Plan and with the County's Land Use Ordinance (Title 9), Division 5, Section 90519.02(d), which states that, Communication Towers are permitted in the S-2 (Open Space/Preservation ) zone only with an approved Conditional Use Permit. Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the County's Land Use Ordinance (Title 9), Division 24 - Communication Ordinance, Section 92401.00 et seq. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant..

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES 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?
a) The proposed project does not anticipate the removal of mineral resources and it is not located within the boundaries or vicinity of an active mine per Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, "Existing Mineral Resources Map ${ }^{8 i "}$ Figure 8. No impacts are expected.
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?
b) The proposed telecommunication tower will not result in the loss of availability of locally-important mineral resources recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. No impacts are expected..
XIII. NOISE Would the project result in:
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
a) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment. Temporary generation of noise would be expected during construction; however, such would not result in the generation of permanent noise beyond that which already occurs on the surrounding area. Such action would be subject to the Imperial County General Plan's Noise Element ${ }^{25}$ which states that construction equipment operation shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday. Additionally, construction noise from a single piece of equipment or combination, shall not exceed 75 dB Leq when averaged over an eight (8) hour period. Compliance with Imperial County General Plan's Noise Element would bring any impacts to less than significant.
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
b) Ground vibration or groundbome noise may be expected during the construction activities; however, as stated above under item a), adherence to the "Noise Element" standards would bring the impacts to less than significant levels.
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?

|  | Potentially |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than |  |
| Significant | Unless Mitigation | Significant |  |
| Impact | Incorporated | Impact | No Impact |
| (PSI) | (PSUMI) | (LTSI) | (NI) |

c) As previously stated on item (IX)(e) above, proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or private airstrip according to the Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Maps ${ }^{22}$. The nearest airport in vicinity is the Holtville Airport located approximately 30 miles west from the proposed project site; therefore, exposure to periodic noise emissions during aircraft takeoff and landing operations are not expected. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

## XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
a) The proposed construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment would not induce a substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, as no changes to the designated residential use on the parcel are proposed. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
b) The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere as the project site is located within a vacant parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company zoned S-2 (Open Space/Preservation within its railroad right-of-way. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

## XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated withc the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
(a) The proposed telecommunication tower does not anticipate that such would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Any impacts would be less than significant.

1) Fire Protection?
2) The proposed project is not expected to result in the need for new of physically altered fire protections services; any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

## 2) Police Protection?

2) The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial impacts on police protection. Both the California Highway Patrol and Sheriff's Office East County Patrol have active policing and patrol operations in the area. Furthermore, the proposed project site is located within a vacant parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company within its railroad right-of-way. The site is entirely self-monitored through a sophisticated alarm system, which is connected to a main switch station. The system alerts personnel of any equipment malfunction or breach of security. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
3) Schools?
4) The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial impacts to schools; no impacts are expected.
5) Parks?
6) The proposed project will not result in impacts to parks; no impacts are expected.
7) Other Public Facilities?
8) As stated above under item a), the proposed project is not expected to result in impacts to other public facilities. Any impact would be expected to be less than significant.

|  | Potentially |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than |  |
| Significant | Unless Mitigation | Significant |  |
| Impact | Incorporated | Impact | No Impact |
| (PSI) | (PSUMI) | (LTSI) | (NI) |

## XVI. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
a) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment. Subsequently, the proposed telecommunications tower would 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. No impacts are expected.
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?
b) The proposed project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
XVII. TRANSPORTATION Would the project:
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
a) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower facility with associated remote equipment. The proposed wireless telecommunications facility will be unmanned and will only require service technicians, in a pick-up or van sized vehicle, to visit the site. The proposed telecommunications tower is not expected to conflict with the Imperial County General Plan Circulation and Scenic Highway Element' and/or any applicable plan, ordinance or policy related to it. Traffic impacts during construction and subsequent operations of the telecommunication facility are expected to be below the acceptable threshold by the County. Less than significant impacts are expected.
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 , subdivision (b)?
b) The proposed self-supported monopole telecommunication tower does not appear to conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA guidelines section 15064.3 (b). Adherence and compliance with Caltrans requirements would bring any impacts to less than significant.
c) Substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
c) The proposed project is for the construction of a self-supported monopole telecommunication tower facility with associated remote and unmanned equipment located within a railroad right-of-way parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company. The proposed project's site is compatible with the Imperial County General Plan Land Use Designation and the site design is not expected to increase hazards. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?
d) The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Additionally, no change on existing land use nor zoning are proposed. Access to the proposed project site from Sidewinder Road appears to be suitable for emergency response vehicles. No impacts are expected.

## XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and

|  | Potentially |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than |  |
| Significant | Unless Mitigation | Significant |  |
| Impact | Incorporated | Impact | No Impact |
| (PSI) | (PSUMI) | (LTSI) | (NI) |

that is:
a) According to the Imperial County Open Space Element8, Figure 6, "Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity ${ }^{\text {se" }}$, the proposed project location is not within a known area that may expect to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. Additionally, notification opportunity to consult letter was sent on August 2, 2023 to the Quechan and Campo Indian Tribe, and no comments were received. Therefore, any impact is expected to be less than significant.
(i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as define in Public Resources Code Section $5020.1(\mathrm{k})$, or
(i) According to the Califomia Historic Resources ${ }^{28}$ in Imperial County, the proposed project site is not listed or seem to be eligible under the Public Resources Code Section 21074 or 5020.1 (k); therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
(ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth is subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.
(ii) No significant resources listed as defined in the Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 are expected to be impacted by the proposed self-supported monopole telecommunication tower with associated remote equipment. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

## XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
a) The proposed self-supported monopole telecommunication tower with associated remote equipment does not require or result in the relocation or construction of a new expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunication facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. On June 8, 2023, ICPDS received a comment letter from the Imperial Irrigation District ${ }^{13}$ advising if the proposed communication tower requires electrical service to contact IID. Moreover, any construction or operation on IID property or within its existing and proposed right of way or easements including but not limited to: surface improvements such as proposed new streets, driveways, parking lots, landscape, and all water, sewer, storm water, or any other above ground or underground utilities, will require an encroachment agreement. Subsequently, any new, relocated, modified or reconstructed IID facilities required for and by the project (which can include but is not limited to electrical utility substations, electrical transmission and distribution lines, water deliveries, canals, drains, etc.) need to be included as part of the project's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation, environmental impact analysis and mitigation. Adherence to lID's recommendations and requirements would bring any impacts to less than significant.
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?
b) The proposed project is for the construction of a monopole telecommunication tower with associated remote equipment which does not anticipate the use of a water supply nor a change to the existing use on the parcel, which is, a vacant parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad Company within its railroad right-of-way. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
c) 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?

|  | Potentially |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than |  |
| Significant | Unless Mitigation | Significant |  |
| Impact | Incorporated | Impact | No Impact |
| (PSI) | (PSUMI) | (LTSI) | (NI) |

c) The proposed project does not anticipate any impacts to wastewater as it does not propose to generate any wastewaters; therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
d) The proposed project is not expected to exceed the generation of solid waste in excess of State or local standards. Any impacts would be expected to be less than significant.
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
e) All proposed projects within the County shall contract with a licensed waste hauler for waste generated by the facility. The proposed telecommunication tower shall comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Any impact are expected to be less than significant.

## XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
a) As previously stated under item (IX)(f) - "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" above, the proposed telecommunication tower would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, according to Cal Fire "Fire Hazard Severity Zones Viewer, ${ }^{23 "}$ " the proposed project site is located within an unincorporated Local Responsibility Area (LRA), but not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHZ); therefore, impacts impairing an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan are expected to be less than significant.
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
b) The proposed project site topography is generally flat and therefore, impacts due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, wildfire risks or pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire are expected to be less than significant.
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
c) The project site is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone and it is not expected to require the installation of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. Therefore, any impact is expected to be less than significant.
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?
As previously stated on item (VII)(a)(4) above, per Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ${ }^{18}$, "Landslide Activity Map ${ }^{186}$," Figure 2, the proposed project is not located within a landslide activity area. The topography within the proposed project site is generally flat. Development, proposed project design and subsequent construction will be subjected to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Adherence and compliance to the California Building Code standards and regulations will bring any impacts to less than significant.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Pubic Resources Code; Sundstromv. Coumty of Mendocino, (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; Leonofv. Monterey Board of Supervisors, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; Eureka Ciliens for Responsble Gowt v. Cily of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 357; Protect the Historic Amador Watemays v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal. App.4th at 1109; San Franciscans Uphoding the Downtown Planv. Cly and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App. 4 th 656.

Revised 2011- ICPDS

|  | Potentially |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than |  |
| Significant | Unless Mitigation | Significant |  |
| Impact | Incorporated | Impact | No Impact |
| (PSI) | (PSUMI) | (LTSI) | (NI) |

Revised 2016-ICPDS
Revised 2017 - ICPDS
Revised 2019 -ICPDS

|  | Potentially |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than |  |
| Significant | Unless Mitigation | Significant |  |
| Impact | Incorporated | Impact | No Impact |
| (PSI) | (PSUMI) | (LTSI) | (NI) |

## SECTION 3

## III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following are Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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 selfsustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, eliminate tribal cultural resources or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?


## IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

This section identifies those persons who prepared or contributed to preparation of this document. This section is prepared in accordance with Section 15129 of the CEQA Guidelines.
A. COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

- Jim Minnick, Director of Planning \& Development Services
- Michael Abraham, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning \& Development Services
- Evelia Jimenez, Project Planner
- Imperial County Executive Office
- Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
- Imperial County Public Health Department Division of Environmental Health
- Agricultural Commissioner


## B. OTHER AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS

- Imperial Irrigation District
- Quechan Indian Tribe, Historic Preservation
- California Department of Transportation
- Imperial Valley Emergency Communications Authority
(Written or oral comments received on the checklist prior to circulation)


## V. REFERENCES

1. Imperial County General Plan: Circulation and Scenic Highway Element https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/circulation-scenic-highway-element-2008.pdf
2. California State Scenic Highway System Map https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aacaa
3. California Important Farmland Finder: Imperial County 2020 https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/
4. California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dirp/WilliamsonAct/App/index.html
5. Imperial County General Plan Land Use Map https://icpds.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.htm|?id=078e1e32c6dc4223ba8c7d69d7c6c383
6. Imperial County Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated June 14, 2023
7. Imperial County Division of Environmental Health comment letter dated May 30, 2023
8. Imperial County General Plan: Conservation and Open Space Element https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/conservation-open-space-element-2016.pdf
a) Figure 1: Sensitive Habitat Map
b) Figure 2: Sensitive Species Map
c) Figure 3: Agency-Designated Habitats Map
d) Figure 5: Areas of Heighten Historic Period Sensitivity Map
e) Figure 6: Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity Map
f) Figure 8: Existing Mineral Resources Map
9. National Wetlands Inventory Map: Surface Waters and Wetlands https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/
10. National Water Information System: Mapper https://maps.waterdata. usgs.gov/mapper/index.html
11. California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Data Viewer https://sgma.water.ca.gov/webgis/?appid=SGMADataViewertcurrentconditions
12. Quechan Indian Tribe comment email dated May 30, 2023
13. Imperial Irrigation District comment letter dated June 8, 2023
14. California Building Code 2022
15. California Geological Survey Hazard Program: Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones https://gis.data.ca.gov/maps/ee92a5f9f4ee4ec5aa731d3245ed9f53/explore?location=32.538703\%2C$110.920388 \% 2 \mathrm{C} 6.00$
16. California Department of Conservation: Fault Activity Map https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/
17. United States Geological Survey's Quaternary Faults Map https://usgs.maps.arcqis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.htm|?id=5a6038b3a1684561a9b0aadf88412fcf
18. Imperial County General Plan: Seismic and Public Safety Element https://www.icpds.com/planning/land-use-documents/general-plan/seismic-and-public-safety
a) Figure 1: Seismic Activity in Imperial County Map
b) Figure 2: Landslide Activity Map
c) Figure 3: Erosion Activity Map
d) Figure 5: Hazardous Materials Sites Map
e) Figure 7: Seismic Hazards Map
19. California Tsunami Data Maps https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps
20. United States Department of Agriculture- Natural Resources Conservation Service: Soils Map https:///websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx
21. California Department of Toxic Substances Control: EnviroStor
https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/
22. Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Maps https://icpds.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html? $\mathrm{id}=46 \mathrm{f7796b2dfb4a6db5311d7892f0b411}$
23. Cal Fire: Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) Viewer https:/legis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ
24. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service Center: Flood Insurance Rate Map https://msc.fema.gov/porta//search?AddressQuery=851\ pitzer\ road\ heber\ ca\#searchresultsanchor
25. Imperial County General Plan: Noise Element https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/noise-element-2015.pdf
26. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) comment letter dated June 14, 2023
27. California Historic Resources: Imperial County https://lohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county\&criteria=13
28. U.S. Fish and Wildife: Recommended Best Practices for Communication Tower Design, Siting, Construction, Operation, Maintenance, and Decommissioning publication dated March 1, 2021 chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcaipcglclefindmkaj/https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/usfws-communication-tower-guidance.pdf
29. "County of Imperial General Plan EIR", prepared by Brian F. Mooney \& Associates in 1993; and as Amended by County in 1996, 1998, 2001, 2003, 2006 \& 2008, 2015, 2016.

## VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION - County of Imperial

The following Negative Declaration is being circulated for public review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act Section 21091 and 21092 of the Public Resources Code.

Project Name: Conditional Use Permit \#23-0010 / Variance \#23-0010 / Initial Study \#23-0004

## Project Applicant: CitySwitch

Project Location: 673 Sidewinder Rd., Winterhaven, CA. 92283

Description of Project: The applicant, CitySwitch, is proposing to install a $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ tall monopole tower with a $10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ to be located within a leased $57^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}$ fenced area. The parcel is owned by Union Pacific Railroad Company and is within its railroad right-of-way. The proposed telecommunications tower, to be located at 673 Sidewinder Rd N., Winterhaven, Ca., would be erected, owned and operated by CitySwitch. CitySwitch has a commitment with Union Pacific and AT\&T Mobility, a wireless services provider, for this site. Additionally, the facility will be open for co-location to other wireless providers and any other communication carriers that have a need for a facility in the area. The project requires a Conditional Use Permit (\#23-0010) for the monopole tower and a Variance (\#23-0010) to exceed the 100 -foot height limitation for the Open Space/Preservation ( $\mathrm{S}-2$ ) zoned area by 80 feet.

## VII. FINDINGS

This is to advise that the County of Imperial, acting as the lead agency, has conducted an Initial Study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environmental and is proposing this Negative Declaration based upon the following findings:

The Initial Study shows that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.The Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects but:
(1) Proposals made or agreed to by the applicant before this proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration was released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur.
(2) There is no substantial evidence before the agency that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.
(3) Mitigation measures are required to ensure all potentially significant impacts are reduced to levels of insignificance.

A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
If adopted, the Negative Declaration means that an Environmental Impact Report will not be required. Reasons to support this finding are included in the attached Initial Study. The project file and all related documents are available for review at the County of Imperial, Planning \& Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, EI Centro, CA 92243 (442) 265-1736.

NOTICE
The public is invited to comment on the proposed Negative Declaration during the review period.


The Applicant hereby acknowledges and accepts the results of the Environmental Evaluation Committee (EEC) and hereby agrees to implement all Mitigation Measures, if applicable, as outlined in the MMRP.


## SECTION 4

VIII.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)
IX.

MITIGATION MONITORING \& REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)
(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

## COMMENT LETTERS

EEC ORIGINAL PKG


Jim Minnlck
DIRECTOR

## Imperial County Planning \＆Development Services Planning／Building

## RECEIVEO

JUN 122023
IMFELIALCOUNTY
ANMING \＆AFVEI ODANFNT SFRVICES
The attached project and materials are being sent to you for your review and as an early nolificalion that the following project is being requested and being processed by the County＇s Flenning \＆Dovelopment Services Depantment．Please review the proposed project based on your agency／deparment area of interest，expentise，and／or jurisolction．

| To：County Agencies | State Agencies／Other | Cities／Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| （ County Executive Office－Rosa Lopez／ | 区 IC Sheriffe Office－Robert | 区 IID－Donald Vargas |
| Miguel Figueros | Benavidez／Fred Miramontes／Ryan Kelley |  |
| ® Public Works－Guillermo Mendoza／John | 区 Board of Supervisors－John Hawk／ | 区 IC Fire／OES Office－Andrew Loper／ |
|  | District \＃5 | Sal Florez／Robert Malok |
| $\triangle$ City of Yuma Depantment of Community | $\triangle$ Ag．Commigsioner－Rachel | X EHS－Jeff Lamoure／Mario Salinas／ |
| Development－Alyssa Linville | Garewal／Margo Sanchez／Ana L | Alphonso Andrade／Jorge PerezNanessa |
|  | Gomez／Jolene Dessert／Sandra | R Ramiraz |
|  | Mendivil |  |
| 区 Winterhaven County Water Diatrict－Rlck | 区 Campo Band Of Mission Indians－ | ® CALTRANS，Dlstrict 11－Roger |
| Miller | Marcus Cuero／Jonathan Mesa | Sanchez |
| X Fort Yumar Quechan Indian Tribe－Jordan | 区 Bard Water District－Ronald Hill | （ BLM－Tristian Triedel｜／Carie Sahagun |
| D．Joaquin／H．Jill McCormick |  |  |
| $\triangle$ APCD－Monioa Soucier／Belen Leon／Jesus | （ County Counsel－Eric Havens | Q County Alrport－Jenell Guerrero |
| Ramirez |  |  |
| X I，V．Emergency Communications Authority－ | X Bard Water District－Ron Derma |  |
| Mark Schmidt |  |  |


| From： Project ID： |  CUP23－0010N23－0004／1823－0010 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Location： | 673 Sidowinder Rd．Wintermaven，CA APN 056－470－002 |
| Probect Description： | Applicant is proposing a $170^{\prime}$ foot monopole tower with a $10^{\prime} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime}$ foot lighting rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ feet to be locatod within a $57^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} \times 45^{\prime}$ square foot leased parcel． |
| Applicants： | ClySwitch |
| Commante due by： | June 15th 2023 at 500PM |
| COMMENTS：（attech No comm | saparate sheot If necessary）（ff no commentis，please state betow and mall，fax，or o－mall this etheel to Case Planner） ents |
| Name：Ana ho <br> Date： $6 / a / 2-3$ | en 2 Signature： （1） $\qquad$ Tile：Ag Bidgist Telephone No：： 4422651500 E－mail：analgumeze coimp |



June 14, 2023
Jim Minnick
Planning \& Development Services Director
801 Maln Street
JUN 152023
IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMETTSERVICES
El Centro, CA 92243
SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit 23-0010 \& Variance 23-0004 - Cityswitch
Dear Mr. Minnick,
The Alr Pollution Control District (Air District) thanks you for the opportunity to review and comment on Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 23-0010 and Variance (V) 23-0004 (Project). The Project proposes the construction and operation of a new 170 -foot tall monopole tower with a 10 -foot lightning rod for a total tower height of 180 feet. The project is located off at 673 Sidewinder Rd., Winterhaven also Identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 056-470-002.

The Alr District reminds the applicant that the project must comply with all Air District rules and regulations and would emphasize Regulation VIII, Regulation VIII is a collection of rules designed to maintain fugitive dust emissions below 20\% visual opacity.

If the project includes a generator it may be subject to permitting requirements, generally generators greater than 50 -bhp require permits. The Air District requests the applicant contact Jesus Ramirez, Engineering \& Permitting Division Manager, to discuss permitting requirements of any generators that may be part of the project.

For your convenlence, the Air District's rules and regulations are available online at https://apcd.imperialcounty.org/rules-and-regulations/. If you have any questions or concerns please call our office at (442) 265-1800.


## Melina Rizo

| From: | Sanchez Rangel, Rogelio@DOT [roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov](mailto:roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, May $30,202310: 17 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| To: | Evelia Jimenez |
| Cc: | ICPDSCommentLetters |
| Subject: | CUP23-0010/V23-0004/IS23-0010 Requests for Comments (1-8 IMP) |

CAUTION: This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.
Hi Evelia,

Thank you for including Caltrans in the project review for the proposed monopole tower out in Winterhaven, Imperial CA.

Below please find Caltrans general comment.

- Any work performed within Caltrans' R/W will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit will be required for any work within the Caltrans' R/W prior to construction.

Thank you,

Rogelio Sanchez
Associate Transportation Planner
Local Development Review | Border Studies
California Department of Transportation
roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov
Tel (619) 987-1043

RECEIVED
MAY 302023
IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

## COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

## Miguel Figueroa

County Executive Officer miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us
www.co.imperial.ca.us


# RECEIVED 

May 31, 2023
MAY 312023
IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
TO: Evelia Jimenez, Planning and Development Services Department
FROM: Rosa Lopez-Solis, Executive Office
SUBJECT: Comments - City Switch - CUP 23-0010

The County of Imperial Executive Office is commenting on City Switch - CUP 23-0010 project. The Executive Office would like to inform the developer of conditions and responsibilities should the applicant seek a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The conditions commence prior to the approval of an initial grading permit and subsequently continue throughout the permitting process. This includes, but not limited to:

- Sales Tax Condition. The permittee is required to have a Construction Site Permit (prior to the issuance of any grading permits) reflecting the project site address, allowing all eligible sales tax payments are allocated to the County of Imperial, Jurisdictional Code 13998.
- The permittee will provide the County of Imperial a copy of the CDTFA account number and sub-permit for its contractor and subcontractors (if any) related to the jobsite. Permittee shall provide in written verification to the County Executive Office that the necessary sales and use tax permits have been obtained, prior to the issuance of any grading permits.
- Construction/Material Budget: Prior to a grading permit, the permittee will provide the County Executive Office a construction materials budget: an official construction materials budget or detailed budget outlining the construction and materials cost for the processing facility on permittee letterhead.

Should there be any concerns and/or questions, do not hesitate to contact me.

## Melina Rizo

| From: | Mario Salinas |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, May 30, 2023 8:48 AM |
| To: | Melina Rizo; Donald Vargas; Jorge Perez |
| Cc: | Jim Minnick; Michael Abraham; Diana Robinson; Evelia Jimenez; Aimee Trujillo; John |
|  | Robb; Kamika Mitchell; Laryssa Alvarado; Rosa Soto; Valerie Grijalva |
| Subject: | RE: CUP23-0010/V23-0004/IS23-0010 Requests for Comments |
|  |  |
| Follow Up Flag: | Follow up |
| Flag Status: | Flagged |

Good morning Ms. Rizo,

Pertaining to CUP\# 23-0010, if the applicant intends to have generator(s) or storage equipment storing 1,320-gallons of petroleum based product, please have the applicant contact our office. If not, Division of Environmental Health does not have any comments at this time.

Thank you,

## Mario Salinas, MBA

Environmental Health Compliance Specialist Imperial County Public Health Department Division of Environmental Health
797 Main Street Suite B, El Centro, CA 92243
mariosalinas@co.imperial.ca.us
Phone: (442) 265-1888
Fax: (442) 265-1903
www.icphd.org

RECEIVED
MAY 202023
ImPERIAL COUNTY
/ PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENTSERVICES


The preceding e-mail message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: Melina Rizo [melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us)
Sent: May 26, 2023 4:40 PM
To: Alphonso Andrade [AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us); Ana L Gomez [analgomez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:analgomez@co.imperial.ca.us); Andrew Loper [AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us); Belen Leon [BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us); Donald Vargas [dvargas@iid.com](mailto:dvargas@iid.com); Eric Havens [EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us); Fred Miramontes [fmiramontes@icso.org](mailto:fmiramontes@icso.org); H. Jill McCormick [historicpreservation@quechantribe.com](mailto:historicpreservation@quechantribe.com); Jeff Lamoure [JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us); Jolene Dessert [JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us); Jordan D. Joaquin [tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com](mailto:tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com); Jorge Perez [JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us); Marcus Cuero [marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov](mailto:marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov); Margo Sanchez [MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us); Mario Salinas [MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us); Miguel Figueroa [miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us); Monica Soucier [MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us); Robert Benavidez
[rbenavidez@icso.org](mailto:rbenavidez@icso.org); Robert Malek [RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us); Rosa Lopez[RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us); Ryan Kelley [RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us); Ryan Kelley [rkelley@isco.org](mailto:rkelley@isco.org); Sandra Mendivil [SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us); Rachel Garewal [RachelGarewal@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RachelGarewal@co.imperial.ca.us); Jesus Ramirez [JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us); Jenell Guerrero [JenellGuerrero@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JenellGuerrero@co.imperial.ca.us); John Hawk [johnhawk@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:johnhawk@co.imperial.ca.us); Vanessa Ramirez [VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us); Salvador Flores [SalvadorFlores@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:SalvadorFlores@co.imperial.ca.us); Mark Schmidt [MarkSchmidt@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MarkSchmidt@co.imperial.ca.us); bardwater@outlook.com; hbardorian@aol.com; whavenca@gmail.com; Roger Sanchez [roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov](mailto:roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov); triddell@blm.gov; Sahagun, Carrie L [csahagun@blm.gov](mailto:csahagun@blm.gov); jmesa@campo-nsn.gov
Cc: Jim Minnick [JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us); Michael Abraham [MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us); Diana Robinson [DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us); Evelia Jimenez [EJimenez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:EJimenez@co.imperial.ca.us); Aimee Trujillo [aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us); John Robb [JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us); Kamika Mitchell [kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us); Laryssa Alvarado [laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us); Melina Rizo [melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us); Rosa Soto [RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us); Valerie Grijalva [ValerieGrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:ValerieGrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us)
Subject: CUP23-0010/V23-0004/IS23-0010 Requests for Comments

## Good Afternoon,

Please see attached Request for Comments packet for CUP23-0010N23-0004/IS23-0010 APN 056-470-002 \{673 Sidewinder Rd., Winterhaven, CA\}

Comments are due by June $15^{\text {th }}, 2023$ at 5:00PM.
In an effort to increase the efficiency at which information is distributed and reduce paper usage, the Request for Comments packet is being sent to you via this email.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Evelia Jimenez at (442) 265-1736, or submit your comment letters to ICPDScommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us.

Thank you,

## Account Clerk III

Imperial County Planning \& Development Services
801 Main St.
El Centro, CA 92243
(442)265-1736


RECEIVED
Since 1911
June 8, 2023

Ms. Evelia Jimenez
Planner II
Planning \& Development Services Department
County of Imperial
801 Maln Street
El Centro, CA 92243

JUN 082023
IMPERIALCOUNTTY
PLANNNG \& DEVELOPMENTSEPYICS

SUBJECT: Clity Swytch Telacom Tower Project at Sidewinder Road; CUP23-0010/V23-0004/IS23-0010

Dear Ms. Jimenez:
On May 26, 2023, the Imperial Irrigation District recelved from the Imperial County Planning \& Development Services Depertment, a request for agency comments on the telecom tower project at Sidewinder Road; Conditional Use Permit No, 23-0010, Variance No. 23-0004, Initial Study No. 23-0010. The applicant, CitySwytch, proposes to install a 170 ft . monopole tower with a 10 ft . lightning rod on a 57 ft . 45 ft . site located at 673 Sidewinder Road, Winterhaven, CA (APN 056-470-002-000).

The IID has reviewed the application and has the following comments:

1. For electrical service to the proposed communication tower, the appllcant should be advised to contact Joel Lopez, IID project development service planner, at (760) 482-3444 or e-mail Mr, Lepez at filopez@ild com to initiate the customer sorvice application process. In addiltion to submilting a formal application (avaliabie for download at the district website http://www. id.com/home/showdocument?idm12923), the applicant will be required to submit a complete set of approved project plans by the County of Imperlal (including AutoCAD files of the site plan and electrical plans), electrical panel size and panel location, operating voltage, electrical loads, project schedule, and the applicable fees, permits, easements and environmental compliance documentatlon pertaining to the provision of electrical service to the project. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs and mitigation measures related to providing electrical service to the project.
2. Electrical capacity is limited In the project area. A circuit study may be required. Any system improvements or mitigation identified in the circuit study to enable the provision of electrical service to the project shall be the financlal responsibility of the applicant.
3. Applicant shall provide a surveyed legal description and an associated exhlbit certlified by a licensed surveyor for all rights of way deemed by IID as necassary to accommodate the project electrical infrastructure. Rights-of-Way and easements shall be in a form acceptable to and at no cost to IID for Installatlon, operation, and maintenance of all electrical facilities.

Evella Jimenez
June B, 2023
Page 2
4. Any construction or operation on IID property or within its existing and proposed right of way or easements including but not limited to: surface improvemente such as proposed new streets, driveways, parking lots, landscape; and all water, sewer, storm water, or any other above ground or underground utilities; will pequire an encraachment permit, or encroachment agreement (depending on the circumstances). A copy of the IID encroachment permit application and instructions for its completion are available at https://www.lid.com/about-ild/department-directory/real-estate. The IID Real Estate Section should be contacted at (760) 339-9230 for additional information regarding encroachment permits or agreements. No foundations or buildings will be allowed within IID's right of way.
5. Any new, relocated, modified or reconstructed IID facillities required for and by the project (which can include but is not ilmited to electrical utility substations, electrical transmission and distribution lines, water dellveries, canals, drains, etc.) need to be included as part of the project's California Envlronmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or Natlona! Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation, environmental Impact analysis and mitigetion. Fallure to do so will result in postponement of any constructlon and/or modification of IID facilities untll such time as the environmental documentation is amended and environmental impacts are fully analyzed. Any and all mitigation necessary as a result of the construction, relocation and/or upgrade of IID facilities is the responsibility of the project proponent.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 760-482-3609 or at dvargas@lld.com. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.


[^0]Imperial Valley Eniergency Connmunicalions
Communitaiions Authority
2514 La Brucherie Road, Imperial, CA 3225
Voice: 442.265-6029


Imperial County Planning \& Development Services 801 Main Street
El Centro, California 92243
Attention: Evelia Jimenez
June 8, 2023

RECEIVED

## 

Dear Evelia Jimenez:
Thank you very much for the opportunity to review and comment on CUP \# 23-0010/V23-0004/IS230010.

CitySwitch proposes the construction and development of a new communication facility and tower consisting of a 170 -foot tall, monopole, co-locatable tower with a 10 -foot tall lightning rod, various antennas, associated radio equipment, and other related infrastructure. The project location is 673 Sidewinder Road, Winterhaven, CA. APN 056-470-002.

The Imperial Valley Emergency Communications Authority (hereinafter, IVECA), is entrusted with the operation of the 800 MHz radio communication system which serves Imperial County Fire, Law Enforcement, and Emergency Medical Services.

Future IVECA or Imperial County communication needs could necessitate tower space on the proposed tower and other related on-site infrastructure. The project's location is quite desirable for communication system enhancements. We therefore are respectfully requesting a Local/Public Benefit Agreement with CUP \# 23-0010/V23-0004/IS23-0010. We are hopeful for language favorable to IVECA for future communication system additions in perpetuity in said CUP. This would include, but not limited to, multiple antenna spaces, guaranteed antenna heights, and shelter space all at no cost to Imperial County or IVECA. It is obvious that the best interest of Imperial County first responders, and the public at large, are best served with the inclusion of a Local/Public Benefit Agreement.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of IVECA's request. Please contact me with any questions.
Sincerely,


Mark Schmidt
Imperial Valley Emergency Communications Authority (IVECA)
Emergency Communications Project Coordinator
nuarkselanidteneco imperial.ca.us
Cell: 442-283-1688

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Jill McCormick [historicpreservation@quechantribe.com](mailto:historicpreservation@quechantribe.com)
Tuesday, May 30, 2023 4:05 PM
Melina Rizo
Evelia Jimenez; ICPDSCommentLetters
RE: [EXTERNAL]:CUP23-0010N23-0004/IS23-0010 Requests for Comments

## CAUTION: This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.

This email is to inform you that we do not wish to comment on this project.

## Thank you, <br> dt. gull Mrearmick, dr. At.

Quechan Indian Tribe
Historic Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 1899

Yuma, AZ 85366-1899
Office: 760-572-2423

Cell: 928-261-0254
E-mail: historicpreservation@quechantribe.com


# RECEIVED 

MAV C 02023<br>IMPERIAL COUNTY PLANNING QEVELOPMENT SERVICE:

From: Melina Rizo [melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us)
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2023 4:40 PM
To: Alphonso Andrade [AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us); Ana L Gomez [analgomez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:analgomez@co.imperial.ca.us); Andrew Loper [AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us); Belen Leon [BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us); Donald Vargas [dvargas@iid.com](mailto:dvargas@iid.com); Eric Havens [EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us); Fred Miramontes [fmiramontes@icso.org](mailto:fmiramontes@icso.org); Jill McCormick [historicpreservation@quechantribe.com](mailto:historicpreservation@quechantribe.com); Jeff Lamoure [JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us); Jolene Dessert [JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us); Gabby Emerson [tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com](mailto:tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com); Jorge Perez [JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us); Marcus Cuero [marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov](mailto:marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov); Margo Sanchez [MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us); Mario Salinas [MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us); Miguel Figueroa [miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us); Monica Soucier [MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us); Robert Benavidez [rbenavidez@icso.org](mailto:rbenavidez@icso.org); Robert Malek [RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us); Rosa Lopez [RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us); Ryan Kelley [RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us); Ryan Kelley [rkelley@isco.org](mailto:rkelley@isco.org); Sandra Mendivil [SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us); Rachel Garewal [RachelGarewal@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RachelGarewal@co.imperial.ca.us); Jesus Ramirez [JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us); Jenell Guerrero [JenellGuerrero@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JenellGuerrero@co.imperial.ca.us); John Hawk [johnhawk@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:johnhawk@co.imperial.ca.us); Vanessa Ramirez [VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us); Salvador Flores [SalvadorFlores@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:SalvadorFlores@co.imperial.ca.us); Mark Schmidt [MarkSchmidt@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MarkSchmidt@co.imperial.ca.us); bardwater@outlook.com;

Aimee Trujillo

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Jill McCormick [historicpreservation@quechantribe.com](mailto:historicpreservation@quechantribe.com)
Thursday, August 3, 2023 6:56 AM
Aimee Trujillo; Evelia Jimenez
RE: [EXTERNAL]:CUP23-0010 AB 52 Letter

## This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.

This email is to inform you that we do not wish to comment on this project.
H. Jill McCormick M.A.

Ft. Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe
P.O. Box 1899

Yuma, AZ 85366-1899
Office: 760-572-2423
Cell: 928-261-0254


# RECEIVED 

AUG 032023<br>IMPERIALCOUNTY PLANNNG \& DEVELDPMFNT SERVVICE:

From: Aimee Trujillo [aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us)
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2023 11:51 AM
To: Jill McCormick [historicpreservation@quechantribe.com](mailto:historicpreservation@quechantribe.com); Gabby Emerson [tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com](mailto:tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com)
Cc: Jim Minnick [JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us); Michael Abraham [MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us); Diana
Robinson [DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us); Evelia Jimenez [EJimenez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:EJimenez@co.imperial.ca.us); Aimee Trujillo
[aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us); John Robb [JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us); Kamika Mitchell
[kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us); Kassandra Castaneda [kassandracastaneda@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:kassandracastaneda@co.imperial.ca.us); Laryssa Alvarado
[laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us); Rosa Soto [RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]:CUP23-0010 AB 52 Letter

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,
Attached hereto please find the AB52 letter for CUP23-0010 (APN 056-470-002)

## APPLICATION SUBMITTAL

 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 (760) 482-4236 - APPLICANT MUST COMPLETE ALL NUMBERED (black) SPACES - Please type or print -

PLEASE PROVIDE CLEAR \& CONCISE INFORMATION (ATTACH SEPARATE SHEET IF NEEDED)
11. DESCRIBE CURRENT USE OF PROPERTY
12. DESCRIBE PROPOSED SEWER SYSTEM
13. DESCRIBE PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM
14. DESCRIBE PROPOSED FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM
15. IS PROPOSED USE A BUSINESS?
$\square$ Yes $\square$ No
1 I WE THE LEGAL OWNER (S) OF THE ABOVE PROPERTY
CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION SHOWN OR STATED HEREIN
IS TRUE AND CORRECT.


| Railroad right-of-way <br> $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{a}$ <br> $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{a}$ <br> SYSTEM$\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{a}$IF YES, HOW MANY EMPLOYEES WILL BE AT THIS SITE? <br> No permanent employees |
| :--- |

## REQUIRED SUPPOMT DOCUINETTS

A. SITE PLAN
B. FEE
C. OTHER
D. OTHER


APPLICATION RECEIVED BY: APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE BY: APPLICATION REJECTED BY: TENTATIVE HEARING BY: FINAL ACTION:
$\square$ APPROVED


## SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

## PLAN MUST:

a. Be drawn to scale upon substantial paper, $11^{\prime \prime} \times 14^{\prime \prime}$ (min.) - ( 20 copies must be submitted.)
b. Show name of owner, legal description and Assessor's Parcel Number.
c. Show existing property dimensions, size, adjacent roads, canals, right-of-ways, easements, etc.
d. Show all existing and proposed structures (both above and below ground) location of sewer and water systems.
e. Show adjacent property uses and approximate distances to nearest structures.
f. Indicate name of person preparing site plan.
g. Show North orientation.
h. Show sufficient dimensions and information for proper evaluation to be done.

CAUTION: Incomplete or inaccurate applications, plans will cause the entire application to be rejected.

| 1. PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME CitySwitch (Lessee) | EMAIL ADDRESS info@cityswitch com |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. MAILING ADDRESS (Sxoet/P O Box Cay, State) 1900 Century Place NE, Suite 320, Atlanta, GA | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ZIP CODE } \\ 30345 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PHONE NUMBER 404-857-0858 |
| 3. ENGINEERS NAME Westchester Services, LLC - Glen L. Hunt III | EMARL ADDRESS <br> ghuntiewestchesterservices.com |  |
| MAILING ADDRESS ISwest / P O Alox Ciry. State) 3740 W. Jasper Drive, Chandier. AZ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{ZIP} \mathrm{CODE} \\ 85226 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PHONE NUMBER $602-403-8614$ |




Rmaunte suppont mocunamis



# RECEIVED 

APR 122022
IIMPEBIALCOUNTY
PLANNNG a DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

## Sherman



# APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND HEIGHT VARIANCE APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED COMMUNICATION FACILITY AT 

637-639 SIDEWINDER RD N
FELICITY, CA 92283
APN: 056-470-002

CITYSWITCH SITE NAME / \# - WINTERHAVEN CAC002
AT\&T SITE NUMBER - 1010309

## Table of Contents

1. Letter of Application
2. Application Materials
3. Site Data Sheet
4. Right-of-Way Title
5. Narrative Overview
6. Compliance with Section 92402.01
7. Compliance with Section 92405.01
8. Conditional Use Permit Standards
9. Variance Standards
10. Alternatives Analysis
11. Sworn Statement of AT\&T
12. Carrier Coverage Plot
13. Fall Zone Certification
14. Site Plan
15. FAA Determination

RECEIVED
16. Lease

APR 122022
IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT SERUICES

## Letter of Application

April 3, 2023
Mr. Jim Minnick
Planning \& Development Services Director, Imperial County
801 W. Main Street
El Centro, CA 92243
RE: Proposed CitySwitch Communications Facility - Winterhaven CAC002
AT\&T Site-10101309
637-639 Sidewinder Rd N
APN 056-470-002
Felicity, CA 92283

Dear Mr. Minnick:
LCC Telecom Services and Sherman \& Howard L.L.C. represent CitySwitch. CitySwitch has finalized an agreement with the property owners of the site referenced above to develop and construct a Communications Facility that will be available to be used by wireless carriers. The proposed shared use facility is designed to house the equipment necessary to provide clear and uninterrupted wireless telecommunications services to the residents and visitors of Imperial County.

This proposed Communications Facility is being constructed pursuant to Sections 92402.01 and 92405.01 of the Imperial County Land Use Code (the "Code"). The proposed facility will consist of a $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ tall monopole tower with a $10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ to be located within a $57^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} \times 45^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lease parcel. The proposed tower will be erected, owned, and operated by CitySwitch. CitySwitch has a commitment with Union Pacific and AT\&T Mobility, a wireless services provider, for this site. Additionally, the facility will be open for co-location to other wireless providers.

The proposed Communications Facility is located in an S-2, Open Space/Preservation zone. Pursuant to Section 90519.02(d) of the Code, Communications Facilities are allowed in this district with a Conditional Use Permit approval. Communications Facilities exceeding the maximum allowable height are allowed in this district with Variance approval.

On behalf of the applicant CitySwitch, LCC Telecom Services and Sherman \& Howard have submitted all required documentation for the proposed tower in accordance with Section 92402.01 of the Code for this application to be deemed complete. Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me. I look forward to working with you during the review and approval process. CitySwitch looks forward to helping provide Imperial County with improved wireless coverage.

Sincerely,

Michael Bieniek, AICP
Zoning Director
Albino Fink
Allison R. Burke
Associate

## Application Materials

## Site Data Sheet

| Applicant: | CitySwitch |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 1900 Century Place NE |
|  | Suite 320 |
|  | Atlanta, GA 30345 |
| Authorized Agent: | Michael Bieniek, AICP |
|  | LCC Telecom Services |
|  | 10700 Higgins Road |
|  | Suite 240 |
|  | Rosemont, IL 60018 |
|  | Allison R. Burke |
|  | Sherman \& Howard, LLC |
|  | 675 Fifteenth Street |
|  | Suite 2300 |
|  | Denver, CO 80202 |
| Tower Owner: | CitySwitch |
|  | 1900 Century Place NE |
|  | Suite 320 |
|  | Atlanta, GA 30345 |
| Applicant's Interest in the Property: | Leasehold |
| Property Owner: | Union Pacific Railroad |
|  | 1400 Douglas Street |
|  | Omaha, NE 68179 |
| Address of Property: | 637-639 Sidewinder Rd N |
|  | Felicity, CA 92283 |
| Parcel Number: | APN: 056-470-002 |
| Request: | Application for a Conditional Use Permit, Height Variance and any other approvals or permits necessary to erect a $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ monopole tower with a $10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ and telecommunications equipment to be located within a $57^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} \times 45^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ ground area. |

## Right-of-Way Title

100 Corporate Drive, Suite 305, Lebanon, NJ 08833
Phone (908) 849-3011 Fax (908) 849-7981
www.ustitlesolutions.com

# REPORT OF TITLE <br> Document Research and Retrieval U.S. Title Solutions File No. UST71006 <br> Reference No. Brawley <br> Site Name: Brawley 

Prepared For: LCC Telecom Services, LLC -
Premises: TBD, Brawley, CA 92227
Parcel: 056-470-002
County: Imperial

REPORT POWERED BY LAND-IT ${ }^{T M}$

This Report of Title is for informational purposes only. It is not a representation of the condition of title to real property. It is not an abstract, legal opinion, opinion of title, or any form of title insurance. This report is issued exclusively for the benefit of the applicant therefore, and may not be relied upon by any other person. The liability of U.S. Title Solutions is limited to the amount of the fee paid therefore.

# U.S. TITLE SOLUTIONS <br> File No. UST71006 Reference No. Brawley <br> REPORT OF TITLE SCHEDULE - I 

1. DATE OF REPORT : April 07, 2022
2. SCOPE OF SEARCH: Beginning January 01, 1908 and extending through February 28, 2022, a search of the land records for the jurisdiction where the property is located was conducted and we have reported what was found regarding taxes; deeds; mortgages; easements and right of ways; covenants and restrictions; judgments; liens and UCCs; and other matters commonly recorded or filed in the County records.
3. THE ESTATE OR INTEREST IN THE LAND DESCRIBED OR REFERRED TO IN THIS REPORT IS:

Fee Simple
4. TITLE TO SAID ESTATE OR INTEREST IN THE LAND DESCRIBED OR REFERRED TO IN THIS REPORT IS AT THE EFFECTIVE DATE HEREOF VESTED IN:

Southern Pacific Company

## 5. SOURCE OF TITLE :

Property card made by Property Card, in Instrument No: Property Detail Report.
Notes: Searcher advised no vesting deed or patent could be found of record for subject property or grantee. The Imperial County Assessor's Office found old SBE maps that shows the Southern Pacific Railroad being in Section 21 Township 16S Range 21E using the corresponding SBE numbers (872-13-9-3).
For reference only, Instrument No: SBE Map, attached has the U.S. Government as Grantor and Southern Pacific R.R. Co. as Grantee. Under the remarks, it states "Acquired for station grounds under section 8 of the Act of Congress of Mar. 3 1871" which under this act, is believed to have authorized the Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California to construct a certain line of railroad and granted certain lands.
6. PROPERTY IS IDENTIFIED AS FOLLOWS :

Parcel ID: 056-470-002
Tax Year: 2021
Status: Exempt
7. THE LAND REFERRED TO IN THIS REPORT IS SET FORTH ON SCHEDULE - II ATTACHED HERETO

## U.S. TITLE SOLUTIONS

File No. UST71006 Reference No. Brawley REPORT OF TITLE SCHEDULE - II

## (LEGAL DESCRIPTION)

A survey is required for an accurate metes and bounds description.

# U.S. TITLE SOLUTIONS File No. UST71006 Reference No. Brawley <br> REPORT OF TITLE <br> SCHEDULE - III 

The items set forth herein are intended to provide you with notice of matters affecting title to the land described in Schedule - II of this Report. Any statement of facts or matters which an accurate survey of the land would disclose, rights of tenants or parties in possession under unrecorded leases and easements or claims of easements not shown by the public record are not included in this report. No liability is assumed for items not indexed or mis-indexed in the County Records.

## 1. MORTGAGES, DEEDS OF TRUST AND UCCs

None found within period searched.
2. JUDGMENTS AND LIENS

None found within period searched.

## 3. COVENANTS AND RESTRICTIONS

None found within period searched.
4. EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS OF WAY

None found within period searched.

## 5. OTHER RECORDED DOCUMENTS

5.1 Parcel Map No. M-891 Recorded July 18, 1977, in Book 3, Page 72.
5.2 Certificate of Merger between Southern Pacific Company and Southern Pacific Transportation Company, Dated December 02, 1969, Recorded December 09, 1969, in Book 1286. Page 821.
5.3 Township No. 16 South, Range No. 21 East, San Bernardino Meridian, California
Recorded November 07, 1934, in Instrument No: 1933 Government Survey.
5.4 Parcel Map No. M-1964 in Book 8. Page 31.

Notes: For reference - shows portion of subject property as "not a part".

## 6. OTHER UNRECORDED DOCUMENTS

### 6.1 Assessor's Map

## U.S. TITLE SOLUTIONS

 File No. UST71006 Reference No. Brawley
## REPORT OF TITLE

 SCHEDULE - V(OWNERSHIP HISTORY)

1. Property card made by Property Card to Southern Pacific Company, in Instrument No: Property Detail Report.

Notes: Searcher advised no vesting deed or patent could be found of record for subject property or grantee. The Imperial County Assessor's Office found old SBE maps that shows the Southern Pacific Railroad being in Section 21 Township 16S Range 21E using the corresponding SBE numbers (872-13-9-3).
For reference only, Instrument No: SBE Map, attached has the U.S. Government as Grantor and Southern Pacific R.R. Co. as Grantee. Under the remarks, it states "Acquired for station grounds under section 8 of the Act of Congress of Mar. 3 1871" which under this act, is believed to have authorized the Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California to construct a certain line of railroad and granted certain lands.

## Property Detail Report

## CA

APN: 056-470-002-000
Imperial County Data as of: 12/29/2021

## Owner Information

| Owner Name: | Southern Pacific Co |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vesting: | Corporation |

## Location Information

Legal Description: Por Sbe 872-13-9-3 Of Sec 21 16-21
APN:
Munic / Twnshp:
Subdivision:
Neighborhood:
Elementary School: Latitude:
Last Transfer / Conveyance - Current Owner
Transfer / Rec Date:
Buyer Name:

## Last Market Sale

Sale / Rec Date: Multi / Split Sale:
1st Mtg Amt / Type:
2nd Mtg Amt / Type:
Seller Name:
Lender:

## Prior Sale Information

## Sale / Rec Date:

1st Mtg Amt / Type:
Prior Lender:

## Property Characteristics

| Gross Living Area: |  | Total Rooms: | 0 | Year Built / Eff: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Living Area: |  | Bedrooms: |  | Stories: |  |
| Total Adj. Area: |  | Baths ( $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{H}$ ): |  | Parking Type: |  |
| Above Grade: |  | Pool: |  | Garage \#: |  |
| Basement Area: |  | Fireplace: |  | Garage Area: |  |
| Style: |  | Cooling: |  | Porch Type: |  |
| Foundation: |  | Heating: |  | Patio Type: |  |
| Quality: |  | Exterior Wall: |  | Roof Type: |  |
| Condition: |  | Construction Type: |  | Roof Material: |  |
| Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use: | Public School | Lot Area: | 1,165,230 Sq. Ft. | Zoning: |  |
| State Use: |  | Lot Width / Depth: |  | \# of Buildings: |  |
| County Use: | 604 - Schools | Usable Lot: |  | Res / Comm Units: |  |
| Site Influence: |  | Acres: | 26.75 | Water / Sewer Type: |  |
| Flood Zone Code: | A | Flood Map \#: | 06025C1875C | Flood Map Date: | 09/26/2008 |
| Community Name: | Fort Yuma Indian Reservation | Flood Panel \#: | 1875 C | Inside SFHA: | True |
| Tax Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessed Year: | 2021 | Assessed Value: |  | Market Total Value: |  |
| Tax Year: |  | Land Value: |  | Market Land Value: |  |
| Tax Area: | 94-002 | Improvement Value: |  | Market Imprv Value: |  |
| Property Tax: |  | Improved \%: |  | Market Imprv \%: |  |
| Exemption: |  | Delinquent Year: |  |  |  |

Disclaimer: This report is not an insured product or service or a representation of the condition of title to real property. It is not an abstract, legal opinion, opinion of title, title insurance, commitment or preliminary report, or any form of title insurance or guaranty. Estimated property values are: (i) based on available data; (ii) are not guaranteed or warranted; (iii) do not constitute an appraisal; and (iv) should not be relied upon in lieu of an appraisal. This report is issued exclusively for the benefit of the applicant therefor, and may not be used or relied upon by any other person. This report may not be reproduced in any manner without the issuing party's prior written consent. The issuing party does not represent or warrant that the information herein is complete or free from error, and the information herein is provided without any warranties of any kind, as-is, and with all faults. As a material part of the consideration given in exchange for the issuance of this report, recipient agrees that the issuing party's sole liability for any loss or damage caused by an error or omission due to inaccurate information or negligence in preparing this report shall be limited to the fee charged for the report. Recipient accepts this report with this limitation and agrees that the issuing party would not have issued this report but for the limitation of liability described above. The issuing party makes no representation or warranty as to the legality or propriety of recipient's use of the information herein.

School information is copyrighted and provided by GreatSchools.org.
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## Property Detail Report

## ca

APN: 039-310-019-000

## Owner Information

| Owner Name: | Southern Pacific Co |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vesting: | Corporation |  |  |  | Unknown |
| Mailing Address: |  |  |  | Occupancy: |  |
| Location Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Description: | Por Sbe 872-13-6A-5 \& -7-1 Of Tr 37 \& Sec $3413-1839.34 \mathrm{Ac}$ |  |  | County: | Imperial, CA |
| APN: | 039-310-019-000 | Alternate APN: | 0393101901 | Census Tract / Block: |  |
| Munic / Twnshp: |  | Twnshp-Rng-Sec: |  | Legal Lot / Block: |  |
| Subdivision: |  | Tract \#: | 37 | Legal Book/Page: |  |
| Neighborhood: |  | School District: | San Pasqual Valley |  |  |
| Elementary School: | San Pasqual Valley... | Middle School: | San Pasqual Middle | High School: | San Pasqual Valley... |
| Latitude: | 32.99305 | Longitude: | -115.06406 |  |  |

## Last Transfer / Conveyance - Current Owner

Transfer / Rec Date:
Buyer Name:

## Last Market Sale

Sale / Rec Date:
Multi / Split Sale:
lst Mtg Amt / Type:
2nd Mtg Amt / Type:
Seller Name:
Lender:

## Prior Sale Information

## Sale / Rec Date:

1st Mtg Amt / Type:
Prior Lender:

## Property Characteristics

| Gross Living Area: |  | Total Rooms: | 0 | Year Built / Eff: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Living Area: |  | Bedrooms: |  | Stories: |  |
| Total Adj. Area: |  | Baths (F/H): |  | Parking Type: |  |
| Above Grade: |  | Pool: |  | Garage \#: |  |
| Basement Area: |  | Fireplace: |  | Garage Area: |  |
| Style: |  | Cooling: |  | Porch Type: |  |
| Foundation: |  | Heating: |  | Patio Type: |  |
| Quality: |  | Exterior Wall: |  | Roof Type: |  |
| Condition: |  | Construction Type: |  | Roof Material: |  |
| Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use: | Public School | Lot Area: | 1,705,374 Sq. Ft. | Zoning: |  |
| State Use: |  | Lot Width / Depth: |  | \# of Buildings: |  |
| County Use: | 604 - Schools | Usable Lot: |  | Res / Comm Units: |  |
| Site Influence: |  | Acres: | 39.15 | Water / Sewer Type: |  |
| Flood Zone Code: | A | Flood Map \#: | 06025C1475C | Flood Map Date: | 09/26/2008 |
| Community Name: | Imperial County | Flood Panel \#: | 1475C | Inside SFHA: | True |
| Tax Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessed Year: | 2021 | Assessed Value: |  | Market Total Value: |  |
| Tax Year: |  | Land Value: |  | Market Land Value: |  |
| Tax Area: | 94-002 | Improvement Value: |  | Market Imprv Value: |  |
| Property Tax: |  | Improved \%: |  | Market Imprv \%: |  |
| Exemption: |  | Delinquent Year: |  |  |  |

Price:
Seller Name:

Sale Price / Type:
Price / Sq. Ft.:
1st Mtg Rate / Type:
2nd Mtg Rate / Type:

Sale Price / Type:
1st Mtg Rate / Type:

Total Rooms:
Bedrooms:
Baths (F/H):
Pool:

Cooling
Heating:
Exterior Wall
Construction Type:

Assessed Value:

Improvement Value:
Delinquent Year:

Transfer Doc \#:
Deed Type:

Deed Type:
New Construction:
1st Mtg Doc \#: N/A
Sale Doc \#:
N/A
Title Company:

Prior Deed Type:
Prior Sale Doc \#: N/A
B.
 Res/Com Unit. Flood Map Date: 09/26/2008

Market Total Value:
Market Land Value:
Imprv Value Market Imprv \%:

Disclaimer: This report is not an insured product or service or a representation of the condition of title to real property. It is not an abstract, legal opinion, opinion of title, title insurance, commitment or preliminary report, or any form of title insurance or guaranty. Estimated property values are: (i) based on available data; (ii) are not guaranteed or warranted; (iii) do not constitute an appraisal; and (iv) should not be relied upon in lieu of an appraisal. This report is issued exclusively for the benefit of the applicant therefor, and may not be used or relied upon by any other person. This report may not be reproduced in any manner without the issuing party's prior written consent. The issuing party does not represent or warrant that the information herein is complete or free from error, and the information herein is provided without any warranties of any kind, as-is, and with all faults. As a material part of the consideration given in exchange for the issuance of this report, recipient agrees that the issuing party's sole liability for any loss or damage caused by an error or omission due to inaccurate information or negligence in preparing this report shall be limited to the fee charged for the report. Recipient accepts this report with this limitation and agrees that the issuing party would not have issued this report but for the limitation of liability described above. The issuing party makes no representation or warranty as to the legality or propriety of recipient's use of the information herein.

School information is copyrighted and provided by GreatSchools.org.
Tax Area code $\quad 39-31$ $\underbrace{1}_{\tau \varepsilon-6 \varepsilon}$


## Indian Appropriations Act (1871)



Indian Appropriations Act (1871)
In what was supposed to be a routine bill providing funds to Indian Agencies, the Indian Appropriations Act of 1871 inciuded a significant clause declaring that Indigenous people did not belong to "independent nations" and could therefore not enter treaties with the United States. A departure from previous US-Indigenous relations, the Act dealt a major
blow to Indigenous sovereignty.

The Indian Appropriations Act of 1871 declared that Indigenous people were no longer considered members of "sovereign nations" and that the US government could no longer establish treaties with them. The act effectively made Native Americans wards of the US government and paved the way for other laws that granted the federal government increased power over the land and lives of Indigenous peoples.
Although it promised not to "invalidate or impair the obligation" of previous treaties, the act was the first step toward the elimination of Indigenous sovereignty, which was completed in 1898 with the Curtis Act, and the invalidation of previous treaty obligations, a power finally granted to Congress in 1903. One of the first arrangements to be made in the post-treaty era was the Brunot Agreement, in which Utes under Ouray ceded Colorado's San Juan Mountains to the United States.

## Origins

Unlike other Indian Appropriations Acts, most of which served the mundane purpose of allocating federal funds to fulfill treaty obligations, the Appropriations Act of 1871 marked a major shift in federal Indigenous policy. Nearly a century earlier, immediately after the nation was established, President George Washington applied the president's treaty-making power to Indigenous nations, setting a precedent for nation-to

Four decades later, Indigenous sovereignty was upheld in the 1832 Supreme Court decision Worcester v. Georgia, which declared that Indigenous people did indeed belong to "sovereign nation[s]." This result obliged the United States to engage with Indigenous people in diplomacy the same as it would Spain, Britain, or France. President Andrew Jackson ignored the ruling, but future administrations respected it, forging treaties with various Native nations that had to be ratified by Congress.
Many Indigenous leaders who signed treaties did not fully understand what they were signing because they were unfamiliar with the US government as well as American legal writing and practices. That eventually changed, however, and over time treaties became an important source of Indigenous power since they were by definition made between equal partners-nation to nation. If nothing else, Indigenous nations could point to treaties to protest nondelivery or delay of annuities (money and supplies promised in treaties) or trespassing on Indigenous land. Many Indigenous leaders rightly came to regard treaties as the final say on what the US government and its citizens could or could not do regarding Indigenous land and people.
After the Civil War, however, a renewed spirit of white national unity, as well as the ongoing conquest of the American West, compelled many in Congress and the western territories to reconsider Indigenous sovereignty. Treaties that created reservations and Indian agencies, they argued, essentially made Indians dependent on the government, so why must they continue to be recognized as independent nations?

## The Appropriations Act of 1871

Under the Constitution, treaty making was the prerogative of the president, acting with the advice and consent of the Senate. The House of Representatives had no say in creating treaties and was only responsible for allocating funds to carry out their provisions. By the 1870 s, however, the House had new members representing new constituencies in western states, many of whom lobbied for the removal of Indigenous people. The House as a whole had also come to resent its minor role in Indigenous affairs, going so far as to refuse to fund new treaties. As the House debated the Appropriations Act of 1871, representatives hitched a rider denying Native sovereignty to what was otherwise a routine aliocations bill. Even though the rider increased the House's power in Indigenous affairs, the Senate approved the bill on March 3, 1871, and President Ulysses S. Grant signed it into law.

## A New Era

Although it prevented new treaties from being written, the Appropriations Act did not end binding agreements with Indigenous nations. These agreements, however, differed from treaties in that they were not bilateral-meaning the US government could choose to respect Native Americans' demands at its own discretion. The Brunot Agreement of 1873 , for example, still had to be ratified by Congress and made the government accountable for the agreement's stated compensation to the Utes. However, the Appropriations Act laid the groundwork for the government to abandon past obligations, a right that the Supreme Court granted to Congress in its 1903 decision Lone Wolf $v$. Hitchcock.
After the 1871 Appropriations Act, historian Mark G. Hirsch writes, "US repudiation of treaties and tribalism was steadfastly opposed by American Indians, who continued to identify themselves as members of autonomous, selfgoverning nations." This resistance took many forms, from religious movements such as the Ghost Dance to outright refusal to participate in subsequent laws, such as the Dawes Act of 1887. In Colorado, the 1879 Meeker Incident stemmed from the Utes' refusal to give up either their tribal identity or their sovereignty, especially because the latter was protected by treaty. While not opposing the Appropriations Act by name, these assertions of autonomy were responses to the denial of Indigenous self-determination that was codified in the 1871 Act. The Dawes Act, which broke up collectively owned Indigenous reservations into individual lots, demonstrated Congress's true intent with the Appropriations Act. Nothing in any treaty signed before 1871 gave the federal government the right to forcibly break up reservations, but after tribal sovere巨ravabmifintad PKG

Appropriations Act, Congress assumed the right to legislate on all matters concerning Indigenous affairs as it saw fit. By breaking up spiritually and culturally significant land that had been held collectively for generations, the Dawes Act dealt another crippling blow to Indigenous sovereignty in the late nineteenth century.

## Legacy

By the end of the nineteenth century, indigenous nations within the United States had gone from having the rights due any other foreign country to having almost no right to exist. This process had been under way before 1871, but the Indian Appropriations Act of that year incorporated it into official government policy, opening the door for its rapid acceleration.
While no new treaties have been written since 1871, Congress did eventually restore some measure of Indigenous sovereignty in 1934 with the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA). However, because it forced tribes to hold votes and write their own Constitutions, many tribes correctly viewed the IRA as another government mandate. Even though most federally recognized tribes today have some form of self-government, the fight for Indigenous sovereignty denied in the 1871 Act continues. In New Mexico, for example, Indigenous people are resisting government-sponsored energy drilling near sacred sites on public land; in North Dakota they have protested government-imposed oil pipelines across treaty-protected land. Meanwhile, in Alaska and Colorado, tribes are lobbying for the power and resources to combat disproportionately high rates of sexual assault and other violent crime on federal reservations.
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# United States v. Southern Pac. R. Co. 

United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit
Jun 22, 1891
46 F. 683 (9th Cir. 1891)
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$683{ }^{*} 68346$ F. 683 (S.D.Cal. 1891) UNITED STATES v. SOUTHERN PAC. R. CO. et al., (two cases.) United States Circuit Court, S.D. California. June 22, 1891
Syllabus by the Court
The act of congress of March 3, 1871, authorized the Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California, subject to the laws of California, to construct a certain line of railroad, and granted it certain lands. The Southern Pacific Railroad Company, as it then existed, accepted said grant, and filed its plat of definite location in the proper office August 12, 1873. Said Southern Pacific Railroad Company, as authorined hw the lawre of Galifornia

## Opinion Case details

built was accepted by the president, and has performed, to the satisfaction of the government, all the services required of it under said act. Held, that said consolidated company if not, technically, is, substantially, the same company to which said act referred. Affirming Railroad Co. v. Poole, 12 Sawy. 544, 32 F. 451; U.S. v. Railroad Co., and U.S. v. Cotton, etc., Co., 45 F. 596.

Pursuant to state authority, recognized by and made a part of the congressional grant of March 3, 1871, the S.P.R.R. Co., April 15, 1871, filed 684 amended articles of *684 incorporation; and August 12, 1873, filed, together with the S.P. Branch R.R. Co., articles of amalgamation and consolidation, under the name of the S.P.R.R. Co. Held, that while in one sense a new corporation was formed, each was substantially and practically the same S.P.R.R. Co. mentioned in the acts of congress, and was so recognized by congress, and that the articles of amendment, amalgamation and consolidation were authorized by congressional as well as by state legislation.

Commissioners having from time to time been appointed to report in regard to the construction of the Southern Pacific Railroad, the road having been accepted by the president, and having been used by the government in the transportation of mail, military stores, etc. Held, that these acts were acts recognizing the defendant company as the S.P.R.R. Co. to which the act of March 3, 1871, applies, and that the defendant company, being subject to burdens imposed by the act, is entitled to the benefits conferred by it as a consideration for those burdens.

Act Cong. July 27, 1866, having expressly granted lands to the S.P.R.R. Co., its successors and assigns, it is held, that if the consolidated company, with the amended articles of incorporation, is not technically the same corporation, referred to in act March 3, 1871, it is within the express provisions of the grant, being the successor or assign of said company. Inchoate grants were not contemplated by cor

## Opinion Case details


Pacific Railroad Company, provided that said section should in no way affect or impair the rights, present or prospective, of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company. Held, that this language did not constitute an exception from the grant, nor a reservation in favor of the United States, but that it made the grant to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company subject and subordinate to any rights the Atlantic \& Pacific Company, a prior grantee, may then have secured, or might thereafter acquire under the law.

The present and prospective rights of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company were to secure the odd sections of land provided for along the line of the road they should build by actually building the road and earning the lands by performing the acts required. Their rights were to earn the lands, and not to obtain them without earning them.

As the Atlantic \& Pacific Company never did comply with the condition of the grant to it, and as all of its rights thereunder became forfeited in 1886, by act of congress, because of such non-compliance, its rights have never ripened into an effective grant, and now they never can so ripen. The only condition imposed upon the grant to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company has thus become inoperative.

The Southern Pacific Railroad Company, having performed all the conditions required of it by the act of 1871 , thereby acquired a right to the odd sections for the prescribed distance on each side of the road, subject only to be defeated by the Atlantic \& Pacific Company having an older grant, and filing its map of definite location, and performing the other conditions necessary to earn the lands; but the Atlantic \& Pacific Company never having performed said conditions, and its grant having been declared forfeited by congress, the lands never were granted to it, within the meaning of the act of congress, and the grant to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company therefore became effective and perfect without in any way affecting or impairing any rights of the Atlanti
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of the grant.
W. H. H. Miller, Atty. Gen., Willoughby Cole, U.S. Atty., and Joseph H. Call, Sp. Asst. U.S. Atty.

Joseph D. Redding and Chapman \& Hendrick, for defendants.
685 Before SAWYER, Circuit Judge, and ROSS, District Judge. *685 SAWYER, J.
These are suits brought against the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and parties who have purchased the land described, and derived title thereto from the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, to determine the adverse claim of title to said lands and to restrain defendants from cutting timber thereon, or from hereafter setting up any claim of title to said lands. The lands involved in suit No. 177 are sections 1, 11, and 13 of township 3, and section 35 of township 4 N., of range 15 W ., San Bernardino meridian; and those in suit No. 178 , section 23 , township 4 N., range 15 W ., same meridian. These lands are claimed by defendants under the act of congress of March 3, 1871, 'to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Co., and to aid in the construction of its road, and for other purposes.' 16 St. 573 . Section 23 of said act is as follows:
'That for the purpose of connecting the Texas Pacific Railroad with the city of San Francisco, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California is hereby authorized (subject to the laws of California) to construct a line of railroad from a point at or near Tehachapa Pass, by way of Los Angeles, to the Texas Pacific Railroad at or near the Colorado river, with the same rights, grants, and privileges, and subject to the same limitations, restrictions, and conditions as were granted to said Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California, by the act of July twenty-seven, eighteen hundred and sixty-six.' 16 St. 579.
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with the said Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad, formed under this act, at such point, near the boundary line of the state of California, as they shall deem most suitable for a railroad line to San Francisco, and shall have a uniform gauge and rate of freight or fare with said road; and in consideration thereof, to aid in its construction, shall have similar grants of land, subject to all the conditions and limitations herein provided, and shall be required to construct its road on the like regulations, as to time and manner, with the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad herein provided for.'

And the provision of the same act, made applicable to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and granting it lands putting it upon the same footing in all particulars with the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company incorporated by the same act, is as follows:
'And be it further enacted, that there be and hereby is granted to the Atlantic \& Pacific Company, (substitute Southern Pacific Railroad Company,) its successors and assigns, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of said railroad and telegraph line to the Pacific Coast, and to secure the safe and speedy transportation of the mails, troops, munitions of war, and public stores, over the route of said line of railway and its branches, every alternate section of public land, not mineral, designated by odd numbers, to the amount of twenty alternate sections per mile, on each side of said railroad line, as said company may adopt, through the territories of the United States, and ten alternate sections of land per mile on each side of said railroad whenever it passes through any state, and whenever, on the line thereof, the United States have full title, not reserved, sold, granted, or otherwise appropriated, *686 and free from pre-emption of other claims or rights, at the time the line of said road is designated by a plat thereof, filed in the office of the
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the interior, in alternate sections, and designated by odd numbers, not more than ten miles beyond the limits of said alternate sections, and not including the reserved numbers: provided, that if said route shall be found upon the line of any other railroad route, to aid in the construction of which lands have been heretofore granted by the United States, as far as the routes are upon the same general line, the amount of land heretofore granted, shall be deducted from the amount granted by this act.' 14 St. 294, Sec. 3.

Substitute in this section the words, 'the Southern Pacific Railroad Company' for the words, 'the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company,' and we shall have the grant to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company both by the act of 1866 , and the act of 1871 . Soon after the passage of the said act of March 3, 1871, to-wit: on April 3, 1871, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company as it then existed, designated the line of its road from Tehatchapa Pass by way of Los Angeles, to Fort Yuma, on the Colorado river, which it on that day filed in the office of the commissioner of the general land-office, and thereby the grant under said act of congress attached to all the odd sections of land, to which it could attach under the provisions of said act of congress. Afterwards, on the 12th day of August, 1873, the said Southern Pacific Railroad Company, in all respects as authorized by the laws of the state of California, existing and in force before and at the time of the passage of said act of congress of March 3, 1871, incorporating the Texas Pacific Railroad Company, amalgamated and consolidated with several smaller companies as shown by Exhibits A, B, annexed to the bill of complaint in these cases; the said consolidated company being called by the name of 'The Southern Pacific Railroad Company,' a part of the object stated in said articles of amalgamation being to construct'a line of railroad from a point at or near Tehachapa Pass by way of Los Angeles, to the Texas Pacific Railroad at or near the Colorado river, a distance of three hundred and twenty-four miles as near as may be,' in pursuance of said provisions
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Pacific Railroad Company.' The said amalgamated and consolidated company afterwards built the said railroad along the line so hereinbefore designated from Tehachapa Pass by the way of Los Angeles to the Colorado river, and fully completed the same within the time, and in all respects, as required by said act of congress; and the said several sections were examined from time to time, and reported upon to the president by commissioners appointed for the purpose, and the whole line accepted by 687 the president. Ever since its completion and acceptance, *687 the said road has performed to the satisfaction of the United States government, all the services, such as carrying the mails, transporting troops, supplies, etc., in all respects as required by the provisions of said act of congress incorporating the Texas Pacific Railroad Company; and said services have been accepted by the United States.

The Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, on March 12, 1872, long subsequent to the definite location of the line of the Southern Pacific line, and after it commenced building its road, filed in the office of the secretary of the interior-- not in the office of the commissioner of the general land-office--two maps of portions of a line of road in the state of California. These were the first maps of any part of the contemplated road in California ever filed. These maps are designated 'Master's Exhibits Nos. 122 and 127.' Some time subsequently, the said company filed in the same office, two other maps designated 'Master's Exhibits Nos. 130 and 131. ' These are the only maps filed relating to the location of the California portion of the Atlantic \& Pacific road. The Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company never constructed any portion of the road authorized to be constructed by it, in the state of California; and for failure to construct said road or any part of it, congress, on July 6, 1886, passed an act declaring a forfeiture of all lands within the state of California, before granted to it, to aid in the construction of the road. 24 St. 123. The line of the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad, as shown upon said maps filed in the office of the secretary of the interior, crosses the lina nf the Coutharn Darifir Dailmad ac lnmatad -
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the said Southern Pacific Railroad Company, respondent, which constructed its road as aforesaid, to the other respondents to this suit, and the title so conveyed, is now vested in them.

The first point made by complainants is, that the present Southern Pacific Railroad Company, which built the road after the amalgamation and consolidation with sundry smaller roads mentioned, under the same name as the old company, and professedly for the same purpose, made in pursuance of the statutes of the state of California, authorizing such consolidation and amalgamation, which statutes were in force at the date of the congressional grant in question, and prior to which consolidation the grant by congress was made, and which road was to be built in accordance with the laws of the state of California, is not the identical Southern Pacific Railroad Company, to which the act referred, and the grant was made, and therefore, that the defendant took nothing under the act of congress. This point is not new in this court, as it was fully considered and overruled in Railroad Co. v. Poole, 12 Sawy. 544, 545, 32 F. 451. Again, the point was made and earnestly urged in the southern district of California, in U.S. v. Railroad Co. and U.S. v. Colton, etc., Co., and the district judge in an able opinion, concurred in, on this point, by the circuit judge, thoroughly examined the 688 point, and overruled it, citing *688 with approval also, the case of Railroad Co. v. Poole, referred to, and affirming it. (14 Sawy. 623, 45 F. 596 et seq.) See, also, Railroad Co. v. Orton, 6 Sawy. 160, 32 F. 457. We shall adhere to the ruling made in these cases till the point is otherwise determined by the supreme court.

It is earnestly urged on the part of the respondents, that the filing in the office of the secretary of the interior, of the fragmentary maps of the location of the line of the contemplated Atlantic \& Pacific road, and to points not authorized by the law, does not constitute a location of the line in such sense, or legal form, as to give any right whatever under the act, to the Atlantic \& Pacific Company; and, that, it in no __r____rti
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company, since, upon the view I take upon the rights of the parties, and of the effect of the act forfeiting the grant to the Atlantic \& Pacific Company, it will not be necessary to decide the point raised.

The only remaining question is, whether, in view of all the facts of the case, the clause in the provision of section 23 in the act of 1871 , 'that this section shall in no way affect or impair the rights, present, or prospective, of the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, or any other railroad company,' or any clause in the act of 1866 , under the facts of the case, defeats the grant to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company to these lands, which lie within the primary limits of the grant? This question did not arise in U.S. v. Railroad Co. and U.S. v. Colton, etc., Co., 14 Sawy. 620, 45 F. 596. It is now directly presented however, and we address ourselves to its consideration and solution. In my judgment, neither the proviso to section 23 of the act of 1871, nor any provision of the act of 1866 , defeats the title to the lands in question, in view of all the facts in the case. That proviso is as follows: 'Provided however, that this section shall in no way affect or impair the rights present or prospective of the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, or any other company. ' Now what is the fair import of this language? What was the intent of congress, in view of the important objects sought, in making the grant to respondents, in adopting this peculiar language? It is not the language of exception from the grant, of any lands that the Atlantic \& Pacific Company might lay claim to without earning them under the statute. It is not the language of exception at all. On the contrary, it merely made the grant to defendant, subordinate, and subject to any rights, that the Atlantic \& Pacific Company may then have secured, or might thereafter, acquire under the law, authorizing it to acquire lands, by the performance of the acts prescribed. Congress intended that the respondent should not interfere with any lands which that other company should lawfully earn. It simply intended to protect any rights, that it should acquire, by performing the 689 required acts. *689 What were 'the rights, present and prospective of the
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that this company should file a plat of a route for a railroad, and then play the role of the dog in the manger, and neither build the road itself, and thereby earn the lands, nor allow the respondents to build one, and earn the lands under another grant. The Atlantic \& Pacific Company never did anything to earn these lands, except to file, what it was pleased to term a 'map of the location of its route,' six years after the date of the grant, and one year after the respondent had located its road under the grant, made five years subsequently, and after it had commenced building the road; and for failure to comply with the terms of the grant, by the Atlantic \& Pacific Company, congress, in 1886; ( 24 St. 123, 124,) passed an act forfeiting its right to earn these lands altogether. Thus its rights 'present' and 'prospective,' have never ripened into an effective grant, and now they never can so ripen. They now have, and can have no further rights in these lands, whether the respondents get them or not. The building of its road, by the respondents, and earning these lands, which the other party has itself failed to earn, and now never can earn, can in no possible way 'affect or impair' any rights the other company now has, or ever did have. And had that company built the road, and earned the lands, the respondent would not have got them, for that would have been to affect or impair its rights.

The present right of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company was to earn the lands by the performance of the required conditions, and the prospective rights, the right to have the lands when so earned. This is all there is of it, and it did neither. Now the grant to the Southern Pacific, being subject, and subordinate, to those rights, could not in any way, or in any degree, have affected, or impaired them, because the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, had it performed the conditions would have taken the said land under the act. It utterly failed to perform the conditions, and all its rights have been forfeited, and now the patenting of the lands to the Southern Pacific cannot in any way possible affect any of these rights which do not now exist. Thus the rights of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company present or
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the prior valid claim, had the work been performed. The prior claimant failed to acquire any real right to the lands, by earning them, and they were forfeited and left to the respondent to earn under its grant, and it has faithfully earned them without in the slightest degree 'affecting or impairing any prior rights' 'present or prospective,' and it now cannot impair them. It 690 seems to me, that the respondent is justly entitled to these lands under its grant. An exception, from a grant, is an entirely different matter from taking a grant subject to other claims or rights, as is, manifestly, the case here. When the other claims are satisfied, or lost, the grantee, subject to those rights, takes what is left. The proviso in section 23 of the act of 1871, seems to me, clearly to prescribe all the limitations intended by congress in that act to be put upon the grant to respondent. It is specific and clear on this point, and, only intended to be subject to any rights that should be actually acquired and perfected under any prior act. The reference to the act of 1866 , does not modify the provision in this particular section. It puts no restriction upon respondent, not expressly put upon the Southern Pacific Company by the act of 1866 , and that act, in the precise language used, taken literally, or substantially, does not affect this point. In that act, the Southern Pacific Company was put upon the precise footing with the Atlantic \& Pacific Company. Both took under the same act, upon equal terms. In the act of 1871, the Southern Pacific Company was put upon the same footing as the Southern Pacific Company was put by the act of 1866. The proviso in section 3 of the latter act is
'That if said route shall be found upon the line of any other railroad route, to aid in the construction of which lands have been heretofore granted by the United States, as far as the routes are upon the same general line, the amount of land heretofore granted shall be deducted from the amount granted by this act.'

The language is 'have been heretofore granted;' that is to say, granted before the passage of the act of 1866 , not the act of $18-\mathrm{m} \cdot 1$. Hhen $_{4}$
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language of the acts. But the line of the Southern Pacific road is not on the line of the 'Atlantic and Pacific' route as designated on what is claimed to be its map of location. The two roads are not 'upon the same general line.' They simply cross each other. But again: The fair construction of this proviso, and as it was intended by congress, in view of the object sought, is, that 'lands that have heretofore been granted,' and 'the amount of land' to be dedicated, means lands that have been effectively granted, and to which the title has passed, or shall effectively pass out of the United States, and finally become effectively vested in the grantees upon the performance of the prescribed conditions. It does not mean inchoate grants, that are not finally perfected-grants that become forfeited by failure to earn them by performing the prescribed conditions or any of them. These do not, ultimately, become grants at all, within the meaning of the act, and intent of congress. Congress was anxious to procure the construction of these great works, for military, mail-carrying, and other uses, and thereby also develop the resources of the country, and make a market for the public *691 lands. It contributed nothing, because it received double price for the even sections. In these provisions, it was, only solicitous to protect the vested rights of prior grantees in lands fairly earned in constructing works of a similar kind in pursuance of a similar policy. It did not seek, by forfeitures, to evade its obligations to subsequent roads, and thereby increase its own property, at the expense of those who, actually carry out the objects of the law, and fairly earn the lands intended for them. We cannot attribute any such unworthy purpose, or motive to congress. It manifestly, intended, that the subsequent grantees should take the odd sections subject only to prior rights, and when the prior grants failed, and finally, became no grants, by reasons of a failure to perform the conditions necessary to perfect the grant, and when no rights can possibly be further affected by the grant to the subsequent grantee, that the latter, upon complying with the terms of its grant should have the lands, not ultimately, or effectively granted under the prior acts of congress. Effective, completed grants only, are contemplated in thic nrougso
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sections of land along the general line of its route, upon building the road as required, but upon no other conditions. The grantee did not, for six years, do anything to locate its road in the state of California, or earn the grant. The act of 1871 was passed, making a similar grant to respondent, subject however to any prior rights of the other company. Within a month it filed its map of location, and immediately, went to work and continued till it performed all the required conditions, had its road completed, and accepted by the president, and earned its lands. By filing its map of definite location, it acquired a right to the odd sections for the prescribed distance on each side of the road, subject only to be defeated by the Atlantic \& Pacific Company, having an older grant, by filing its map of definite location, and then performing the other conditions necessary to earn the lands. At the time of locating the Southern Pacific line, there was nothing to indicate that the Atlantic \& Pacific would ever move in the matter. A year afterwards, and six years after the date of its grant, the Atlantic \& Pacific Company filed what is claimed to be its definite location; and by that act, if properly done, and not already too late, under the law, it acquired what? Not a perfect, or complete title, to the land but at most a temporary provisional title, with a right to build the road, earn the lands, along its line, perfect its title, and defeat the right of the respondents to acquire the land. But it did nothing more, and, after waiting 20 years for it, without anything more being done, congress passed the act referred to, forfeiting its grant, and the lands never were fully granted--never became granted, within the reasonable meaning of the act of congress providing for deducting therefrom subsequent grants, and thereby the grant to respondents became effective and perfect, without in the slightest degree, or 'in any way,' 'affecting' or 'impairing any right,' 692 'present or prospective' of the *692 Atlantic \& Pacific Company, or any other prior grantee. If this be not the true view of the case, then no lands could have been acquired by the respondents under its grants, and the act, purporting to be a grant, as to it, was a dead letter-- a mere illusion; for, if the acts mentioned, performed by the Atlantic \& Pacific Comnany at that
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latter grant.
I am, therefore, of the opinion, that the earning and acquiring of these lands by the respondents, under the conditions shown by the record, in no way affected, or impaired, the 'rights present or prospective,' of the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, or any other, within the meaning of the act of congress; and that, these lands are not lands heretofore, or at any time, granted by the act of congress in such sense as to require them to be deducted along the general line of the road, or otherwise, within the meaning of the acts of congress of 1866 , and 1871 , or of either of them.

Upon the views expressed, the amended bills must be dismissed, and it is so ordered, without costs.

ROSS, J.
These cases have been argued and submitted together. The suits are brought to quiet the complainant's alleged title to certain lands and to enjoin defendant from asserting or claiming any title thereto. The lands are claimed by the defendant by virtue of the act of congress of March 3,1871, entitled 'An act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Company, and to aid in the construction of its road, and for other purposes.' 16 St.U.S. 573. By the 23 d section of that act it was provided as follows:
'That for the purpose of connecting the Texas Pacific Railroad with the city of San Francisco, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California is hereby authorized (subject to the laws of California) to construct a line of railroad from a point at or near Tehachapa Pass, by way of Los Angeles, to the Texas Pacific Railroad at or near the Colorado river, with the same rights, grants, and privileges, and subject to the same limitations, restrictions, and conditions as were granted to said Southern Pacific Railroad Company of California by the act of July 27, 1866, provided, however that this section shall in
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thereby authorized to build, and proceeded to build it and completed its construction, to the satisfaction of the government, in January, 1878. It thereby earned the lands embraced by the grant to it. The point that the present Southern Pacific Railroad Company is not the same Southern Pacific
693 Railroad Company to which the act of *693 March 3, 1871, applied, was decided against the government in the recent cases of U.S. v. Railroad Co. and U.S. v. Colton, etc., Co., 45 F. 596, (March 6, 1891.) The reasons for so holding were given at length in the opinions then rendered, and need not now be repeated.

It is admitted that the lands in controversy in the present suits are situate within 20 miles of the line of road so located and built by the Southern Pacific Company, but as they are also within 20 miles of the line that the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, under the act of congress of July 27, 1866, designated for its road, it is earnestly contended on behalf of the government that they are excluded from the grant to the Southern Pacific Company. When the cases of U.S. v. Railroad Co. and U.S. v. Colton, etc., Co., 39 F. 132, were before the court on demurrers to the bills-- the lands then involved being within the indemnity limits of the Atlantic \& Pacific grant and within the primary limits of that of the Southern Pacific Company-- it was said:
'Had they been situated within 20 miles of the designated route of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company they would clearly have fallen within the grant to that company and consequently have been excluded from the subsequent grant to the Southern Pacific Company; for, if the construction above put upon the act of July 27, 1866, be the correct one, every alternate section of public land, designated by odd numbers, within 20 miles of the line of the road, as definitely fixed, would have passed to the Atlantic \& Pacific Company as of the date of its grant.'
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and to be decided. The grant to the Atlantic \& Pacific Company was the prior grant-- it having been made by the act of July 27,1866 , entitled 'An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line in the states of Missouri and Arkansas to the Pacific coast.' 14 St.U.S. 293. By that act the Atlantic \& Pacific Company was authorized to construct a railroad
'Beginning at or near the town of Springfield, in the state of Missouri, thence to the western boundary of said state, and thence, by the most eligible railroad route as shall be determined by the said company, to a point on the Canadian river; thence to the town of Albuquerque on the river Del Norte, and thence by way of the Agua Frio or other suitable pass to the head-waters of the Colorado Chiquito, and thence along the 35th parallel of latitude, as near as may be found most suitable for a railroad route, to the Colorado river at such point as may be selected by said company for crossing; thence by the most practicable and eligible route to the Pacific.'

To aid in the construction of the road there was granted to the Atlantic \& Pacific Company, by the third section of the act, every alternate section of public land, not mineral, designated by odd numbers, to the amount of 10 sections on each side of the road whenever it passes through a state
'And whenever on the line thereof the United States have full title, not reserved, sold, granted, or otherwise appropriated, and free from pre694 emption *694 or other claims or rights, at the time the line of said road is designated by a plat thereof filed in the office of the commissioner of the general land-office, and whenever,' etc.

The Atlantic \& Pacific Company did nothing towards locating its line of road in California until March 12, 1872, and never did do anything towards building it; in consequence of which congress, in 1886, passed an act declaring its land grant forfeited. In the mean time, that is to say, March 3,1871, the grant under which the defendant c¢ . 1 l
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non-mineral in character, as should fall within the designated limits and be, at the time the line of its road should be designated by a plat thereof filed in the office of the commissioner of the general land-office, not reserved, sold, granted, or otherwise appropriated and free from pre-emption or other claims or rights. No valid reason, therefore, existed why congress could not include the lands in controversy in the grant it made to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company. Did it do so? The act of March 3, 1871, refers to that of July 27, 1866, for the terms of the grant thereby made to the Southern Pacific Company to aid it in building a road from a point at or near Tehachapi Pass, by way of Los Angeles, to the Texas Pacific Railroad at or near the Colorado river, for the purpose of connecting the Texas Pacific Railroad with the city of San Francisco. The grant was for 10 odd-numbered sections of public land, not mineral, on each side of the road. As has already been said, the lands in controversy here were at that time public lands of the United States. They are within 20 miles of the line of road the Southern Pacific Company was by the act of March 3,1871 , authorized to locate and build and which it did locate and build and which the government accepted as having been built in compliance with the terms of that act and which it has since used for its own purposes. The lands in controversy are therefore within the primary limits of that grant and justly belong to the Southern Pacific Company unless there be something in the act of March 3, 1871, excluding them from the grant thereby made to it. It is urged that such exclusion is effected by the concluding clause of the section making the grant, which is in these words: 'Provided, however, that this section shall in no way affect or impair the rights, present or prospective, of the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, or any other railroad company.'

It is plain that this clause is not in the form of an exception from the grant. Congress was, of course, aware of its previous grant to the Atlantic \& Pacific Company of date July 27, 1866, and being desirous of making that to the Southern Pacific Company subordinate and subject to its previous grants,
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Southern Pacific Company should be excluded from that grant. It was not to reserve anything to the United States, but to protect the 'present and prospective' rights of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company and any other railroad company to which congress may have made grants of lands that the proviso was inserted. Had the line of road the Atlantic \& Pacific Company was authorized to build by the act of July 27,1866 , been definitely located at the time of the grant to the Southern Pacific Company of March 3, 1871, and had the Atlantic \& Pacific Company thereafter built its road and thereby earned the lands covered by its grant, the lands in controversy would have gone to it without regard to the proviso in question; for its grant which would have attached to such lands at the time of the definite location of the route of its road would have been perfected by the building of the road and the title thus perfected have related back to the date of the grant, July 27,1866 , and of course have excluded any subsequent grant covering the same lands. But the Atlantic \& Pacific Company had not designated the route of its road at the time of the grant to the Southern Pacific Company of March 3, 1871. It might do so, however, thereafter and might build the road it was authorized to build and thereby earn the lands embraced by the grant to it of July 27, 1866. It had a 'present and prospective' right to do so. If it did both of those things, it would be entitled to the lands granted to it by that act. If it did not do both of those things, it would not be so entitled and the lands would remain as they then were, public lands of the United States. Congress, therefore, in making its grant to the Southern Pacific Company of March 3, 1871, made it subject to those 'present and prospective' rights. Had they been perfected by a compliance on the part of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company with the conditions on which they were based, the title to the lands in controversy would have become vested in the Atlantic \& Pacific Company as of date July 27,1866 . But as that company never did comply with the conditions of the grant and as all of its rights thereunder became forfeited in 1886 by act of congress because of such non-compliance, there remain no rights of that company to be, or that ever can be affected or
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United States any land that would otherwise be included in the granting clause of the act. The lands in controversy were public lands of the United States at the time of that grant; the terms of the granting clause include them, provided, only, that the grant be without prejudice to the present or prospective rights of the Atlantic \& Pacific Railroad Company, or any other railroad company. The Atlantic \& Pacific Company having forfeited its right to earn the lands in question by failing to build the road it was required to build as a consideration for the grant, it never acquired any title thereto

Page 696.
and thenceforward there remained no right, 'present or prospective,' to be affected or impaired. When its rights became forfeited (there being no pretense that the case is affected by the rights of any other railroad company than those herein spoken of) there came to an end the only condition imposed by congress upon the grant to the Southern Pacific Company of March 3, 1871.

These views render it unnecessary to determine the question elaborately and ably argued by counsel as to whether there ever was a valid designation of the route of the proposed road of the Atlantic \& Pacific Company.

I concur in the dismissal of the amended bill in each case, without costs, and wish to add that I would not have written this brief opinion had I known the circuit judge was engaged in the preparation of an opinion; but as each of us reached the same conclusion in a separate examination of the cases, at his suggestion both opinions are filed.
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EASEMENT DEED BY COURT ORDER IN SETTLEMENT OF LANDOWNER ACTION

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TODD SMITH, DIRK REGAN and CAROL REGAN, JACQUELY̦N SHELDRICK, GLENN L. BOOM, and WILLIAM NELSON and LINDA NELSON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS REPRESENTATIVES OF A CLASS OF PERSONS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Plaintiffs,
v.

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LLC; SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.; LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC; and WILTEL COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

CASE NO. 3:11-cv-02599-TEH

Defendants.

## EASEMENT DEED BY COURT ORDER IN SETTLEMENT OF LANDOWNER ACTION

WHEREAS, the parties to the above-captioned class action (the "Action") entered into a California Class Settlement Agreement, as of September 5, 2012, (the "Settlement Agreement") (terms capitalized herein and not otherwise defined shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Settlement Agreement);

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2013, the Court entered a final Order and Judgment approving the Settlement Agreement and ordering that this Action may be settled as a class action on behalf of the following class:
[A] class under the Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement Class"), defined as follows:
a class comprising all Persons who own or who claim to own, for any period of time during a Compensation Period, any Covered Property, except for: (1) Right-of-Way Providers and their predecessors, successors, parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates, past or present; (2) federal, state, and local governmental entities; (3) Native American nations and tribes; or (4) any Person who files a valid and timely exclusion on or before the Opt-Out Deadline.
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Members of this Class are referred to below as Class Members; and
WHEREAS, the Settlement Agreement provides for the entry of an Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action by which the Settling Defendants acquire, to the extent that Class Members have the right to transfer it, a permanent telecommunications easement in the Right of Way adjacent to the property of each Class Member;

## THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT:

1: To the extent that each Class Member owns rights in the Easement Premises (as hereafter defined), the Class Member (the "Grantor") hereby grants to whichever of Sprint Communications Company L.P., Qwest Communications Company, LLC, Level 3 Communications, LLC, and WilTel Communications, Inc. has Designated for inclusion under a Settlement Agreement the Right of Way which adjoins, underlies or includes Covered Property owned by the Class Member, together with its successors, assigns, and licensees (the "Grantee"), a permanent telecommunications easement in the Easement Premises. For each county in which this Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowṇer Action is being recorded, a list of affected Class Members and their affected parcels is attached as Exhibit 1. Exhibit 1 shall describe Class Members' affected parcels with the following information, to the extent that it is in the Database of Identification Information: owner name; owner mailing address; tax map identification number; tax parcel identification number; lot number; and section, township, and range. Exhibit 1 may describe Class Members' affected parcels with any other available information.
2. The terms and conditions of the permanent telecommunications easement that is the subject of this Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action are:
a perpetual easement and right of way (hereinafter, together with the rights and privileges herein granted, the "Easement") and right to place, lay, bury, construct, install, operate, repair, Case Number: 3:11-cv-02599-TEH Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action
maintain (including aerial patrol), renew, rebuild, replace, upgrade, expand, relocate, and remove fiber optic cables, copper cables, coaxial cables or other cables through which voice, data, video or other signals are transmitted, conduits, inner ducts, hand holes, splice vaults, poles, optical or electronic equipment, regenerator huts, marker posts or signs, and other related facilities appropriate for installation, use, or maintenance of such cables (collectively, the "Telecommunications Cable System"), in, on, over, under, through and/or across the Easement Premises. The Easement Premises means all that real property that (a) either (i) is included within a parcel of property that is described in. Exhibit 1 or (ii) has a common boundary with a parcel of property described in Exhibit 1 (the "Grantor's Property") (for purposes of this Telecommunications Cable System Easement Deed, a parcel of property shall be deemed to have a common boundary with the Easement Premises if it is separated by a non-navigable river or a street, road, or highway, other than a numbered state or federal highway) and that (b) (i) is or was used as a railroad right of way ("Railroad Right of Way") and (ii) is on a side of the centerline of the Railroad Right of Way that is next to the Grantor's Property (the "Grantor Side"), and (iii) extends no more than ten (10) feet on each side of the Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System (A) as it existed on November 21, 2012 (B) where the actively used components of the Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System are moved or placed, provided, however, that only a single 20 -foot easement per moved component may exist at any point in time in the Easement Premises, and the width of the moved component's Easement Premises shall be reduced on one side and increased by an equal linear footage on the other side wherever necessary in order that it shall in all places remain solely within the limits of a șingle Grantor Side of the Railroad Right of Way, and (C) where new components are installed to connect the existing Telecommunications Cable System to the edge of the Right of Way. The

Easement shall be construed to grant Grantee all rights necessary to abandon in place unused components of Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System.

The Easement shall not include the right to construct on the Easement Premises regenerator huts and similar structures ("Buildings") in addition to those existing on November 21, 2012. The Easement shall include the rights to repair, replace, and expand existing Buildings, provided, however, that no such repair, replacement, or expansion shall increase the site that the Buildings occupy, or the height of any Building, by more than twenty-five percent. The Easement does not permit the construction of microwave towers, cell towers, or other components of a primarily aboveground statewide Telecommunications Cable System.

The Easement includes the right to temporarily use the entire Grantor Side of the Railroad Right of Way for construction or maintenance, so long as Grantee uses its best efforts not to interfere with any real property which, although within the boundaries of the Easement Premises, is actually being used by Grantor; provided, however, that in no event shall Grantee be prohibited from using such real property if it is commercially reasonable to do so under the circumstances or if Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System is currently located within such area. The Easement shall include the right of reasonable ingress and egress to and from the Easement Premises over that portion of the Grantor's real property that underlies the Railroad Right of Way and, for repair and maintenance, over any existing private roads of Grantor, where access from public or railroad roads is not reasonably practical, provided Grantee has made commercially reasonable efforts to give prior notice to Grantor of Grantee's use of Grantor's private roads. Grantee shall not be liable for damages caused by its removal of trees, undergrowth, and brush within the Easement Premises necessary or appropriate for the enjoyment of the Easement. Nothing contained herein shall constitute a waiver of any right that

Grantor may have for any damages to Grantor's property outside of the Easement Premises caused by Grantee's action. If Grantee's action causes damage to any of Grantor's existing improvements, including houses, garages, shops, sheds, and fences, or growing crops, which are within the Easement Premises, Grantee shall pay reasonable compensation to the Grantor for such damage to the extent provided by law.

From and after June 24, 2013, subject to all the restrictions and limitations stated herein, the Easement includes the right to construct and install additional components of a Telecommunications Cable System within the Easement Premises. Grantee agrees that unless (a) it is required to do so by the railroad or other owner of Railroad Right of Way or (b) it is commercially reasonable under the circumstances to do so, it will not install additional components of a Telecommunications Cable System in the area of the Easement Premises that is outside a parallel fence constructed by the railroad or other owner of Railroad Right of Way or is actually being used by the Grantor or its successor, provided, however, that the foregoing shall not be binding upon Grantee if Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System is currently located within such area. If Grantee's action causes damage to any of Grantor's existing improvements, including houses, garages, shops, sheds, and fences, or growing crops, which are within the Easement Premises, Grantee shall pay reasonable compensation to the Grantor for such damage to the extent provided by law.

The Easement includes all rights necessary to the lawful occupation of the Easement Premises by an existing Telecommunications Cable System, and by any additional Telecommunications Cable System that is constructed and installed by or on behalf of Grantee in the Easement Premises and that is owned or operated by either (a) Grantee or (b) any person or entity to which Grantee sold, granted, leased, or otherwise transferred or may hereafter sell,
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grant, lease, assign, or otherwise transfer, all or any part of the rights in or use of such Telecommunications Cable System.

The Easement, however, does not apply to any Telecommunications Cable System that existed on November 21, 2012, but that was acquired by Grantee after that date (unless such Telecommunications Cable System or component thereof was acquired from any of Sprint Communications Company L.P.; Qwest Communications Company, LLC, f/k/a Qwest Communications Corporation; Level 3 Communications, LLC, Level 3 Communications, Inc., and Level 3 Telecom Holdings, Inc.; WilTel Communications, Inc.; WilTel Communications, LLC; and Williams Communications, LLC, f/k/a Williams Communications, Inc., f/k/a Vyvx, Inc.).

No oil, gas, or other mineral rights are granted and no existing oil, gas, or other mineral rights are expanded, limited, or affected by this instrument, provided, however, that Grantor shall not use a method of extraction that interferes with or impairs in any way the Easement, the Telecommunications Cable System, or the exercise of Grantee's rights herein.

Grantor shall not, nor shall Grantor authorize others to, construct or create any road, reservoir, excavation, obstruction, structure, or building or change the land grade on, in, over, under, through, or across the Easement Premises without the prior written consent of Grantee, provided that nothing herein shall be construed to affect the rights and obligations of any railroad with respect to the use, improvement, or alteration of its Railroad Right of Way, as provided in any agreement between the railroad and the Grantee, by applicable law, or otherwise.

It is understood and agreed that the Easement is not exclusive and is subject to all preexisting uses and pre-existing rights to use the Easement Premises, whether such uses are by Grantor or others and whether for surface uses, crossings, or encroachments by communication
companies or utilities. It is further understood and agreed that Grantor retains all of its existing rights, if any, to grant, convey, assign, and restrict any and all rights (including future rights and uses) on the Easement Premises, provided, however, and notwithstanding the foregoing, that Grantor shall not use or authorize others to use the Easement Premises in a manner that interferes with or impairs in any way Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System or the exercise by Grantee of the rights granted herein.

Subject to the terms hereof, Grantee shall have all other rights and benefits necessary or useful to the full and complete enjoyment and use of the Easement for the purposes stated herein, including the right to sell, grant, lease, or otherwise transfer all or any part of the rights in or use of the Telecommunications Cable System.

Grantor conveys the Easement without warranty of title to any property interest in the Easement Premises. This instrument does not address and shall not affect any real property rights, including the priority of interests, between Grantor and any railroad or between Grantee and any railroad, or any of their predecessors, successors, past or present predecessors in interest, successors in interest, successors in title, members, partners, parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, lessees, assigns, and past, current, or future licensees or assignees. This Easement is not intended to impact or diminish any railroad's existing rights or property interests in the Right of Way. This Easement shall not be construed to permit Grantee to interfere with railroad operations. This Easement also shall not permit any component of a Telecommunications Cable System to remain in a Railroad Right of Way except (a) under existing or future agreements with the railroad or (b) in any Railroad Right of Way in which no railroad operates and no railroad retains any right, title, or interest. This Easement also shall not permit any new components to be installed to connect the existing Telecommunications Cable System to the edge of the Right
of Way- in any Railroad Right of Way as to which the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Surface Transportation Board has entered an order, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. $\S 10903$, that the railroad is authorized to cease to provide or maintain rail service over that right of way and the railroad no longer provides or maintains rail service over that line, provided that if the railroad does not cease such rail service or later reactivates such service, then this limitation shall not apply.

This Telecommunications Cable System Easement Deed is executed and delivered on behalf of Grantor for the purpose of granting the Easement to Grantee in, on, over, under, through and/or across the Easement Premises to the full extent of Grantor's right, title or interest, if any, in or to the Easement Premises, and the Easement granted hereby shall. affect the Easement Premises only to the extent of Grantor's right, title, and interest therein. Grantor and Grantee agree that this Telecommunications Cable System Easement Deed shall not grant any rights to the Easement Premises, or any portion thereof, in which Grantor holds no right, title or interest.

No rights reserved to Grantor herein shall be deemed to expand rights reserved to Grantor under any other easement, right of way, license, lease, or any similar instrument or court order. No limitation herein on the rights of Grantee shall be deemed to limit rights heretofore granted by Grantor or its predecessors in interest under any other easement, right of way, license, lease, or any similar instrument or court order.

The terms and provisions of this instrument shall constitute covenants running with the land and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Settling Defendants, the Grantor, their successors, assigns, personal representatives, and heirs.
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This instrument fully sets forth the terms and conditions of the Easement. There are no oral or other written agreements between Grantor and Grantee that modify, alter, or amend this instrument.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the Easement, rights and privileges unto Grantee, its successors and assigns in perpetuity or until such time as Grantee shall cause the Easement to be released of record.
3. Settling Defendants may record this Easement under the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

Date: 6/27/13


Honorable Thelton E. Henderson, Judge United States District Court
${ }^{2}$ The owner's/grantor's mailing address is not necessarily the same as the affected parcel'saddress
EXHIBIT 1
IMPERIAL COUNTY
LIST OF AFFECTED PARCELS ${ }^{1}$

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 021-160-017 | 11S-14E-3 | Southern Pacific Pipe Lines Partnership | 888 So Figueroa St, Los Angeles, CA 90017 |
| 021-160-020 | 11S-14E-3 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 021-280-003 | 115-14E-10 | Juan Chavez | PO Box 642, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 021-280-005 | 115-14E-10 | Y Ranches | PO Box 267, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 021-280-010 | 11S-14E-10 | IID-Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 021-290-013 | 115-14E-12 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 021-290-015 | 115-14E-11 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 021-321-004 | 115-14E-15 | Anna S Sandhu Tr et al | 6212 Commodore Ln, Oklahoma,OK 73162 |
| 021-331-002 | 115-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 021-331-003 | 115-14E-15 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 021-331-004 | 115-14E-15 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 021-340-003 | 115-14E-13 | Andrew \& Marlene Currier | 290 River Wood Dr, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 022-020-005 | 115-14E-22 | liD - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the "Court Order"), Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to theCourt Order.
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 022-020-009 | 11S-14E-22 | Dennis \& Orvin Lambert | PO Box 158, Montrose, CO 81402 |
| 022-110-006 | 11S-14E-27 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 022-110-007 | 11S-14E-27 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 022-110-008 | 11S-14E-27 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 022-110-009 | 11S-14E-27 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 022-170-004 | 12S-14E-3 | TNT Enterprises inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar, CA 92395 |
| 022-170-005 | 12S-14E-3 | SM me LLC | 111 Woodmere Rd, Folsom, CA 95630 |
| 023-020-015 | 12S-14E-10 | F L \& Deanie Johnson | 2327 Hwy 86, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 023-020-016 | 12S-14E-10 | James R \& Barbara A Smith | 1593 Gonder Rd, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 023-101-003 | 12S-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar, CA 92395 |
| 023-101-004 | 12S-14E-15 | Williams First Choice Onion Properties LLC et al | PO Box 1058, Nuevo, CA 92567 |
| 023-130-004 | 125-14E-15 | Golden Eagle Hay Co Inc | PO Box 467, Calipatria,CA 92281 |
| 023-130-005 | 12S-14E-15 | Chavez Bros | PO Box 1545, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-141-002 | 12S-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 023-141-006 | 12S-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-201-002 | 12S-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildmar,CA 92395 |
| 023-201-003 | 12S-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-261-002 | 12S-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 023-261-003 | 12S-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-331-002 | 12S-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 023-331-003 | 12S-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-380-003 | 12S-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-380-007 | 12S-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar, CA 92395 |
| 023-380-008 | 12S-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-391-002 | 12S-14E-15 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar,CA 92395 |
| 023-391-005 | 12S-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 023-391-006 | 125-14E-15 | Superior Land \& Cattle Co | PO Box 1828, Calipatria,CA 92233 |
| 024-260-031 | 12S-14E-22 | Thomas Young et al | PO Box 537, Homer,AK 99603 |
| 024-260-059 | 12S-14E-22 | Supr Terminal LLC | PO Box 509, Calipatria,CA 92233 |

IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 024-260-061 | 12S-14E-22 | EZ Properties LLC | 2506 Kentia St, Oxnard, CA 93036 |
| 024-290-004 | 12S-14E-27 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 024-290-021 | 12S-14E-27 | Herbert J \& Elizabeth L Bool | 6844 N 36th St, Phoenix,AZ 85018 |
| 024-290-022 | 12S-14E-27 | Herbert J \& Elizabeth L Bool | 6844 N 36th St, Phoenix,AZ 85018 |
| 024-290-025 | 12S-14E-27 | TNT Enterprises Inc | PO Box 427, Wildomar, CA 92395 |
| 024-340-015 | 12S-14E-34 | Herbert J \& Elizabeth L Bool | 6844 N 36th St, Phoenix,AZ 85018 |
| 024-340-016 | 12S-14E-34 | Herbert J \& Elizabeth L Bool | 6844 N 36th St, Phoenix,AZ 85018 |
| 025-260-003 | 11S-15E-18 | Timothy Bopp | 2401 E GlenOaks Blvd, Glendale,CA 91206 |
| 025-260-006 | 11S-15E-18 | Mark A Wheeler | 28229 Branch Rd, Castaic,CA 91384 |
| 025-260-008 | 115-15E-18 | Denis L Kleidosty | 2986 Tisbury Dr, Henderson,NV 89052 |
| 025-260-019 | 11S-15E-17 | Lincoln H Banks | 777 Alvarado Rd, La Mesa, CA 91941 |
| 025-260-031 | 11S-15E-18 | Ricardo Martinez | PO Box 572, Niland,CA 92257 |
| 025-290-010 | 11S-15E-36 | S B Grant \& E B Franklin LLC et al | 901 N Brutscher St, Newberg, OR 97132 |
| 025-290-019 | 115-15E-36 | J M Foigelman et al | 27 Gleneagles, Newport Beach,CA 92660 |
| 025-290-036 | 115-15E-36 | Helen E Johnson | PO Box 1131,105 Cornville,AZ 86325 |
| 034-360-036 | 16S-11E-12 | Ed L Construction Inc | PO Box 785, San Marcos,CA 92069 |
| 034-360-037 | 165-11E-12 | Ed L Construction Inc | PO Box 785, San Marcos,CA 92069 |
| 037-030-012 | 13S-14E-3 | Barbara D Cox | 249 Andrita Pl, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 037-030-022 | 13S-14E-2 | Carl E Weiler | 5451 N 25th St, Phoenix,AZ 85016 |
| 037-060-018 | 13S-14E-3 | Lawrence W \& Tina Cox | PO Box 301, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 037-070-013 | 13S-14E-3 | Henrietta Farms Inc | PO Box 239, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 037-100-003 | 13S-14E-10 | SP \& ML Rutherford Tr | PO Box 6, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 037-100-004 | 13S-14E-3 | Matthew Lee Rutherford | PO Box 6, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 037-110-004 | 13S-14E-10 | Gargiulo Farms | PO Box 96, Brawley,CA 92227 |
| 037-140-006 | 13S-14E-15 | ORNI LLC | 6225 Neil Rd, Reno,NV 89511 |
| 037-140-021 | 13S-14E-15 | ORNI LLC | 6225 Neil Rd, Reno,NV 89511 |
| 037-160-011 | 135-14E-15 | IID-Imperial Irrigation District | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 037-160-012 | 13S-14E-22 | Emma Loucille Walk | 1101 St, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 037-160-019 | 13S-14E-22 | JLF Ranches Ltd | PO Box 134, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 037-160-021 | 13S-14E-22 | Matthew Lee Rutherford Tr | PO Box 6, Brawley, CA 92227 |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action(the "Court Order"), Owest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to theCourt Order.
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| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 037-160-022 | 13S-14E-22 | California R/W Inc | PO Box 357, Niland,CA 92257 |  |
| 037-160-024 | 13S-14E-21 | Matthew Lee Rutherford Tr | PO Box 6, Brawley,CA 92227 |  |
| 039-310-026 | 13S-18E-33 | Eugene L Leblanc | 5775 E Hwy 78, Brawley,CA 92227 |  |
| 039-310-028 | 13S-18E-33 | Eugene L Leblanc | 5775 E Hwy 78, Brawley,CA 92227 |  |
| 040-130-008 | 14S-14E-09 | Avelardo Rodriguez | 10235 Otis St, South Gate, CA 90280 |  |
| 040-130-009 | 14S-14E-04 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 1809, El Centro, CA 92243 |  |
| 040-130-011 | 14S-14E-09 | Avelardo Rodriguez | 10235 Otis St, South Gate,CA 90280 |  |
| 040-130-012 | 14S-14E-08 | John R \& Carolyn F Benson | PO Box 239, Brawley, CA 92227 |  |
| 040-190-004 | 14S-14E-17 | Brookfield 101 Ranch LLC | 12865 Pointe del Mar,Ste 200 Del Mar,CA 92014 |  |
| 040-230-006 | 14S-14E-20 | Evelyn S Ayala | 462 W G St, Brawley, CA 92227 |  |
| 040-230-013 | 145-14E-20 | Pioneer Livestock Inc | PO Box 328,Trust Dept Meridian,ID 83642 |  |
| 040-230-016 | 14S-14E-20 | Barkley Seed Inc | PO Box 5540, Yuma,AZ 85366 |  |
| 040-230-017 | 14S-14E-20 | Barkley Seed Inc | PO Box 5540, Yuma,AZ 85366 |  |
| 040-240-003 | 14S-14E-20 | IID-Imperial Irrigation District | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |  |
| 040-240-018 | 14S-14E-20 | Barkley Seed Inc | PO Box 5540, Yuma,AZ 85366 |  |
| 040-330-005 | 14S-14E-29 | Spreckels Sugar Co Inc | PO Box 581, Brawley, CA 92227 |  |
| 040-330-009 | 14S-14E-30 | IID-Imperial Irrigation District | PO Box 937, Imperial, CA 92251 |  |
| 040-340-020 | 14S-14E-31 | IID-Imperial Irrigation District | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |  |
| 040-340-022 | 14S-14E-32 | Wayne \& Di Peng Yang | 2478 N Stevens Ave, Rosemead,CA 91770 |  |
| 040-340-036 | 14S-14E-31 | Central Pipe Mechanical Inc | PO Box 3682, El Centro,CA 92244 |  |
| 040-340-041 | 14S-14E-31 | J C Floyd Sr \& Nancy C Nale | 196 W Harris Rd, Imperial,CA 92251 |  |
| 043-380-008 | 15S-13E-35 | Ruth Schultz-Rudof Tre | 10975 Rim Rd, Escondido,CA 92026 |  |
| 043-450-092 | 15S-14E-31 | Pacific West Management LLC | 16027 Ventura Blvd,550 Encino,CA 91436 |  |
| 043-540-015 | 15S-14E-07 | Veronica Sam | 716 E Sunrise, Imperial,CA 92251 |  |
| 043-673-006 | 15S-14E-18 | Nicholas Sanchez | 531 W Belford RD, Imperial,CA 92251 |  |
| 044-200-043 | 15S-14E-19 | Hector Margain | PO Box 8214, Chula Vista,CA 91912 |  |
| 044-200-065 | 15S-14E-19 | Robert S \& Marie Ellison | PO Box 351, Imperial, CA 92251 |  |
| 044-200-077 | 15S-14E-19 | James A \& Janet R Lamphere | 2925 W Main St, El Centro, CA 92243 |  |
| 044-200-078 | 15S-14E-19 | James A \& Janet R Lamphere | 2925 W Main St, El Centro,CA 92243 |  |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the "Court Order"), Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to the Court Order.
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 044-200-079 | 15S-14E-19 | Delgado Secundino Arellano \& Martha Co Tr | 1161 Obeliscos, Calexico,CA 92231 |
| 044-200-079 | 15S-14E-19 | Martha Delgado et al | 1161 Obeliscos, Calexico,CA 92231 |
| 044-200-081 | 15S-14E-19 | Hector F Margain | PO Box 8214, Chula Vista,CA 92012 |
| 044-200-086 | 15S-14E-30 | Ana Bastidas et al | 320 Aten Rd, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 044-220-004 | 15S-14E-30 | Simcal Chemical Co | PO Box 27, Boise,ID 83707 |
| 044-220-022 | 15S-14E-30 | WHB Enterprises | 1085 State St, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-290-015 | 155-14E-31 | Dubois Land \& Livestock Co LLC | 801 W Ross Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-001 | 15S-14E-31 | Maria Nicolasa Beltran | 1097 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-002 | 15S-14E-31 | Francisco J \& Maria Martinez | 1087 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-003 | 155-14E-31 | Mary Helen Gloria | 1077 Stacey, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-004 | 15S-14E-31 | Rosa N Maldonado | 1067 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-005 | 15S-14E-31 | Joseph Lee Houseman | PO Box 387, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 044-313-006 | 15S-14E-31 | Jose C \& Socorro M Antunez | 2257 Pepper Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-007 | 15S-14E-31 | Reyes A \& Romelia Gonzalez | 1037 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-008 | 15S-14E-31 | Ernesto Bustamante | 1027 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-009 | 15S-14E-31 | John Angel \& Navar I Garcia | 1017 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-010 | 15S-14E-31 | Ruben \& Dahlia Jimenez | 2490 Brighton Ave, EI Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-011 | 15S-14E-31 | Victor \& Gloria Herrera | 1001 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-313-012 | 15S-14E-31 | Frank J \& Maria A Perdomo | 897 Stacey, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-013 | 15S-14E-31 | Tomas E \& Maria Jesus Diaz | 887 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-313-014 | 15S-14E-31 | Martin J Aguilera et al | 1526 Trinity Way, Salinas,CA 93906 |
| 044-313-015 | 15S-14E-31 | Frank G \& Anita A Cruz | 867 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-313-016 | 15S-14E-31 | Arnulfo V De Hoyos et al | 857 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-313-017 | 155-14E-31 | Delvin \& Patricia Yarnall | 2275 Pepper Dr, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-313-018 | 155-14E-31 | Encarnacion \& Rosamaria Cabrera | 837 Stacey Ave, EI Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-313-019 | 15S-14E-31 | Gale L Larran | 4410 Glistening Spgs, Rowlett, TX 75088 |
| 044-313-020 | 155-14E-31 | Rafael \& Jacqueline Gutierrez | 817 Stacey Ave, EI Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-313-021 | 15S-14E-31 | Rosalinda Garcia-Herrera | 807 Stacey, El Centro,CA 92243 |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the "Court Order"), Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to the Court Order.
The owner's/grantor's mailing address is not necessarily the same as the affected parcer'saddress
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 044-320-014 | 15S-14E-31 | Conrado R \& Martha Andrade | 731 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-320-015 | 15S-14E-31 | Lorenzo \& Laura Cancel | 434 E Hamilton Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-320-016 | 15S-14E-31 | Francisco Hernandez et al | 749 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-320-017 | 15S-14E-31 | Guadalupe Moreno | 759 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-320-018 | 15S-14E-31 | Maria \& Raul Mungarro | 769 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-320-019 | 15S-14E-31 | Baltazar \& Frances Romero | 779 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-320-020 | 15S-14E-31 | Imperial Valley Properties LLC | 375 E Commercial Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-320-021 | 15S-14E-31 | Fernando \& Margarita Lozano | 799 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-331-006 | 15S-14E-31 | Sun Wah \& Kay Fun Louie | 610 E Holton Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-332-016 | 15S-14E-32 | Floyd D \& Emma L Berryman | PO Box 2154, El Centro,CA 92244 |
| 044-332-018 | 15S-14E-31 | RGT EI Centro LLC | 7825 Fay Ave, La Jolla, CA 92037 |
| 044-332-020 | 15S-14E-31 | El Centro Police Athletic League | 1100 N 4th St, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-332-020 | 15S-14E-32 | El Centro Police Athletic League | 1100 N 4th St, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-343-003 | 15S-14E-32 | Juana Lopez et al | 915 N Fourth St, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-440-024 | 15S-14E-32 | Montecito Land | PO Box 360, El Centro,CA 92244 |
| 044-440-025 | 15S-14E-31 | Michael Brett Driscoll | 1470 State St, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-440-035 | 15S-14E-31 | Brenda Rodriguez et al | 220 E Villa Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-440-060 | 15S-14E-32 | Maria Leticia Barriga | 1803 Barbara Worth, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-530-004 | 15S-14E-06 | Central Pipe Mechanical Inc | PO Box 3682, El Centro, CA 92244 |
| 044-530-008 | 15S-14E-06 | R M Mosqueda et al | 3102 Clark Rd, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 044-530-009 | 15S-14E-06 | Jason Hathaway | PO Box 2047, Beaver, UT 84713 |
| 044-530-016 | 15S-14E-06 | Western Farm Service Inc | 3005 Rocky Mountain Ave, Loveland,CO 80538 |
| 044-530-017 | 15S-14E-06 | Crop Production Services Inc | 3005 Rocky Mountain Ave, Loveland,CO 80538 |
| 044-550-004 | 15S-14E-07 | Ogwaro Holdings LLC | 1509 Brookside Ct, San Marcos, CA 92078 |
| 044-561-001 | 15S-14E-31 | Angel L \& Josefina V Lopez | 1201 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-561-002 | 15S-14E-31 | Nicolas A \& Consuelo Sanchez | 531 Belford Rd, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 044-561-003 | 15S-14E-31 | Jaime \& Rosa Edith Ahumada | 1221 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-561-004 | 15S-14E-31 | Joe M \& Consuelo L Puga | 2442 Ross Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettement of Landowner Action (the "Court Orde"),
Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached ir to theCourt Order.
${ }^{2}$ The owner's/grantor's mailing address is not necessarily the same as the afferted parcer'saddress
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 044-561-005 | 15S-14E-31 | Cesar \& Donna Martinez | 1241 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-561-006 | 155-14E-31 | Arthur \& Yvette M Garcia | 1251 Stacey, EI Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-561-007 | 15S-14E-31 | Herminia Rios | 1261 Stacy Ave, EI Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-561-008 | 15S-14E-31 | Jose Luis D Gonzales | 1271 Stacey Ave, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 044-561-009 | 15S-14E-31 | Ricardo M \& Maria D Larios | 1281 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-561-010 | 15S-14E-31 | Peggy J Artrup | 1291 Stacey Ave, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-561-011 | 15S-14E-31 | Lucinda Parkinson | 1299 Stacey, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 044-561-012 | 15S-14E-31 | Sixto \& Estella Dlaz | 910 N 14th St, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 047-010-029 | 135-14E-27 | National Beef California LP | 57 E Shank Rd, Brawley,CA 92227 |
| 047-050-012 | 13S-14E-28 | Chevron USA Inc | PO Box 1392, Bakersfield, CA 93302 |
| 047-060-003 | 13S-14E-28 | Chevron USA Inc | PO Box 1392, Bakersfield, CA 93302 |
| 047-140-005 | 13S-14E-28 | IID - Trust Lands | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 047-281-006 | 135-14E-33 | Brawley American Citizens Club Inc | PO Box 529, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 047-281-007 | 13S-14E-33 | Brawley American Citizens Club Inc | PO Box 529, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 047-281-010 | 135-14E-33 | Brawley American Citizens Club Inc | PO Box 529, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 047-281-011 | 13S-14E-33 | Chubasco LLC | 385 N 9th St, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 047-281-012 | 13S-14E-33 | El Redentor Assembly of God Church | 305 N 9th St, Brawley,CA 92227 |
| 047-281-018 | 135-14E-33 | El Redentor Assembly of God Church | 305 N 9th St, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 047-351-008 | 13S-14E-33 | Thomas A Gargiulo | PO Box 1207, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 047-351-009 | 135-14E-33 | Thomas A Gargiulo | PO Box 1207, Brawley,CA 92227 |
| 048-250-037 | 14S-14E-04 | Jimmy Dean Tucker | 4201 Dogwood Rd, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 048-250-054 | 14S-14E-04 | Delvin S \& Frances M Ashurst | PO Box 100, Westmorland, CA 92281 |
| 048-250-055 | 14S-14E-04 | Jon Montgomery Self | 4201 Dogwood Rd, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 049-031-011 | 135-14E-33 | The Hartford Center LLC | 4425 Brandt Rd, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 049-032-009 | 135-14E-33 | Bob L \& Juanita Merrill | PO Box 1434, Brawley,CA 92227 |

[^1]2The owner'sfgrantor's mailing address is not necessarily the same as the afferted parcel'saddress


In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlernent of Landow ner Action \{ the "Court Order"),
Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to theCourt Order.
${ }^{2}$ The owner's/grantor's mailing address is not necessarily the same as the affected parcel's address
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 051-084-001 | 16S-12E-07 | Carmen Redondo et al | PO Box 208, Seeley,CA 92273 |
| 051-084-003 | 16S-12E-07 | Jesus Redondo | 2825-A W Evan Hewes Hwy, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 051-091-001 | 16S-12E-07 | IID-Imperial Irrigation District | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 051-092-001 | 16S-12E-07 | Sam Estes | PO Box 830, Seeley,CA 92273 |
| 051-092-002 | 16S-12E-07 | Maria Lourdes Acuna | 371 Ross Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 051-092-010 | 165-12E-07 | Heidi L Kutn | 5743 Meadows del Mar, San Diego,CA 92130 |
| 051-092-014 | 16S-12E-07 | Heidi L Kuhn | 5743 Meadows del Mar, San Diego,CA 92130 |
| 051-120-024 | 16S-12E-09 | George J \& Clemence V Lerno | 2801 W Main St, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 051-120-025 | 16S-12E-09 | FC \& MK Tomlinson LLC | 259 S Randolph Ave, Brea, CA 92821 |
| 051-120-039 | 16S-12E-10 | George J \& Clemence V Lerno | 2801 W Main St, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 051-120-047 | 16S-12E-10 | Frank N \& Carma J Tomlinson | PO Box 2577, Capistrano Beac, CA 92624 |
| 051-120-060 | 16S-12E-10 | Madeline L Kuhn | 47 Medina Dr, Palm Desert,CA 92260 |
| 051-215-001 | 16S-12E-12 | Roman Catholic Bishop of San Diego | 795 So La Brucherie Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 051-242-001 | 16S-12E-11 | Val-Rock Inc | 3200 San Fernando Rd, Los Angeles,CA 90065 |
| 051-250-007 | 16S-12E-11 | Francisco \& Maria T Parga | PO Box 476, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 051-250-008 | 165-12E-12 | Francisco \& Maria T Parga | PO Box 476, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 051-250-010 | 16S-12E-12 | Seeley Properties LLC | 1805 Evan Hewes,PO Box 549 Seeley,CA 92273 |
| 051-250-011 | 16S-12E-11 | First Baptist Church of Seeley | PO Box 770, Indio,CA 92202 |
| 051-420-030 | 16S-12E-12 | Paul E \& Beverly A Benefield | 1191 River Front Dr, Bullhead City, AZ 86442 |
| 051-420-033 | 16S-12E-12 | Roman Catholic Bishop of San Diego | 795 So La Brucherie Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 051-420-034 | 16S-12E-12 | Norman P Pearse | 1958 Sunderidge, San Antonio, TX 78260 |
| 051-420-035 | 16S-12E-12 | Paul \& Beverly Benefield | 1191 River Front Dr, Bullhead City,AZ 86442 |
| 051-420-036 | 16S-12E-12 | Paul \& Beverly Benefield | 1191 River Front Dr, Bullhead City,AZ 86442 |
| 051-420-037 | 16S-12E-12 | Wigwam Investments LLC | 10920 Via Frontera, San Diego,CA 92127 |
| 051-420-065 | 16S-12E-12 | Johnny P \& Gloria S Singh | 607 Russell, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 051-420-066 | 16S-12E-12 | Bernadette Strobel | 21351 Autmnwood, Lake Forrest,CA 92630 |
| 051-440-001 | 16S-12E-11 | Madeline L Kuhn | 47 Medina Dr, Palm Desert,CA 92260 |
| 051-440-005 | 16S-12E-11 | IID-Imperial Irrigation District | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the ${ }^{\text {"Court Order" }}$ ), Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to the Court Order.
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 051-440-006 | 16S-12E-11 | IID-Imperial Irrigation District | PO Box 937, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 051-440-015 | 16S-12E-11 | Danny C \& Antonia Nichols | 1880 Derrick Rd, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 051-440-023 | 16S-12E-11 | Melvin J Preece Jr | 2396 W Vaughn Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 056-060-017 | 16S-21E-8 | Pilot Knob Corp | 2 Center of World Plz, Felicity, CA 92283 |
| 056-060-018 | 16S-21E-7 | William H French | 6559 S Lazy Ln, Gold Canyon,AZ 85118 |
| 056-060-022 | 16S-21E-7 | George A Biffle | 14726 El Monte Rd, Lakeside,CA 92040 |
| 056-060-023 | 16S-21E-7 | Will Biffle | 14726 El Monte Rd, Lakeside,CA 92040 |
| 056-060-031 | 16S-21E-7 | Robert C Watson | 40616 Rock Mtn Dr, Fallbrook,CA 92028 |
| 056-060-042 | 16S-21E-7 | Bertha Popeney | 5285 Wellesley St, La Mesa,CA 91942 |
| 056-060-043 | 16S-21E-6 | Bertha Popeney | 5285 Wellesley St, La Mesa,CA 91942 |
| 056-060-044 | 16S-21E-7 | R \& L M Sanchez et al | 822 Mesa Verde, Yuba City,CA 95993 |
| 056-060-045 | 16S-21E-7 | Ogden Environmental Services Inc | 40 Lane Rd, Fairfield, NJ 07007 |
| 056-080-012 | 16S-21E-17 | Pilot Knob Corp | 2 Center of World Plz, Felicity, CA 92283 |
| 056-440-001 | 16S-21E-16 | Pilot Knob Corp | 2 Center of World Plz, Felicity,CA 92283 |
| 056-440-044 | 16S-21E-16 | Pilot Knob Corp | 2 Center of World Plz, Felicity,CA 92283 |
| 056-460-009 | 16S-21E-22 | Eller Telecasting Co of Arizona | 7950 Jones Branch Dr, McLean, VA 22107 |
| 056-460-010 | 165-21E-22 | Thomas R \& Terrence J Glenn | 19557 Valley Ford Dr, Cottonwood,CA 96022 |
| 056-460-011 | 16S-21E-22 | James A Griffin | 5551 Kenwood Ave, Buena Park,CA 90621 |
| 056-460-012 | 16S-21E-22 | Gilda F Correnti-Kroos | 2111 Whitfield Park Ave, Sarasota, FL 34243 |
| 056-470-003 | 16S-21E-21 | Jacques A \& Felicia L Istel | One Center of The World Plaza, Felicity, CA 92283 |
| 056-470-027 | 16S-21E-21 | David A Ligas | 10556 Emerald Ave, Yuma,AZ 85365 |
| 056-470-029 | 16S-21E-21 | Eleodoro A Lopez | 1158 S 3rd Ave, Yuma,AZ 85364 |
| 056-470-035 | 16S-21E-21 | Jacques A \& Felicia L Istel | One Center of The World Plaza, Felicity, CA 92283 |
| 056-570-005 | 16S-22E-20 | USA For Shirley VP Ropp PG | 1661 S 4th St, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 056-590-011 | 16S-22E-23 | Tovar Family LP | 2261 E 27th Way, Yuma,AZ 85365 |
| 056-600-006 | 16S-22E-26 | Roman Catholic Bishop of San Diego | PO Box 1176, WinterHaven, CA 92283 |
| 062-080-013 | 15S-13E-32 | La Valle Sabbia Inc | 2015 Silsbee Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 062-080-031 | 16S-12E-01 | George Amaral | PO Box 1402, Gonzales,CA 93926 |

In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action (the "Court Order"),
Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to theCourt Order.
2The owner's/grantor's mailing address is not necessariy the same as the affected parcel'saddress
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 062-080-055 | 15S-13E-31 | Gustavo \& Debra T Ramirez | 1591 W Elm Ave, EI Centro,CA 92243 |
| 062-080-056 | 155-13E-31 | Robert E \& Margaret P Horton | 1614 W Ames Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 062-080-057 | 155-13E-31 | Fernando \& Rosario Maestre | 1620 W Ames Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 062-080-058 | 155-13E-31 | Jose \& Juana Rodriquez | 1624 Ames Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 062-080-060 | 155-13E-31 | Sm Seed \& Milling LLC | 2050 Bennett Rd, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 062-080-069 | 155-13E-31 | Smith-Kandal Real Estate \& Ramsay M D \& G | 510 W Main St, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 062-090-009 | 155-13E-34 | Meyer Imperial Investments III LLC | 2921 B S Kish Ave, Yuma,AZ 85365 |
| 062-090-012 | 155-13E-34 | Meyer Imperial Investments III LLC | 2921 B S Kish Ave, Yuma, AZ 85365 |
| 062-090-017 | 15S-13E-33 | La Valle Sabbia Inc | 2015 Silsbee Rd, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 062-090-022 | 155-13E-33 | La Valle Sabbia Inc | 2015 Silsbee Rd, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 062-090-025 | 15S-13E-32 | La Valle Sabbia inc | 2015 Silsbee Rd, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 062-090-035 | 15S-13E-34 | Heidi Kuhn | 5743 Meadows Del Mar, San Diego,CA 92130 |
| 062-101-001 | 15S-13E-31 | Smith-Kandal Real Estate \& Ramsay M D \& G | 510 W Main St, Brawley,CA 92227 |
| 062-102-002 | 15S-13E-31 | Smith-Kandal Real Estate \& Ramsay MD \& G | 510 W Main St, Brawley, CA 92227 |
| 062-111-021 | 15S-13E-32 | Rafael \& Gloria Escutia | 1599 N 12th St, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 062-112-002 | 155-13E-32 | Heidi L Kuhn | 5743 Meadows Del Mar, San Diego, CA 92130 |
| 063-112-004 | 15S-14E-18 | Alan M Thornburg | PO Box 39, Julian, CA 92036 |
| 063-112-007 | 155-14E-18 | Adam \& Alma Lopez | 4534 Carter Ct, Chino, CA 91710 |
| 063-121-005 | 15S-14E-18 | Adam \& Alma Lopez | 4534 Carter Ct, Chino,CA 91710 |
| 063-122-006 | 15S-14E-18 | Dennis H \& Arlene M Devermont et al | PO Box 421217, San Diego,CA 92142 |
| 063-122-007 | 15S-14E-18 | Joseph R Flores | PO Box 1204, Boulevard,CA 91905 |
| 063-122-008 | 155-14E-18 | Maximiano \& Consuelo Torres | PO Box 605, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 063-122-009 | 15S-14E-18 | Maximiano \& Consuelo Torres | PO Box 605, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 063-141-001 | 15S-14E-18 | Gary A \& Sue W Shumard | 647 Desert Gardens Dr, El Centro,CA 92243 |

[^2]The owner's/gramtor's mailing address is not necessarily the same as the affected parcer'saddress
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 063-142-001 | 155-14E-18 | B Wesley \& Susan A Blakely et al | 2391 Desert Gardens Dr, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 064-072-001 | 155-14E-18 | R T \& C L BW SA Mills II | PO Box 1804, El Centro,CA 92244 |
| 064-074-026 | 155-14E-18 | Lydell W \& Elizabeth M Gordon | 975 W Evan Hewes Hwy, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 064-082-003 | 155-14E-18 | Gabriel Medina | PO Box 4122, El Centro, CA 92244 |
| 064-082-004 | 155-14E-18 | Jose Ramon Topete | 1126 Wanda St, Crockett, CA 94525 |
| 064-082-005 | 15S-14E-18 | Robert Melendrez | 1418 Hayes Ct, Calexico, CA 99231 |
| 064-082-010 | 15S-14E-18 | Larry \& Patricia Rose | PO Box 995, Imperial,CA 99251 |
| 064-082-011 | 15S-14E-18 | John R Hansen | 310 West Tenth, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-082-048 | 15S-14E-18 | Lydell W \& Elizabeth M Gordon | 975 W Evan Hewes Hwy, EI Centro,CA 92243 |
| 064-162-001 | 155-14E-18 | Angelita Ramirez | 400 South N St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-162-002 | 15S-14E-18 | Gutierrez Real Estate Investments | 2950 Sandalwood Ct, El Centro, CA 92243 |
| 064-162-005 | 15S-14E-18 | loe \& Linda Esparza | 421 W 6th St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-162-012 | 155-14E-18 | Joe \& Linda D Esparza | 421 W 6th St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-163-003 | 15S-14E-18 | Alejandra Yanez | 522 So N St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-163-004 | 15S-14E-18 | David \& Jaan Wilson | 123 W 23rd St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-163-005 | 15s-14E-18 | William George \& Rita C Wilson Tr | 522 W 4th St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-163-006 | 15S-14E-18 | Wilston William George \& Rita C Wilson Tr | 522 W 4th St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-163-007 | 15S-14E-18 | Almon Dale Martin | PO Box 176, San Manuel,AZ 85631 |
| 064-173-003 | 15S-14E-18 | Miguel \& Rosa L Ybarra | 601 E 2nd St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-173-004 | 15S-14E-18 | Jo E or Aurora Guizar | 690 W Neckel Rd, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-173-005 | 15S-14E-18 | LN Pena | 612 S N St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| 064-173-007 | 15S-14E-18 | Hope \& Ferrere Petra Estrada et al | 600 S N St, Imperial, CA 92251 |
| 064-174-003 | 15S-14E-18 | Chevron USA Inc | PO Box 1392, Bakersfield, CA 93302 |
| 064-174-004 | 15S-14E-18 | Chevron USA Inc | PO Box 1392, Bakersfield,CA 93302 |
| 064-174-006 | 15S-14E-18 | Gregorio Garcia | 602 E 2nd St, Imperial,CA 92251 |

[^3]${ }^{2}$ The owner'sfgrantor's mailing address is nor necessarily the same as the affected parcel'saddress
IMPERIAL

| Assessor's Parcel No. | T-R-S | Owner's/Grantor's Name | Owner's/Grantor's Mailing Address ${ }^{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $064-460-001$ | $15 S-13 E-34$ | Meyer Imperial Investments III LLC | 2921 B S Kish Ave, Yuma,AZ 85365 |
| $064-460-007$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | MSPM Associates LP | $2815 A$ Lafayette Ave, Newport Beach,CA 92663 |
|  |  |  |  |
| $064-470-046$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Donald L \& Marilyn J Scoville et al | PO Box 394, El Centro,CA 92244 |
| $064-470-091$ | $15 S-14 E-31$ | Cole PB Portfolio I LP | 3111 W Allegheny Ave, Philadelphia,PA 19132 |
| $064-542-005$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Jose \& Margarita Ordonez | 901 N 17th St, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-006$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Humberto \& Martha Aguilera | 1701 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-007$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Julieta Anduro | 1715 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-008$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Robert Jones | 1735 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-009$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Joe Heger Farms LLC | PO Box 880, El Centro,CA 92244 |
| $064-542-010$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Carlos Vasquez | 649 Cinnabar St, Imperial,CA 92251 |
| $064-542-011$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Jesus \& Marisa Torres | 1801 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-012$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Ramon \& Ana Bertha Mendoza | 1815 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 0 |  |  |  |
| $064-542-013$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Lopez Jorge I \& Velasquez Mayra | 1835 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-014$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | George \& Margarita Ontiveros | 1855 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-015$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Efrain A Jr \& Bethzabe L Tanori | 1875 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| $064-542-016$ | $15 S-13 E-36$ | Elifonso M \& Linda A Nava | 1895 Stacey Ct, El Centro,CA 92243 |
| 0 |  |  |  |
| 0 | Francisco \& Alma Rosa Cervantes | 902 N 19th St, El Centro,CA 92243 |  |

${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the ${ }^{\circ}$ Court Order"), Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to theCourt Order.
${ }^{2}$ The owner's/grantor's mailing address is not necessarily the same as the afferted parcer'saddress
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## TITLE OF DOCUMENT

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 

TODD SMITH, DIRK REGAN and CAROL REGAN, JACQUELYN SHELDRICK, GLENN L. BOOM, and WILLIAM NELSON and LINDA NELSON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS REPRESENTATIVES OF A CLASS OF PERSONS SIMILARLY SITUATED,

Plaintiffs,
v.

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LLC; SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.; LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC; and WILTEL COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Defendants.
CASE NO. 3:11-cv-02599-TEH

## EASEMENT DEED BY COURT ORDER IN SETTLEMENT OF LANDOWNER ACTION

WHEREAS, the parties to the above-captioned class action (the "Action") entered into a
California Class Settlement Agreement, as of September 5, 2012, (the "Settlement Agreement") (terms capitalized herein and not otherwise defined shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Settlement Agreement);

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2013, the Court entered a final Order and Judgment approving the Settlement Agreement and ordering that this Action may be settled as a class action on behalf of the following class:
[A] class under the Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement Class"), defined as follows:
a class comprising all Persons who own or who claim to own, for any period of time during a Compensation Period, any Covered Property, except for: (1) Right-of-Way Providers and their predecessors, successors, parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates, past or present; (2) federal, state, and local governmental entities; (3) Native American nations and tribes; or (4) any Person who files a valid and timely exclusion on or before the Opt-Out Deadline.

Members of this Class are referred to below as Class Members; and
WHEREAS, the Settlement Agreement provides for the entry of an Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action by which the Settling Defendants acquire, to the extent that Class Members have the right to transfer it, a permanent telecommunications easement in the Right of Way adjacent to the property of each Class Member;

## THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT:

1. To the extent that each Class Member owns rights in the Easement Premises (as hereafter defined), the Class Member (the "Grantor") hereby grants to whichever of Sprint Communications Company L.P., Qwest Communications Company, LLC, Level 3 Communications, LLC, and WilTel Communications, Inc. has Designated for inclusion under a Settlement Agreement the Right of Way which adjoins, underlies or includes Covered Property owned by the Class Member, together with its successors, assigns, and licensees (the "Grantee"), a permanent telecommunications easement in the Easement Premises. For each county in which this Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action is being recorded, a list of affected Class Members and their affected parcels is attached as Exhibit 1. Exhibit 1 shall describe Class Members' affected parcels with the following information, to the extent that it is in the Database of Identification Information: owner name; owner mailing address; tax map identification number; tax parcel identification number; lot number; and section, township, and range. Exhibit 1 may describe Class Members' affected parcels with any other available information.
2. The terms and conditions of the permanent telecommunications easement that is the subject of this Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action are:
a perpetual easement and right of way (hereinafter, together with the rights and privileges herein granted, the "Easement") and right to place, lay, bury, construct, install, operate, repair, Case Number: 3:11-cv-02599-TEH Easement Deed by Court Order in Settlement of Landowner Action
maintain (including aerial patrol), renew, rebuild, replace, upgrade, expand, relocate, and remove fiber optic cables, copper cables, coaxial cables or other cables through which voice, data, video or other signals are transmitted, conduits, inner ducts, hand holes, splice vaults, poles, optical or electronic equipment, regenerator huts, marker posts or signs, and other related facilities appropriate for installation, use, or maintenance of such cables (collectively, the "Telecommunications Cable System"), in, on, over, under, through and/or across the Easement Premises. The Easement Premises means all that real property that (a) either (i) is included within a parcel of property that is described in Exhibit 1 or (ii) has a common boundary with a parcel of property described in Exhibit 1 (the "Grantor's Property") (for purposes of this Telecommunications Cable System Easement Deed, a parcel of property shall be deemed to have a common boundary with the Easement Premises if it is separated by a non-navigable river or a street, road, or highway, other than a numbered state or federal highway) and that (b) (i) is or was used as a railroad right of way ("Railroad Right of Way") and (ii) is on a side of the centerline of the Railroad Right of Way that is next to the Grantor's Property (the "Grantor Side"), and (iii) extends no more than ten (10) feet on each side of the Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System (A) as it existed on November 21, 2012 (B) where the actively used components of the Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System are moved or placed, provided, however, that only a single 20 -foot easement per moved component may exist at any point in time in the Easement Premises, and the width of the moved component's Easement Premises shall be reduced on one side and increased by an equal linear footage on the other side wherever necessary in order that it shall in all places remain solely within the limits of a single Grantor Side of the Railroad Right of Way, and (C) where new components are installed to connect the existing Telecommunications Cable System to the edge of the Right of Way. The
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Easement shall be construed to grant Grantee all rights necessary to abandon in place unused components of Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System.

The Easement shall not include the right to construct on the Easement Premises regenerator huts and similar structures ("Buildings") in addition to those existing on November 21, 2012. The Easement shall include the rights to repair, replace, and expand existing Buildings, provided, however, that no such repair, replacement, or expansion shall increase the site that the Buildings occupy, or the height of any Building, by more than twenty-five percent. The Easement does not permit the construction of microwave towers, cell towers, or other components of a primarily aboveground statewide Telecommunications Cable System.

The Easement includes the right to temporarily use the entire Grantor Side of the Railroad Right of Way for construction or maintenance, so long as Grantee uses its best efforts not to interfere with any real property which, although within the boundaries of the Easement Premises, is actually being used by Grantor; provided, however, that in no event shall Grantee be prohibited from using such real property if it is commercially reasonable to do so under the circumstances or if Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System is currently located within such area. The Easement shall include the right of reasonable ingress and egress to and from the Easement Premises over that portion of the Grantor's real property that underlies the Railroad Right of Way and, for repair and maintenance, over any existing private roads of Grantor, where access from public or railroad roads is not reasonably practical, provided Grantee has made commercially reasonable efforts to give prior notice to Grantor of Grantee's use of Grantor's private roads. Grantee shall not be liable for damages caused by its removal of trees, undergrowth, and brush within the Easement Premises necessary or appropriate for the enjoyment of the Easement. Nothing contained herein shall constitute a waiver of any right that

Grantor may have for any damages to Grantor's property outside of the Easement Premises caused by Grantee's action. If Grantee's action causes damage to any of Grantor's existing improvements, including houses, garages, shops, sheds, and fences, or growing crops, which are within the Easement Premises, Grantee shall pay reasonable compensation to the Grantor for such damage to the extent provided by law.

From and after June 24, 2013, subject to all the restrictions and limitations stated herein, the Easement includes the right to construct and install additional components of a Telecommunications Cable System within the Easement Premises. Grantee agrees that unless (a) it is required to do so by the railroad or other owner of Railroad Right of Way or (b) it is commercially reasonable under the circumstances to do so, it will not install additional components of a Telecommunications Cable System in the area of the Easement Premises that is outside a parallel fence constructed by the railroad or other owner of Railroad Right of Way or is actually being used by the Grantor or its successor, provided, however, that the foregoing shall not be binding upon Grantee if Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System is currently located within such area. If Grantee's action causes damage to any of Grantor's existing improvements, including houses, garages, shops, sheds, and fences, or growing crops, which are within the Easement Premises, Grantee shall pay reasonable compensation to the Grantor for such damage to the extent provided by law.

The Easement includes all rights necessary to the lawful occupation of the Easement Premises by an existing Telecommunications Cable System, and by any additional Telecommunications Cable System that is constructed and installed by or on behalf of Grantee in the Easement Premises and that is owned or operated by either (a) Grantee or (b) any person or entity to which Grantee sold, granted, leased, or otherwise transferred or may hereafter sell,
grant, lease, assign, or otherwise transfer, all or any part of the rights in or use of such Telecommunications Cable System.

The Easement, however, does not apply to any Telecommunications Cable System that existed on November 21, 2012, but that was acquired by Grantee after that date (unless such Telecommunications Cable System or component thereof was acquired from any of Sprint Communications Company L.P.; Qwest Communications Company, LLC, f/k/a Qwest Communications Corporation; Level 3 Communications, LLC, Level 3 Communications, Inc., and Level 3 Telecom Holdings, Inc.; WilTel Communications, Inc.; WilTel Communications, LLC; and Williams Communications, LLC, f/k/a Williams Communications, Inc., f/k/a Vyvx, Inc.).

No oil, gas, or other mineral rights are granted and no existing oil, gas, or other mineral rights are expanded, limited, or affected by this instrument, provided, however, that Grantor shall not use a method of extraction that interferes with or impairs in any way the Easement, the Telecommunications Cable System, or the exercise of Grantee's rights herein.

Grantor shall not, nor shall Grantor authorize others to, construct or create any road, reservoir, excavation, obstruction, structure, or building or change the land grade on, in, over, under, through, or across the Easement Premises without the prior written consent of Grantee, provided that nothing herein shall be construed to affect the rights and obligations of any railroad with respect to the use, improvement, or alteration of its Railroad Right of Way, as provided in any agreement between the railroad and the Grantee, by applicable law, or otherwise.

It is understood and agreed that the Easement is not exclusive and is subject to all preexisting uses and pre-existing rights to use the Easement Premises, whether such uses are by Grantor or others and whether for surface uses, crossings, or encroachments by communication
companies or utilities. It is further understood and agreed that Grantor retains all of its existing rights, if any, to grant, convey, assign, and restrict any and all rights (including future rights and uses) on the Easement Premises, provided, however, and notwithstanding the foregoing, that Grantor shall not use or authorize others to use the Easement Premises in a manner that interferes with or impairs in any way Grantee's Telecommunications Cable System or the exercise by Grantee of the rights granted herein.

Subject to the terms hereof, Grantee shall have all other rights and benefits necessary or useful to the full and complete enjoyment and use of the Easement for the purposes stated herein, including the right to sell, grant, lease, or otherwise transfer all or any part of the rights in or use of the Telecommunications Cable System.

Grantor conveys the Easement without warranty of title to any property interest in the Easement Premises. This instrument does not address and shall not affect any real property rights, including the priority of interests, between Grantor and any railroad or between Grantee and any railroad, or any of their predecessors, successors, past or present predecessors in interest, successors in interest, successors in title, members, partners, parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, lessees, assigns, and past, current, or future licensees or assignees. This Easement is not intended to impact or diminish any railroad's existing rights or property interests in the Right of Way. This Easement shall not be construed to permit Grantee to interfere with railroad operations. This Easement also shall not permit any component of a Telecommunications Cable System to remain in a Railroad Right of Way except (a) under existing or future agreements with the railroad or (b) in any Railroad Right of Way in which no railroad operates and no railroad retains any right, title, or interest. This Easement also shall not permit any new components to be installed to connect the existing Telecommunications Cable System to the edge of the Right
of Way in any Railroad Right of Way as to which the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Surface Transportation Board has entered an order, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 10903, that the railroad is authorized to cease to provide or maintain rail service over that right of way and the railroad no longer provides or maintains rail service over that line, provided that if the railroad does not cease such rail service or later reactivates such service, then this limitation shall not apply.

This Telecommunications Cable System Easement Deed is executed and delivered on behalf of Grantor for the purpose of granting the Easement to Grantee in, on, over, under, through and/or across the Easement Premises to the full extent of Grantor's right, title or interest, if any, in or to the Easement Premises, and the Easement granted hereby shall affect the Easement Premises only to the extent of Grantor's right, title, and interest therein. Grantor and Grantee agree that this Telecommunications Cable System Easement Deed shall not grant any rights to the Easement Premises, or any portion thereof, in which Grantor holds no right, title or interest.

No rights reserved to Grantor herein shall be deemed to expand rights reserved to Grantor under any other easement, right of way, license, lease, or any similar instrument or court order. No limitation herein on the rights of Grantee shall be deemed to limit rights heretofore granted by Grantor or its predecessors in interest under any other easement, right of way, license, lease, or any similar instrument or court order.

The terms and provisions of this instrument shall constitute covenants running with the land and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Settling Defendants, the Grantor, their successors, assigns, personal representatives, and heirs.

This instrument fully sets forth the terms and conditions of the Easement. There are no oral or other written agreements between Grantor and Grantee that modify, alter, or amend this instrument.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the Easement, rights and privileges unto Grantee, its successors and assigns in perpetuity or until such time as Grantee shall cause the Easement to be released of record.
3. Settling Defendants may record this Easement under the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

Date: 6/27/13


Honorable Thelton E. Henderson, Judge United States District Court
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## LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PORTIONS OF TRACT 37 , T13 SOR18 EAST, SBMIN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNTA

## GRANTORS:

## SPRINKLE, BETTY J/ICSR 681

 LEBLANC, EUGENE LOUIS JR/ICSR 681 TRACT 37/ICSR 681113 SO R18 EAST SBM/ICSR 681 ICSR 681/T13 SO R18 EAST SBM




## Narrative Overview

CitySwitch seeks approval for a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP"), a Height Variance ("Variance") and any other permits or approvals necessary in order to install a communications facility on property located at 637-639 Sidewinder Rd N, Felicity, CA 92283. CitySwitch proposes to erect this tower and will be offering it as a shared facility to Union Pacific (with whom CitySwitch already has a commitment), AT\&T Mobility, and any other communication carriers that have a need for a facility in this area. CitySwitch thus submits this Application (as that term is defined in Sections 92404.01 and 92405.01 of the Imperial County Land Use Code (the "Code")) seeking a CUP and Variance for the siting and construction of a new communication facility.

The proposed site is located in a S-2, Open Space/Preservation zone. Pursuant to Sections 90519.02(d) of the Code, Communication Facilities are allowed in this district with CUP approval. The property consists of a railroad line in the desert, located approximately 1,200' north of the on-ramp to l-8.

The wireless communications facility that CitySwitch is proposing to install on the property for Union Pacific and AT\&T is necessary to provide critical communications for the railroad line and uninterrupted AT\&T wireless services to the residents and visitors of Felicity and the surrounding area, including wireless telephone service, voice paging, messaging and wireless internet and broadband data transmission. All registered wireless providers' technology operate at various radio frequency bands allocated by the FCC as part of their license.

Wireless systems operate on a grid system where overlapping cells mesh together, forming a seamless network. No single site can function as a stand-alone entity as each site is interconnected, forming the network. The technical criteria for establishing cell sites are very exacting as to the location and height. The proposed site at 637-639 Sidewinder Rd N, Felicity, CA 92283 is within the geographic area deemed necessary by radio frequency engineers for the anchor wireless telecommunications providers to provide uninterrupted services.

In accordance with Sections 92402.01 s and 92405.01 of the Code, CitySwitch is submitting this Application to install a new Communications Facility. The proposed new communications
facility will consist of a $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ tall monopole tower with a $10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ to be located within a $57^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime} \times 45^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ ground area.

After the initial construction, the facility is unstaffed and will only require service technicians, in a pick-up/van sized vehicle, to visit the site approximately once per month. Access will be provided via an easement with the proposed access entry point off Sidewinder Rd $N$. The only utilities required to service the facility are power and fiber. The site is entirely selfmonitored through a sophisticated alarm system which is connected to a main switch station. The system alerts personnel to any equipment malfunction or breach of security. Additionally, there is no impact on Imperial County's utilities such as water and sanitation, as they are not used at the site.

In accordance with FCC regulations, the mobile service facility will not interfere with any form of communications, including but not limited to, land-line phones, cable and satellite television and radio broadcasts. Wireless technology has become a vital part of emergency services, aiding local residents and motorists in a variety of situations, thus helping to protect the general public's health, safety and welfare. The proposed communications facility at this site will further enhance goals of providing the most reliable wireless coverage possible in this area.

The proposed communications facility will be designed and constructed to meet all applicable governmental and industry safety standards. Specifically, CitySwitch will comply with all FCC and FAA rules and regulations regarding construction requirements and technical standards. RF emissions are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the FCC, and the proposed facility will comly with the FCC's RF emission standards.. Any height, lighting or marking issues are also subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the FAA, and the proposed facility will comply with the FAA's requirements for height, lighting, and marking.

LCC Telecom Services and Sherman \& Howard, on behalf of CitySwitch, look forward to working with Imperial County to bring the benefits of the proposed improved wireless services to the area. The addition of the facility will ensure improved railroad communications and the best uninterrupted wireless services for Imperial County. This application addresses all applicable standards of Sections 92404.01 and 92405.01 of the Imperial County Zoning Ordinance and satisfies the requirements of those sections.

## Compliance with Section 92404.01 - General Requirements for Communications Facilities

All new, altered and re-permitted communication facilities in unincorporated areas of Imperial County, with the exception of those exempted under Section 92401.03 , shall meet the following general requirements, regardless of the zone in which they are located:
A. Zones. Wireless communication facilities may be located in all base zones which allow such facilities, upon approval of a conditional use permit as described below.

Telecommunications towers, along with related equipment are allowed with CUP approval in the S-2 Open Space/Preservation zone pursuant to Section 90519.02(d) of the ordinance.
B. Use Permit Required. All wireless communication facilities and all wired or fiber regeneration facilities other than those designated as exempt under Section 92401.03 require a conditional use permit (CUP). To obtain a conditional use permit, a hearing is required before either the planning director or the planning commission, as provided for in Title 9.

The proposed wireless communications facility is not exempt under Section 92401.03, therefore CitySwitch has applied for a CUP, and will follow the CUP process provided for in Title 9.
C. Building Permit Required. All communication facilities shall require a building permit issued by the county of Imperial.

If and when the CUP has been approved, CitySwitch will apply for the necessary building permits through Imperial County.
D. Design Consistency with the Surrounding Environment. To the maximum extent feasible, all wireless communication facilities and all regeneration facilities shall blend in with the predominant features of the existing natural and/or built environments in which they are located. To this end, co-location, stealth mounts, structure mounts and ground mounts are particularly encouraged.

Due to the diminutive size of the parcel and the tower's location adjacent to the railroad tracks in the desert, there will be little impact on the surrounding environment.
E. Height. All communication facilities shall conform to the following height requirements:

1. All communication facilities shall be of the minimum functional height, with additional provisions for co-location, as allowed in the respective base zone unless a variance is approved concurrent with a CUP. (For example, if the number of colocators that a particular facility is designed for is four and the required height is eighty (80) feet, then the allowed height of the facility would be one hundred ten (110) feet and if it is five co-locators, then it would be one hundred twenty (120) feet).

The proposed monopole tower is designed to be $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ with a $10^{\prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. The proposed height is the minimum functional height for Union Pacific and AT\&T to provide the necessary coverage for the area. A height variance has been requested as part of this application. See Site Plans
2. All communication facilities constructed within three-quarters mile of a scenic corridor (as designated by the Imperial County General Plan) shall conform with the height limit in the zone in which they are located. New facilities that are co-located with an existing facility may exceed their zone's height limit, provided that the installation of the new facility does not require a height increase of the existing facility.

According to the General Plan, the area is designated as Recreation/Open Space, there is no designation of a scenic corridor in the vicinity. Therefore, this section does not apply.
3. Outside of the three-quarter-mile range of a designated scenic corridor, communication facility, except an exempt facility, may exceed one hundred twenty (120) feet. A bonus of twenty (20) additional feet per facility, up to a maximum height of three hundred (300) feet, is permissible for operators co-locating on a single facility.

The proposed tower height is $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ and a height variance has been requested as part of this application.
4. No roof-mounted wireless communication facility, except an exempt facility, may be more than twelve (12) feet taller than the roof of the building on which it is mounted, unless facility is fully screened and height does not exceed height permitted by applicable zoning code.

The application is for a new communications tower facility and not a rooftop facility, Therefore, this section does not apply.
5. If an operator wishes to apply for an exception to these height limitations, then the facility shall be subject to the provisions at Title 9 relating to conditional use permits and variances hearing processes.

The proposed tower height is $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ and a height variance has been applied for as part of this application.
F. Screening. All communication facilities shall be screened to the maximum extent possible, pursuant to the following requirements.

1. Ground- and tower-mounted antennas and all sound structures shall be located within areas where substantial screening by vegetation, landform and/or buildings can be achieved. Additional vegetation and/or other screening may be required as a condition of approval. Each structural screening shall be based on a recommendation from the planning department having addressed the visual impacts, which in some instance may, in fact, warrant no screening.

No screening is proposed with this application. The proposed tower site is within the railroad right-of-way in the desert with no residential structures in the area.
2. The projection of structure-mounted antennas from the face of the structure to which they are attached shall be minimized.

The proposed wireless communications facility is a new tower, not a co-location on an existing structure. Therefore, this section does not apply.
3. Roof-mounted antennas shall be set back from the edge of the roof a distance greater than or equal to the height of the antenna, except when the antennas are fully screened. For roofmounted antennas, a screening structure that is architecturally compatible with the building on which it is mounted may also be required as a condition of approval. Antenna panels mounted flush on the outside of the parapet wall of an existing building and painted to match the exterior of the building may be allowed.

The proposed wireless communications facility is a new tower, not a co-location on an existing structure. Therefore, this section does not apply.
G. Radio Frequency Exposure. No communication facility shall be sited or operated in such a manner that it poses, either by itself or in combination with other such facilities, a
potential threat to public health. To that end, no communications facility or combination of facilities shall produce at any time power densities that exceed the current FCC adopted standards for human exposure to RF fields. Certification that a facility meets this standard is required. A copy of the certification from the FCC shall be submitted to the county.

All spectrum used by both railroad users and wireless providers are solely regulated by the FCC which includes the power densities, therefore, no signals will exceed the current FCC adopted standards for human exposure.
H. Cabling. For structure-mounted antennas, all visible cabling between equipment and antennas shall be routed within the building wherever feasible, or on the roof below the parapet wall. Cabling on the exterior of a building or monopole shall be located within cable trays painted to match. All cabling shall be performed in accordance with the NEC (National Electrical Code).

All cabling is proposed for the interior of the monopole and will be in accordance with the NEC guidelines. In the event that any future cabling needs to be on the exterior of the tower, a cable tray painted to match the tower will be used.
I. Painting and Lighting. All facilities shall be painted or constructed of materials to minimize visual impact. All towers shall be painted in a non-reflective and preferably earth tone color. All towers shall be lit with approved lighting as required by the FAA and the Airport Land Use Commissions Standards.

The proposed tower is going to be galvanized metal which is a non-reflective material. The proposed tower is going to be $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ with a $10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $180^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ which is below the 200' threshold requiring lighting per the FAA. Therefore, no lighting will be provided.
J. Noise. All communication facilities shall be designed to minimize noise. If a facility is located in or within one hundred (100) feet of a residential zone, noise attenuation measures shall be included to reduce noise levels to a maximum exterior noise level of fifty (50) $L$ dn at the facility site's property lines.

The proposed wireless communications facility does not generate significant noise. The proposed facility will not initially have a back-up generator, therefore there will be no noise generated at the site. There are no residential zone parcels within one hundred (100) feet of the proposed facility Therefore, no noise attenuation measures will be necessary.
K. Accessory Structures. Enclosures and cabinets housing equipment related to a wireless communication facility shall meet setback and height restrictions for such structures in
their zones. Such structures shall appear architecturally compatible (as determined by the planning director evaluating the facility on the basis of color and materials) with their surroundings and be designed to minimize their visual impact. To meet this requirement, underground vaults may be required.

The proposed facility will be in compliance with all local, state and federal guidelines, therefore the zero setback will be applicable. Additionally, the equipment will be architecturally compatible with the rest of the communications facility and surrounding area.
L. Roads and Parking. Communication facilities shall be served by the minimum roads and parking areas necessary and shall use existing roads and parking areas whenever possible.

A 12' wide gravel access road is proposed to run parallel to the train tracks in the Union Pacific right-of-way. The access road will connect to Sidewinder Road N., just south of the tracks.
M. Provisions for Future Co-location. All commercial communication facilities shall be encouraged to promote future facility and site sharing. Technical evidence will be provided as to the infeasibility either technical and/or economic, of co-location or grouping prior to the issuance of a new use permit for a facility that would not be considered to be co-located or grouped under this ordinance.

There is an existing tower owned by SBA Structures, LLC which is located approximately 0.36 miles southeast of the proposed tower site. AT\&T is currently colocated on that tower, however, the lease rate has sharply increased over the term of the agreement and has caused an economic burden which is shown in the attached Sworn Statement of Spencer Gambrell in Support of New Tower Construction from AT\&T Mobility Services LLC. As shown on the drawings the proposed tower is designed to potentially add five additional future carriers.
N. Removal Upon Discontinuation of Use. All equipment associated with a communication facility shall be removed within one hundred eighty (180) days of the discontinuation of the use and the site shall be restored to its original pre-construction condition. The operator's agreeing to such removal and allowing the county access across private property to effect such removal shall be a condition of approval of each permit issued. At its discretion, the county may require a financial guarantee acceptable to the county to ensure removal.

CitySwitch agrees to removal of the tower in the event it is no longer in use for more than 180 days as a condition of the Conditional Use approval.
O. Principal or Accessory Use. Antennas and towers may be considered either principal or accessory uses. A different existing use of an existing structure on the same lot shall not preclude the installation of an antenna or tower on such lot.

The proposed wireless communications facility is an accessory use on the property to the principal use of the railroad. As stated above, this will not preclude the installation of antennas on within the right-of-way.
P. Lot Size. For purposes of determining whether the installation of a facility complies with county development regulations, including, but not limited to, setback requirements, lot-coverage requirements, and other such requirements, the dimensions of the entire lot shall control, even though the antennas or towers may be located on lease parcels within such lot. This shall also take into consideration the height of the tower in the event of a failure whereby it could fall thereby crossing property lines.

The proposed tower is going to be located within the railroad right-of-way, therefore the development regulations do not strictly apply to this facility because there is no actual lot size. The proposed tower will be designed to collapse onto itself in the unlikely event of a failure. The surrounding area is desert, so even an unlikely failure will not have an impact.
Q. Inventory of Existing Sites. Each applicant for a facility shall provide to the planning director an inventory of its existing towers, antennas, or sites approved for facilities, that are either within the jurisdiction of Imperial County or within one mile of the border thereof, including specific information about the location, height and design of each facility. The planning director may share such information with other applicants applying for administrative approvals or special use permits under this ordinance or other organizations seeking to locate facilities within the jurisdiction of Imperial County, provided, however that the planning director is not, by sharing such information, in any way representing or warranting that such sites are available or suitable.

## See attached Coverage Plots.

R. Aesthetics. Towers and antennas shall meet the following requirements:
a. Towers shall either maintain a galvanized steel finish, or, subject to any applicable standards of the FAA, be painted a neutral color so as to reduce visual obstructiveness.

The proposed tower will maintain a galvanized steel finish so as to reduce visual obstructiveness.
b. At a tower site, the design of the buildings and related structures shall, to the extent possible, use materials, colors, textures, screening, and landscaping that will blend them into the natural setting and surrounding buildings.

The proposed support equipment will consist of galvanized metal equipment cabinets that are similar to gym lockers. The materials will match the tower and fit in with the natural surroundings.
c. If an antenna is installed on a structure other than a tower, the antenna and supporting electrical and mechanical equipment must be of a neutral color that is identical to, or closely compatible with, the color of the supporting structure so as to make the antenna and related equipment as visually unobstructive as possible.

The proposed wireless communications facility is a new tower, not a co-location on an existing structure, therefore this provision does not apply.
S. Lighting. Towers shall not artificially lighted, unless required by the FAA or other applicable authority. If lighting is required, the lighting alternatives and design chosen must cause the least disturbance to the surrounding views and community.

The proposed tower is going to be $170^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ with a $10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ lightning rod for a total height of $\mathbf{1 8 0}^{\prime}-\mathbf{0}^{\prime \prime}$ which is below the $200^{\prime}$ threshold requiring lighting per the FAA, therefore no lighting will be provided.
T. State or Federal Requirements. All towers must meet or exceed current standards and regulations of the FAA, the FCC and any other agency of the state or federal government with the authority to regulate towers and antennas. If such standards and regulations are changed, then the owners of the towers and antennas governed by this ordinance shall bring such towers and antennas into compliance with such revised standards and regulations as mandated by the controlling state or federal agency. Failure to bring towers and antennas into compliance with such revised standards and regulations shall constitute grounds for the removal of the tower or antenna at the owner's expense.

The proposed tower will meet and / or exceed all FAA, FCC and any other agencies of the State of California or federal government with authority to regulate towers and antennas. In the event of a change in regulations, CitySwitch and the providers colocated on the tower will make their equipment compliant.
U. Building Codes; Safety Standards. To ensure the structural integrity of towers, the owner of a tower shall ensure that it is maintained in compliance with standards contained in applicable state or local building codes and the applicable standards for towers that are published by the Electronic Industries Association, as amended from time to time. If, upon inspection, the county concludes that a tower fails to comply with such codes and
standards and constitutes a danger to persons or property, then upon notice being provided to the owner of the tower, the owner shall have thirty (30) days to bring such tower into compliance with such standards. Failure to bring such tower into compliance within said thirty (30) days shall constitute grounds for the removal of the tower or antenna at the owner's expense.

CitySwitch will be compliant with all Electronic Industries Association along with any local, state or federal guidelines relating to the construction and maintenance of the communications facility.
V. Measurement. For purposes of measurement, tower setbacks and separation distances shall be calculated and applied to facilities located in the unincorporated areas of the county of Imperial according to the provisions of Title 9 for the respective base zone.

Noted, the setbacks are shown on the drawings and the separation distance has been calculated based on the coordinates of the existing tower and the coordinates for the SBA tower shown on the FCC ASR Search website.
W. Not Essential Services. Towers and antennas shall be regulated and permitted pursuant to this ordinance and shall not be regulated or permitted as essential services, public utilities or private utilities.

CitySwitch, Union Pacific, and AT\&T Mobility are private corporations and are not essential service providers.
X. Franchises. Owners and/or operators of towers or antennas shall certify that all franchises required by law for the construction and/or operation of a communication system in Imperial County have been obtained and shall file a copy of all required franchises with the planning director.

Any required certifications of franchise will be filed with Imperial County as required.
Y. Public Notice. For purposes of this ordinance, any conditional use permit request, variance request, or appeal of an administratively approved CUP or special use permit shall require public notice to all abutting property owners and all property owners of properties that are located within the corresponding separation distance listed for a CUP or variance in the respective base zone, under Title 9, in addition to any notice otherwise required by the planning director.

CitySwitch will comply with any notice obligations for the CUP process, to the extent the public notice is not required by Imperial County.
Z. Signs. No signs shall be allowed on an antenna or tower except as may be required by law or another permitting or licensing agency.

The only signage displayed on the communications facility site will be that which is required by federal regulations, specifically those signs needed for health and safety reasons.

AA. Buildings and Support Equipment. Buildings and support equipment associated with antennas or towers shall comply with requirements of Title 9.

All support equipment used in the communications facility will comply with the requirements of Title 9.

BB. Multiple Antenna/Tower Plan. Imperial County encourages the users of towers and antennas to submit a single application for approval of multiple towers and/or antenna sites. Applications for approval of multiple sites shall be given priority in the review process.

CitySwitch is submitting three (3) total applications for sites within Imperial County.

## Compliance with Section 92405.01 - Wireless Communications Permitting Requirements

All communication facilities not specifically exempted from these regulations are subject to one of the two permit processes described below. Both processes include a conditional use permit and may have a concurrent variance. Applications for all permits required pursuant to this division shall be made in writing on a form prescribed by the planning director, and shall be accompanied by plans and data to assure the fullest practical presentation of facts for the permanent record. Such application shall be accompanied by a fee or fees as may be set by the board of supervisors. No part of such fee shall be refundable.
A. Conditional Use Permit before the planning director. Certain communication facilities may be conditionally approved by the planning director, as described in this subsection.

1. Qualifying Facilities. The following types of communication facilities qualify for a use permit before the planning director:
a. Receive-only radio and television antennas and satellite dishes or antennas that do not qualify for exemption under Section 92401.3, including multiple antennas or dishes on a single parcel.
b. Amateur radio facilities that do not qualify for exemption under Section 92401.3. When required, a conditional use permit before the planning director shall be granted to amateur radio operators with no fee.
c. Communication facilities installed on publicly owned property, regardless of zone, provided they comply with the general requirements in Section 92401.04 and hold an executed license or lease agreement.
d. Co-located communication facilities, regardless of zone, provided they comply with the general requirements in Section 92401.04.

The proposed wireless communications is located within the Union Pacific right-of-way and does not qualify for a CUP before the Planning Director.
2. Required Findings. In order for the planning director to approve a proposed communication facility under a conditional use permit, the planning director shall make the findings required for a conditional use permit, as well as, the following additional findings:
a. The facility complies with all applicable Section 92401.04.

The application includes all items required in Section 92401.04 and complies with all requirements in said section.
b. The facility either 1) does not require an RF environmental evaluation report as described in Section 92401.08, or 2) the RF environmental evaluation report for the facility shows that the cumulative radio-frequency energy emitted by the facility and any nearby facilities will be consistent with FCC regulations.

The proposed installation is not required to included a RF Environmental Evaluation Report as spelled out in Section 92401.08.
c. The facility blends in with its existing environment and will not have significant adverse visual impacts.

The proposed tower is being located within an existing railroad right-of-way in the desert and will not have a significant adverse visual impact on surrounding area.
3. Administrative Approval Process. The planning director may administratively approve a proposed communication facility by using the following process:
a. Each applicant for administrative approval shall apply to the planning director providing the information and fees set forth in Section 92401.09 of this ordinance.
b. The planning director shall review the application shall review the application for administrative approval and determine if the proposed use complies with Sections 92401.04 and 92401.05 of this ordinance.
c. The planning director shall respond to each such application within sixty (60) days after receiving it by either approving or denying the application.
d. In connection with any such administrative approval, the planning director may, in order to encourage shared use, administratively waive any setback requirements or separation distances between towers in the base zone by up to fifty percent (50\%).
e. In connection with any such administrative approval, the planning director may, in order to encourage the use of monopoles, administratively allow the reconstruction of an existing tower to monopole construction.
f. If an administrative approval is denied, the applicant shall file an application for a conditional use permit pursuant to Section 91401.05B. prior to filing any special appeal that may be available under the Title 9.

The proposed wireless telecommunications facility requires a Conditional Use Permit and a Height Variance, therefore this site does not meet the criteria for an Administratively Approved site.
4. List of Administratively Approved Uses. The following uses may be approved by the planning director after conducting an administrative review:
a. Locating a tower, antenna or facility, including the placement of additional buildings or other supporting equipment used in connection with said tower or antenna, in any industrial or heavy commercial zone or a grouped facility.
b. Locating antennas or existing structures or towers consistent with the terms of subsections (1) and (2) below.
(1) Antennas on existing structures. Any antenna, which is not attached to a tower, may be approved by the planning director as an accessory use to any commercial, industrial, professional, institutional, or multi-family structure of eight or more dwelling units, provided:
(a) The antenna does not extend more than thirty (30) feet above the highest point of the structure;
(b) The antenna complies with all applicable FCC and FAA regulations;
(c) The antenna complies with all applicable building codes.
(2) Antennas on existing towers. An antenna which is attached to an existing tower may be approved by the planning director and, to minimize adverse visual impacts associated with the proliferation and clustering of towers, collocation of antennas by more than one carrier on existing towers shall take precedence over the construction of new towers, provided such collocation is accomplished in a manner consistent with the following:
(a) A tower which is modified or reconstructed to accommodate to collocation of an additional antenna shall be of the same tower type as the existing tower, unless the planning director allows reconstruction as a monopole.
(b) Height.
(i) An existing tower may be modified or rebuilt to a taller height, not to exceed thirty (30) feet over the tower's existing height, to accommodate the collocation of an additional antenna.
(ii) The height change referred to in subsection (b)(i) may only occur one time per communication tower.
(iii) The additional height referred to in subsection (c)(i) shall not require an additional distance separation. The tower's premodification height shall be used to calculate such distance separation.
(c) On-site location.
(i) A tower which is being rebuilt to accommodate the collocation of an additional antenna may be moved onsite within fifty (50) feet of its existing location.
(ii) After the tower is rebuilt to accommodate collocation, only one tower may remain on the site.
(iii) A relocation onsite tower shall continue to be measured from the original tower location for purposes of calculating separation distances between towers pursuant to the base zone.
(iv) The onsite relocation of a tower which comes within the separation distances to residential units or residentially zoned lands shall only be permitted when approved by the planning director.
c. New towers in nonresidential zones. Locating any new tower in a nonresidential zone other than industrial or heavy commercial, provided a licensed professional engineer certifies that the tower can structurally accommodate the number of shared users proposed by the applicant; the planning director concludes the tower is in conformity with the goals set forth in [Section] 92401.00 and the requirements of Section 92401.04; the tower meets all setback and separation requirements of the base zone; and the tower meets the following height and usage criteria:
(1) For a single user, up to ninety (90) feet in height;
(2) For two users, up to one hundred twenty (120) feet in height; and
(3) For three or more users, up to one hundred twenty (120) feet in height; and
(4) For four or more users up to one hundred eighty (180) feet in height.
d. Locating any alternative tower structure in a zone other than industrial or heavy commercial that in the judgment of the planning director is in conformity with the goals set forth in Section 92401.00 of this ordinance.
e. Installing a cable microcell network through the use of multiple low-powered transmitters/receivers attached to existing wireline systems, such as conventional cable or telephone wires, or similar technology that does not require the use of towers.

The proposed wireless telecommunications facility requires a CUP and a Variance for height. Therefore, this site does not meet the criteria for an Administratively Approved site.
B. Conditional Use Permit before the planning commission. All other communication facilities or any facility requiring an exception to these regulations shall require a conditional use permit with a public hearing before the planning commission.

1. Qualifying Facilities. A conditional use permit is required for any communication facility that is not exempt under these regulations and that does not qualify for a conditional use permit before the planning director.

The proposed 170'-0" monopole tower is not exempt under Section 92401, therefore a Conitional Use Permit and Variance for height are required.
2. Required Findings. In order for the planning commission to approve a proposed communication facility under a conditional use permit, the commission shall make the findings required for a conditional use permit, as well as the following additional findings:
a. No alternative site or design is available that would allow for issuance of a conditional use permit before the planning director for the facility. This finding shall be based on the results of an alternatives analysis, as described in Section 92401.06, below.

AT\&T Mobility is currently located on the existing SBA tower which is approximately 0.36 miles southeast of the proposed location. At the current lease rate, AT\&T is burdened by the high rent, as stated in the attached Sworn Statement of Spencer Gambrell in Support of New Tower Construction from AT\&T Mobility Services LLC. Should SBA be allowed to continue charging above market rates, AT\&T will not be able to upgrade its equipment and stay competitive in the market.
b. Facility either 1) does not require an RF environmental evaluation report as described in Section 92401.08, or 2) the RF environmental evaluation report for the facility shows that the cumulative radio frequency exposure emitted by the facility and any nearby facilities will be consistent with FCC regulations.

The proposed installation is not required to included a RF Environmental Evaluation Report as spelled out in Section Section 92401.08.
c. The facility blends in with its existing environment and will not have significant visual impacts.

As stated above, the proposed facility is located within the Union Pacific railroad right-of-way and is located in the desert. The proposed facility will not have a significant visual impact on the surrounding area.
4. Conditional Use Permit Process. Applications for conditional use permits under this subsection shall conform to the requirements of Section 92401.04 and shall be subject to the procedures and requirements of Title 9 relating to the granting of conditional use permits.

The proposed application is in conformity with Section 92401.04 and Title 9 relating to the granting of the Conditional Use Permit.
5. Conditions. In granting a conditional use permit, the planning commission may impose conditions to the extent the planning commission concludes such conditions are necessary to minimize any adverse effects if the proposed facilities on adjoining properties.

CitySwitch is aware that the Planning Commission may impose conditions on the Conditional Use Permit to minimize adverse effects on the adjoining properties.

## TITLE 9

DIVISION 4: SIGNS, PARKING, FENCE, HOME OCCUPATIONS, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS AND CANNABIS \& INDUSTRIAL HEMP OPERATIONS

CHAPTER 1: SIGNS<br>CHAPTER 2: PARKING<br>CHAPTER 3: FENCES<br>CHAPTER 4: HOME OCCUPATIONS<br>CHAPTER 5: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUS)<br>CHAPTER 6: CANNABIS \& INDUSTRIAL HEMP OPERATIONS

## CHAPTER 1: SIGNS

| $\S 90401.00$ | PURPOSE/APPLICATION |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\S 90401.01$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR MONUMENT SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.02$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/POLE SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.03$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/SIGNS ATTACHED TO BUILDINGS |
| $\S 90401.04$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/OFF-SITE ADVERTISING SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.05$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/TEMPORARY REAL ESTATE SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.06$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/TEMPORARY SUBDIVISION SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.07$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/PERMANENT SUBDIVISION AREA |
|  | SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.08$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION |
|  | SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.09$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/TEMPORARY CAMPAIGN SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.10$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/AGRICULTURAL SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.11$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS/AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.12$ | DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT STANDARD/INSTITUTIONAL IDENTIFICATION |
| $\S 90401.13$ | SIGNS |
| $\S 990401.14$ | PROHIBITED SIGNS |
| $\S 90401.15$ | SPECIAL SIGN PROVISIONS |
| $\S 90401.16$ | DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR WIND-FETHERED |
| $\S 99401.17$ | BANNER FLAG SIGNS (FEATHER SIGNS) |
| $\S 90401.18$ | NON-CONFORMING SIGNS |
| ILLUSTRATIONS |  |

90401.00 PURPOSE/APPLICATION

The purpose and intent of this Chapter is to provide and promote for the orderly and attractive construction, placement, and display of signs throughout the County of Imperial. It is the policy of the County of Imperial that the primary purpose of signs is for identification and public information. All signs shall be located on the property on which they are advertising unless otherwise specified. Signs that cause a distraction and present potential safety hazards, as well as, aesthetic problems or public nuisance problems are discouraged and/or prohibited. The provisions of this Chapter serve as specific development standards to be applied in addition to the sign codes required under the building construction provisions.

## $\S \quad 90401.01$

Freestanding monument signs shall comply with all of the following standards.
A. No monument sign shall be located within the existing road right-of-way or designated future road right-of-way.
B. The maximum area of the sign shall not exceed 48 square feet per side.

The proposed location is within the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way and will designed to mininimize the adverse effects of this application. Further, CitySwitch will work with the County Officials to provide the best possible design for the proposed site.
6. Professional Engineer. Any information of an engineering nature that the applicant submits, whether civil, mechanical or electrical, shall be certified by a licensed professional engineer.

All required information relating to the engineering of this site will be certified a California licensed professional engineer, including all civil, mechanical or electrical documents.

## Conditional Use Permit Standards

90203.09 Action on a conditional use permit.

An application for a conditional use permit shall be reviewed, and approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the decision-making authority.

The authority may approve or conditionally approve an application only if it finds all of the following:
A. The proposed use is consistent with the goals and policies of the adopted county general plan;

## Legislative Mandate

For the reasons stated above, the California legislature has established the General Plan as the comprehensive statement of public policy by which to evaluate all decisions regarding the development of land, the extension of public infrastructure, and the conservation and wise use of natural resources.

Although wireless telecommunications is not technically the extension of public infrastructure, it does serve the general public as a service that is essential to the fabric of Imperial County. Wireless technology has become as important to society as all other forms of public infrastructure such as roads, water, electricity and others.

## County Population

The West Shores communities of Salton City, Salton Sea Beach, and Desert Shores are also largely retirement and recreation communities, though increasingly their populations are becoming more diversified. These communities experience a noticeable increase in population during the winter months when visitors converge to the area to avoid cold, wet winters in other parts of the United States and Canada.

The comprehensive plan acknowledges the influx of "snow-birds" in the winter months causing a noticeable increase in the population. A robust wireless infrastructure is essential to the common good of the population of Imperial County because with the seasonal change in population, a strong wireless network is critical.

## Public Safety

Additional public safety is provided by the County Fire Department/Office of Emergency Services in cooperation with the incorporated cities and volunteer units in the unincorporated communities. The County Fire Department's main facility is located at the County Airport in Imperial.

## Conditional Use Permit Standards

### 90203.09 Action on a conditional use permit.

An application for a conditional use permit shall be reviewed, and approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the decision-making authority.

The authority may approve or conditionally approve an application only if it finds all of the following:
A. The proposed use is consistent with the goals and policies of the adopted county general plan;

## Legislative Mandate

For the reasons stated above, the California legislature has established the General Plan as the comprehensive statement of public policy by which to evaluate all decisions regarding the development of land, the extension of public infrastructure, and the conservation and wise use of natural resources.

Although wireless telecommunications is not technically the extension of public infrastructure, it does serve the general public as a service that is essential to the fabric of Imperial County. Wireless technology has become as important to society as all other forms of public infrastructure such as roads, water, electricity and others.

## County Population

The West Shores communities of Salton City, Salton Sea Beach, and Desert Shores are also largely retirement and recreation communities, though increasingly their populations are becoming more diversified. These communities experience a noticeable increase in population during the winter months when visitors converge to the area to avoid cold, wet winters in other parts of the United States and Canada.

The comprehensive plan acknowledges the influx of "snow-birds" in the winter months causing a noticeable increase in the population. A robust wireless infrastructure is essential to the common good of the population of Imperial County because with the seasonal change in population, a strong wireless network is critical.

## Public Safety

Additional public safety is provided by the County Fire Department/Office of Emergency Services in cooperation with the incorporated cities and volunteer units in the unincorporated communities. The County Fire Department's main facility is located at the County Airport in Imperial.

Companies like CitySwitch have worked with local emergency service agencies to allow for the placement of equipment in and around their facilities. Additionally, with AT\&T co-locating on the tower, 5 G will be a part of the installation. 5 G technology is used by first responders to create a network which supports their needs in the time of crisis which will provide better response times and services by local emergency services.
B. The proposed use is consistent with the purpose of the zone or sub-zone within which the use will be located;

The proposed communications facility is consistent with the with the purpose of the zone within which it will be located. Per Section 90519.00, the "primary intent" of the $\mathrm{S}-2$ zone is "to preserve the cultural, biological, and open space areas that are rich and natural as well as cultural resources. The S-2 zone is dominated by native desert habitat and stark topographic features. While certain uses are allowed within the S-2 zone, such uses must be compatible with the intent of the open space and conservation element of the general plan."

In this case, a communications facility is an allowable use in the zone with conditional use approval. The site is located approximately 0.23 miles north of I-8 and will serve to ensure a robust wireless network for AT\&T and Union Pacific in this area.
C. The proposed use is listed as a use within the zone or sub-zone or is found to be similar to a listed conditional use according to the procedures of Section 90203.10;

Communications towers are an articulated conditional use in the S-2 (Open Space/Preservation) zone pursuant to Section 90519.02(d) of the Imperial County Zoning Ordinance.
D. The proposed use meets the minimum requirements of this title applicable to the use and complies with all applicable laws, ordinances and regulations of the county of Imperial and the state of California;

The proposed communications facility meets the minimum requirements of this title applicable to the use as addressed above and complies with all applicable laws, ordinances and regulations of Imperial County and the State of California.
E. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the public or to the property and residents in the vicinity;

Due to the diminutive size of the proposed equipment, it will not have an adverse effect on the surrounding properties nor the character of the area. Wireless
transmissions do not interfere with any other form of communications whether public or private, or in any way endanger the general welfare by reason of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare or odors. Wireless telephones provide an alternate communication system which has repeatedly proven its effectiveness in emergency situations and is commonly being used by police and fire departments to protect the general public's health, safety, and welfare. All wireless telecommunications facilities are governed by FCC and FAA regulations. As such, all spectrum used to provide a wireless signal are allocated by the FCC which has deemed the signals will not cause any health-related affects.
F. The proposed use does not violate any other law or ordinance;

The application on behalf of CitySwitch, Union Pacific and AT\&T conforms to the applicable regulations of the S-2 zone and the facility in allowable as a conditional use in that zone. The proposed wireless telecommunications facility is also designed to conform to all federal, state and local regulations.
G. The proposed use is not granting a special privilege.

No special privilege will be granted to CitySwitch, Union Pacific or AT\&T by granting the Conditional Use Permit. AT\&T is currently located on an existing tower owned by SBA Structures, LLC approximately 0.36 miles southeast of the proposed location. At the current lease rate, AT\&T is burdened by the high rent, as stated in the attached Sworn Statement of Spencer Gambrell in Support of New Tower Construction from AT\&T Mobility Services LLC. Should SBA be allowed to continue charging above market rates, AT\&T will not be able to upgrade its equipment and stay competitive in the market.

## Variance Standards

The planning director, the planning commission and/or the board of supervisors, shall approve, approve subject to conditions or disapprove a variance with the following findings:
A. Findings. Approval or conditional approval may be granted only if the director/commission/board of supervisors first determines that the variance satisfies the criteria set forth in Government Code Section 65906, and the following findings can be made:

1. That there are special circumstances applicable to the property described in the variance application, that do not apply generally to the property or class of use in the same zone or vicinity;

The proposed location has special circumstances that are not applicable to other properties in the area. The proposed location is within Union Pacific's right-of-way and will host communication equipment for railroad use and will also service wireless providers. The property is located in a railroad right-of-way within the desert, there are no residential properties in the area that would be affected.
2. That the granting of such variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or vicinity in which the property is located;

The proposed variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or vicinity. The area is a mostly undeveloped area in the desert located approximately 0.33 miles north of Interstate 8. The location is far removed from any residential uses.
3. That because of special circumstances applicable to subject property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of zoning laws is found to deprive subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical zone classifications;

There are special circumstances applicable to subject property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of zoning laws is found to deprive subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical zone classifications. The proposed location is within Union Pacific's right-of-way and will host communication equipment that will service wireless providers along with the railroad's needs. The height required for the proposed tower is necessary to allow for the Union Pacific Railroad and AT\&T to utilize the tower to provide the necessary signal.
4. That the granting of such variance will not adversely affect the comprehensive general plan.

The granting of such variance will not adversely affect the comprehensive general plan. As previously stated:

## Legislative Mandate

For the reasons stated above, the California legislature has established the General Plan as the comprehensive statement of public policy by which to evaluate all decisions regarding the development of land, the extension of public infrastructure, and the conservation and wise use of natural resources.

Although wireless telecommunications is not technically the extension of public infrastructure, it does serve the general public as a service that is essential to the fabric of Imperial County. Wireless technology has become as important to society as all other forms of public infrastructure such as roads, water, electricity and others.

## County Population

The West Shores communities of Salton City, Salton Sea Beach, and Desert Shores are also largely retirement and recreation communities, though increasingly their populations are becoming more diversified. These communities experience a noticeable increase in population during the winter months when visitors converge to the area to avoid cold, wet winters in other parts of the United States and Canada.

The comprehensive plan acknowledges the influx of "snow-birds" in the winter months causing a noticeable increase in the population. A robust wireless infrastructure is essential to the common good of the population of Imperial County because with the seasonal change in population, a strong wireless network is critical.

## Public Safety

Additional public safety is provided by the County Fire Department/Office of Emergency Services in cooperation with the incorporated cities and volunteer units in the unincorporated communities. The County Fire Department's main facility is located at the County Airport in Imperial.

Companies like CitySwitch have worked with local emergency service agencies to allow for the placement of equipment in and around their facilities. Additionally, with AT\&T co-locating on the tower, 5 G will be a part of the installation. 5 G technology is used by first responders to create a network which supports their needs in the time of crisis which will provide better response times and services by local emergency services.
B. Conditions of Approval. In approving a variance, the director/commission/board of supervisors may impose such conditions deemed necessary to enable making the findings listed under subsection A of this section.
C. Denial of Variance. Where the director/commission/board of supervisors cannot make the findings under subsection $A$ of this section (with or without conditions) the variance shall be denied.

## Alternatives Analysis

For a facility requiring a conditional use permit before the planning commission, an alternatives analysis shall be prepared by or on behalf of the operator, as described below.
A. Alternatives to be Considered. The alternatives analysis shall consider alternative locations and designs for the proposed facility, including those which would not require a conditional use permit. At a minimum, alternatives included in the analysis shall include: (1) co-location at all existing communication facilities whether in the unincorporated area of the county, a city or an adjacent county; (2) lower, more closely spaced communication facilities; and (3) mounting on any existing nonresidential structure within one-half mile of the proposed facility in the unincorporated area of Imperial County. The alternatives analyzed shall be approved by the planning director. For facilities to be located near an incorporated city, the analysis shall also explain why siting within the city is not possible.

Union Pacific and AT\&T have considered co-location on existing facilities and deemed that no other tower in the area is appropriate for the following reasons.
(1) As stated in previous narrative, AT\&T is currently on an SBA Structures, LLC tower approximately 0.36 miles southeast of the proposed CitySwitch facility. AT\&T has deemed this tower to be economically burdensome as shown in the attached Sworn Statement of Spencer Gambrell in Support of New Tower Construction from AT\&T Mobility Services LLC. In addition, Union Pacific requires direct access to their equipment along the railroad line and the ability to upgrade as needed which would be much more difficult locating on the SBA tower.
(2) Providing lower towers more closely spaced out would not benefit AT\&T, Union Pacific or the County. When evaluating a network, carriers such as AT\&T require specific height and locations based on the existing network. Lowering the height and building more towers would create a degradation of the signal in the area. Doing this would create coverage gaps in some areas and a bleed over into other cell sites.
(3) AT\&T is currently on an SBA Structures, LLC tower approximately 0.36 miles southeast of the proposed CitySwitch facility. The proposed tower is in a nonresidential area, north of I-8. The nearest incorporated city is Yuma, Arizona which is approximately 4.75 miles southeast of the proposed tower which would not be a possible alternative. As stated above, due to the economic burden on AT\&T it is no longer desirable to co-locate on this tower.
B. Findings. The alternatives analysis shall show whether or not the proposed siting and design would have the least possible environmental and visual effect on the community and whether any alternative site or design is available that would allow for issuance of a conditional use permit before the planning director for the facility.

The proposed location for the CitySwitch communications facility is within the right-of-way of the Union Pacific railroad line northwest of I-8 and Sidewinder Rd N . The proposed location is in the desert in an unpopulated area. With the SBA tower being located 0.36 miles southeast of the proposed facility, Imperial County has already deemed that a communications facility would be visually acceptable in this area. Additionally, CitySwitch has chosen to use a monopole design for the tower which is the least obtrusive design for a 170' tower in this area.
C. Review. The planning director may, at his or her discretion, employ on behalf of the county an independent technical expert to review this alternative analysis. The operator shall bear the reasonable costs of this review.
Based on the information submitted in the Sworn Statement of Spencer Gambrell in Support of New Tower Construction from AT\&T Mobility Services LLC, included as part of this application, CitySwitch believes a third party is not necessary, however, if deemed necessary by the planning director, CitySwitch will bear the reasonable costs for this review.

# Sworn Statement of Spencer Gambrell in 

 Support of New Tower Construction from AT\&T Mobility Services LLC
## Sworn Statement of Spencer Gambrell in Support of New Tower Construction from AT\&T Mobility Services LLC

# SWORN STATEMENT OF SPENCER GAMBRELL IN SUPPORT OF NEW TOWER CONSTRUCTION 

## BY CitySwitch II-A, LLC

| PULASKI COUNTY | ) ss. |
| :--- | :--- |
| STATE OF ARKANSAS |  |

SPENCER GAMBRELL, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that:

1. I am an adult resident of the State of Arkansas and serve as Director-Network Planning for AT\&T Wireless ("AT\&T").
2. I manage AT\&T's high-rent relocation program, under which AT\&T identifies high-cost or economically burdensome antenna site leases that accommodate AT\&T's communications equipment and materially inhibits AT\&T from improving or maintaining wireless services and relocates its communications equipment onto lower-cost alternative antenna site lease locations to either improve or maintain wireless coverage.
3. I am familiar with the proposed tower to be constructed by CitySwitch II-A, LLC ("CitySwitch") at 637-639 Sidewinder Road, Felicity, California 92283 APN 056-470-002 (the "CitySwitch Towerl"). I am also familiar with the existing communications tower (the "SBA Tower" owned by SBA Towers II, LLC ("SBA") which is located at 612 Sidewinder Road, Winterhaven, California 99283. Both the existing SBA Tower and the location of the proposed CitySwitell Tower are located in AT\&T's coverage search ring for this part of Imperial County.
4. AT\&T currently leases space on the SBA Tower, along with related ground space at the base of the SBA Tower, to locate its communications equipment (the "Wireless Facilities"). AT\&T has located its Wireless Facilities on the $5 B A$ Tower since [Old site lease commencement month \& year] but AT\&T
now desires to relocate its Wireless Facilities onto the CitySwitch Tower as the SBA Tower has become a high-cost antenna site structure for AT\&T.
5. This sworn statement is made to attest that having its Wireless Facilities remain on the SBA Tower, which is the only existing communications support structure in AT\&T's search ring, is economically burdensome for AT\&T and would not result in the same cost-effective operation as compared to what AT\&T could achieve if it relocated its Wireless Facilities to the Cityswitch Tower and, thus, would materially inhibit AT\&T from improving and maintaining wireless services.

## Co-Location on the SBA Tower is Economically Burdensome.

6. AT\&T maintains a co-location agreement with SBA for the SBA Tower. Under this agreement, SBA increases the rent, assesses other costs and poses other logistical issues when AT\&T installs additional Wireless Facilities on the SBA Tower. AT\&T anticipates future rent increases and costs from SBA if it remains co-located at the SBA Tower. Those rent increases and costs would result from, among other things, AT\&T's equipment rights on the SBA Tower.
7. The current rent charged by SBA to co-locate on the SBA Tower is over [Three] times what CitySwitch will charge AT\&T to co-locate on the CitySwitch Tower. Pursuant to the agreement between $A T \& T$ and City Switch, annual rent increases are less than the annual rent increases charged by SBA . At the current rate of rent increases, over the next twenty (20) years, the difference in rent paid by AT\&T to remain on the SBA Tower versus relocating on the CitySwitch Tower is well over [Four] million dollars.
8. Since AT\&T located on the SBA Tower in [3/24/2006], rent and escalators have become more competitive in the tower marketplace. New tower companies have entered the marketplace since [3/24/2006], which has also led to more competitive economic terms in tower lease agreements. Considering these competitive economic terms from other tower companies, AT\&T has requested tower rent reductions from SBA. Unlike other tower companies, SBA has resisted an economically sustainable cost structure with its existing AT\&T co-location leases, such that many of these leases have become economically burdensome for AT\&T.
9. Decommissioning an existing Wireless Facility in favor of moving to an alternate tower location is something AT\&T will only do in limited circumstances. AT\&T will bear a significant capital cost in decommissioning its Wireless Facilities installation on the SBA Tower and relocating to the CitySwitch Tower. Despite these relocation costs, the CitySwitch Tower remains a better co-location option for AT\&T.
10. AT\&T has made this determination because the current rents and other charges to co-locate on the SBA Tower have been categorized as high-cost as compared to other existing sites in AT\&T's portfolio and the rents charged by other tower companies, such as CitySwitch
11. AT\&T has entered into nationwide development and master lease agreements with City Switch, which I am familiar with. Under these agreements, City Switch will construct, at its own expense, its own communications towers upon which AT\&T will lease space to install its Wireless Facilities. AT\&T does not bear any costs for the construction of a tower owned by CitySwitel.
12. Per these agreements and as is the case with the Cityswitch Tower, AT\&T pays CitySwitch rent in return for 30,000 square inches of wind load surface area of loading and defined space on each tower and does not pay increased rent for additions to its Wireless Facilities provided said facilities remain within the predetermined space and loading limits. The agreed upon tower space and loading limits have taken into consideration the future additions and upgrades projected for AT\&T's Wireless Facilities.
13. There are no other structures (other than the SBA Tower) located in AT\&T's search ring capable of accommodating its Wireless Facilities.
14. The economic terms imposed upon AT\&T by SBA to remain co-located on the SBA Tower are not cost-effective and are economically burdensome for AT\&T especially when the nearby CitySwitch Tower presents a more competitive and flexible co-location option.

## The CitrSwitch Tower Provides Superior Mobile Service Functionality.

15. Technological changes and market trends in the wireless communications industry require AT\&T to continuously upgrade its Wireless Facilities. AT\&T is also obligated to build out FirstNet, which is our country's first nationwide integrated data network for providers of emergency services.

AT\&T's lease agreement for the SBA Tower does not include "set aside" capacity reserved for the future needs of AT\&T's Wireless Facilities. Every time AT\&T desires to improve the Wireless Facilities installed on the SBA Tower, it must apply to SBA which then triggers an application fee and a lengthy administrative review process, which typically includes a structural analysis of the tower and an amendment to the existing lease agreement. This administrative process may take several months and results in unnecessary time delay and additional costs in the deployment of the upgraded Wireless Facilities.
16. Conversely, AT\&T's master tower lease agreement with CitySwith allows AT\&T to rent 30,000 square inches of tower space and loading on a CitySwitch Tower. This space and loading capacity is reserved exclusively for AT\&T and will accommodate the needs for AT\&T's Wireless Facilities well into the future. This arrangement benefits AT\&T because it increases the speed of deploying Wireless Facilities and gives AT\&T greater flexibility to upgrade technologies and respond to the ever-changing coverage and capacity demands of its wireless network and does not materially inhibit AT\&T from improving and maintaining its wireless services. Provided it does not exceed the reserved space and capacity limits in the co-location agreement, AT\&T is free to upgrade its Wireless Facilities on the City Switch Tower with little to no delay.

Spencer Gambrell

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28 day of Felana, 2023.
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## FAA Determination Letter

Mail Processing Center
Federal Aviation Administration
Southwest Regional Office
Obstruction Evaluation Group
10101 Hillwood Parkway
Fort Worth, TX 76177
Issued Date: 08/22/2022

Leslie Lindeman
Palm-Tech Consulting, LLC
11365 Little Bear Way
Boca Raton, FL 33428

## ** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

| Structure: | Antenna Tower Winterhaven |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Winterhaven, CA |
| Latitude: | $32-45-01.45 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NAD} \mathrm{83}$ |
| Longitude: | $114-45-20.84 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Heights: | 285 feet site elevation (SE) |
|  | 170 feet above ground level (AGL) |
|  | 455 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) |

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s), if any, is(are) met:

Based on this evaluation, marking and lighting are not necessary for aviation safety. However, if marking/ lighting are accomplished on a voluntary basis, we recommend it be installed in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 M.

This determination expires on $02 / 22 / 2024$ unless:
(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO

## SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTIC $\nrightarrow\llcorner$ CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOU. DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power, except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, effective 21 Nov 2007, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA.This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

If construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed, you must submit notice to the FAA within 5 days after the construction or alteration is dismantled or destroyed.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

A copy of this determination will be forwarded to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) because the structure is subject to their licensing authority.

If we can be of further assistance, please contact our office at (847) 294-7575, or vivian.vilaro@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2022-AWP-12871OE.

Fiequency Data for ASN 2022-AWP-1287^-JE

| LOW <br> FREQUENCY | HIGH <br> FREQUENCY | FREQUENCY <br> UNIT | ERP <br> ERP | UNIT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 7 |  |  |  |
| 6 | 7 | GHz | 55 | dBW |
| 10 | 11.7 | GHz | 42 | dBW |
| 10 | 11.7 | GHz | 55 | dBW |
| 17.7 | 19.7 | GHz | 42 | dBW |
| 17.7 | 19.7 | GHz | 55 | dBW |
| 21.2 | 23.6 | GHz | 42 | dBW |
| 21.2 | 23.6 | GHz | 55 | dBW |
| 614 | 698 | MHz | 42 | dBW |
| 614 | 698 | MHz | W |  |
| 698 | 806 | MHz | 1000 | W |
| 806 | 901 | MHz | 2000 | W |
| 806 | 824 | MHz | 5000 | W |
| 824 | 849 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 851 | 866 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 869 | 894 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 896 | 901 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 901 | 902 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 929 | 932 | MHz | 7 | W |
| 930 | 931 | MHz | 3500 | W |
| 931 | 932 | MHz | 3500 | W |
| 932 | 932.5 | MHz | 3500 | W |
| 935 | 940 | MHz | 17 | W |
| 940 | 941 | MHz | 1000 | W |
| 1670 | 1675 | MHz | 3500 | W |
| 1710 | 1755 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 1850 | 1910 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 1850 | 1990 | MHz | 1640 | W |
| 1930 | 1990 | MHz | 1640 | W |
| 1990 | 2025 | MHz | 5640 | W |
| 2110 | 2200 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 2305 | 2360 | MHz | 500 | W |
| 2345 | 2310 | MHz | 2000 | W |
| 2496 | 2360 | MHz | 2000 |  |
|  | 2690 | MHz | 500 |  |

.OPO Map for ASN 2022-AWP-12871-C



## Fall Zone Certification

March 3, 2023
Tim Cook
CitySwitch, LLC
1900 Century Place NE, Suite 320
Atlanta, GA 30345

RE: Proposed 170' Sabre Monopole for Winterhaven, CA
Dear Mr. Cook,
Upon receipt of order, we propose to design and supply the above referenced Sabre monopole for an Ultimate Wind Speed of 99 mph , Risk Category II, Exposure Category C, and Topographic Category 1, in accordance with the Telecommunications Industry Association Standard ANSI/TIA 222-H-2017 "Structural Standard for Antenna Supporting Structures, Antennas and Small Wind Turbine Support Structures". The monopole will also mee the requirements of the 2022 California Building Code.

When designed according to this standard, the wind pressures and steel strength capacities include several safety factors. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that the monopole will fail structurally in a wind event where the design wind speed is exceeded within the range of the built-in safety factors.

Should the wind speed increase beyond the capacity of the built-in safety factors, to the point of failure of one or more structural elements, the most likely location of the failure would be within the monopole shaft, above the base plate. Assuming that the wind pressure profile is similar to that used to design the monopole, the monopole will buckle at the location of the highest combined stress ratio within the monopole shaft. This is likely to result in the portion of the monopole above leaning over and remaining in a permanently deformed condition. This would effectively result in a fall radius of 30 feet or less at ground level. Please note that this letter only applies to the above referenced monopole designed and manufactured by Sabre Industries.

Sincerely,

Keith J. Tindall, P.E.
Vice President, Telecom Engineering
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## Lease



## TOWER CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT

This Agreement, made the $3^{\text {rd }}$ day of May , 2022 (the "Effective Date"), between Union Pacific Railroad Company, a Delaware corporatior, having an office at 1400 Douglas Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68179, hereinafter referred to as "Licensor", and CitySwitch - II-A, LLC, a Georgia company, having an office at 1900 Century Place, Suite 320, Atlanta, Georgia 30345 hereinafter referred to as "Licensee".

The term "Premises" as used in this Agreement, refers to a rectangle measuring approximately forty-five feet ( $45.00^{\prime}$ ), by fifty-seven feet ( $57.00^{\prime}$ ), containing a total of 2,656 square feet, combined with an approximate two hundred seventy-five feet ( $275.00^{\prime}$ ) by twelve feet ( $12.00^{\prime}$ ) access and utility corridor containing 3,300 square feet on the parcel of land on Licensor's railroad right-of-way and located in Felicity, California_, in the County of _Imperial_, as presented on the attached Plot Plan, described in Exhibit "A".

Licensor agrees to allow construction of a One Hundred Seventy foot (170') tower hereinafter referred to as the "Tower"), fenced compound and equipment cabinets (hereinafter referred to as the "Facilities") on the Premises for the location of Licensee's radio equipment; said Tower and Facilities shall be used by Licensee in conducting their communications activities on the Premises.

THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained, Licensor and Licensee agree as follows:

## 1. GRANT:

Licensor grants to Licensee the right to construct the Tower and Facilities together with non-exclusive rights of access for: (a) ingress and egress, seven (7) days a week, twenty-four (24) hours a day, on foot or motor vehicle (including trucks), and (b) the installation and maintenance of utility wires, poles, cables (including fiber optic cable), conduits, and pipes over, under, or along the Licensor's property, the location of said rights of access being limited to the locations shown on Exhibit "A" attached hereto. Licensee shall have the right to use the Premises for the location of the Tower and Facilities. Licensee shall be responsible for all costs and activities associated with the construction of the aforementioned Tower and Facilities. Equipment owned by and installed, operated and maintained by Licensee will be installed at the Premises. The Licensee's use of the Premises shall be subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including but not limited to, the General Terms and Conditions, attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof.

## 2. TOWER FACILITIES:

Licensor grants to Licensee the right to construct the Tower on the Premises for the installation of its communications antennas. The Tower and Facilities will be located within the area further defined on Exhibit "A" of this Agreement.

## 3. EQUIPMENT FACILITIES:

Licensor grants to Licensee the right to locate on the Premises, in an area close to the base of the Tower, one (1) concrete slab measuring sixteen ( $16^{\prime}$ ) feet by twenty-two ( $22^{\prime}$ ) feet] that will be used to mount the Tower and Facilities installed on the Premises by Licensee. The Facilities will be located within the area further defined on Exhibit "A" of this Agreement. Licensee may install, as part of the Facilities on the Premises all other related equipment, cables, accessories and improvements and any other items necessary to the successful and secure use of the Premises, subject to the other terms and conditions in this Agreement.

## 4. PLANS:

Licensee shall submit detailed site plans and technical specifications for the construction of the Tower and Facilities at the Premises to Licensor for Licensor's approval prior to the commencement of construction thereof. Licensor shall not unreasonably withhold, condition or delay such approval. The approved site plans shall be made a part of this Agreement and be attached to the Agreement as Exhibit "A". In the event any modifications to the Tower or Facilities, or any other improvements or installations on the Premises, are desired by Licensee or any approved sublicensees of Licensee, then the plans and technical specifications for such modifications, improvements or installations shall also be subject to Licensor's approval prior to commencement of construction thereof.

## 5. PERMIT:

Licensee shall have the obligation to apply to the municipality or any other state or federal authority, as may be required, for a permit to construct the Tower and Facilities at any time during the term of this Agreement. Licensee shall prepare, at its sole cost and expense, all site plans (i.e., engineering and architectural documents) which are required pursuant to its application for the foregoing permit.

Licensor agrees to reasonably cooperate with Licensee in its efforts to obtain any necessary permits from the municipality or any other state or federal agency, as the case may be. Licensor further agrees not to unreasonably withhold consent to any such application for and during the term of this Agreement, and further agrees to execute all necessary application forms that may be reasonably required. Licensor shall further appear for testimony before any municipal, state or federal board in the event same is required for approval. Any application so filed, however, shall be at the full cost and expense of Licensee, said cost and expense including, but not being limited to engineering fees, application fees, legal fees and such other costs as may be incidental to the pursuance of any such application.

Licensee shall be responsible for ensuring that all equipment installed by Licensee complies with the applicable rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission (hereinafter, the "FCC") and the electrical code and other applicable codes of any other governmental authority having jurisdiction over the Premises or such equipment prior to the installation thereof.

## 6. COST OF PERMUTS:

Licensee shall be responsible for payment of expenses for any and all necessary and/or required municipal permits to construct the Tower and Facilities on the Premises. Licensor agrees that it shall not unreasonably withhold or delay its consent of any such application or permit which may be required. Licensee shall pay any and all fees associated with the approval and/or construction of the Tower and Facilities. Licensor

In the event Licensee elects to relocate its Tower and Facilities to the alternative location, the parties shall execute new copies of approved Exhibit "A" as necessary, to reflect such change in the location of Licensee's Tower and Facilities at the Premises.

## 10. PROTECTION OF FIBER OPTIC CABLE:

Licensee represents and warrants that all work on the Premises performed by Licensee, its contractors, agents and/or employees will be in strict compliance with the provisions set forth in "PROTECTION OF SUBSURFACE FACILITIES ON LICENSOR'S PROPERTY" of the General Terms and Conditions.

In addition to the liability terms contained elsewhere within this Agreement, Licensee shall indemnify and hold Licensor harmless against and from all costs, liability and expense whatsoever (including, without limitation, attorneys' fees and court costs and expenses), arising out of or in any way contributed to by any act or omission of Licensee, its contractors, agents and/or employees, that cause or in any way contribute to (a) any damage to or destruction of any fiber optic cable telecommunications system located on the Premises by Licensee, its contractors, agents and/or employees, (b) any injury to or death of any person employed by or on behalf of any fiber optic cable telecommunications company and/or its contractors, agents and/or employees on the Premises, and/or (c) any claim or cause of action for alleged loss of profits or revenue by, or loss of service by a customer or user of, such telecommunications company or companies.

## 11. TERMINATION:

In the event that any municipal, state, federal or any other governmental authority prevents Licensee from occupying or operating Licensee's equipment at the Premises, or if in Licensee's reasonably exercised judgment, significant engineering, economic or other developments occur that prevent the economic feasibility of this Agreement, Licensee has the right to terminate this Agreement, upon providing Licensor with six (6) months prior notice and removing Licensee's equipment and restoring the Premises to its original conditions, except for reasonable wear and tear, and removing any underground structures to a depth that is mutually agreeable to the Parties.

The Licensee agrees that upon the expiration or termination of this Agreement or the abandonment of the Premises by the Licensee, the Licensee shall (a) remove from the Premises, at the expense of the Licensee, all structures, property and other materials not belonging to the Licensor; and (b) restore the surface of the ground to as good a condition as the same was in before such structures were erected and/or constructed, including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing the removal of foundations of such structures, the filling in of all excavations and pits, and the removal of all debris and rubbish, all of which shall be performed at the Licensee's expense. If the Licensee should fail to perform such removal, the Licensor may perform the work and the Licensee shall reimburse the Licensor for the cost thereof, within thirty (30) days after the bill is rendered. The Licensee's non-use of the Premises for the purposes described in this Agreement continuing for one (1) year shall be sufficient and conclusive evidence of such abandonment, unless the Licensee shall have notified the Licensor in writing of its reasons for such non-use, and shall continue to pay rent as and when due to the Licensor.

## 12. OWNERSHIP OF TOWER, FACILITIES AND RADIO EQUIPMENT:

It is understood and agreed that Licensee shall own the Tower and Facilities and all related radio equipment, and/or any such improvements constructed or placed on the Premises by Licensee.

## 13. OWNER'S RIGHT OF INSTALLATION:

Licensee hereby grants to Licensor the right, reasonably exercised, to locate antennas on the Tower and related radio equipment, upon the Premises, subject to a maximum of 10,000 square inches of wind loading and availability of space upon the Tower being available at the time of Licensor's desire to exercise said right.

Licensor shall assume all costs and liabilities associated with the installation, operation and maintenance of Licensor's equipment at the Premises.

Licensee shall charge Licensor no fee for the installation, operation and maintenance of Licensor's equipment at the Premises.

## 14. MAINTENANCE:

Licensee shall (i) be responsible for any and all improvements located upon the Premises by Licensee or any approved sublicensees, including the Tower and Facilities, and (ii) shall perform whatever remedial and preventive maintenance, repairs, construction and security which may be required to properly maintain the Tower and Facilities and the equipment located thereupon or therewithin.

## 15. PAYMENT:

Effective upon the first month following the Commencement Date, Licensee shall pay Licensot per year for the privileges and rights presented in this Agreement which rental shall increase by percent annually. At such time as the amount equal to of the total gross revenue collected by Licensee from all sublicenses at the Premises exceeds the amount of the then-current annual rental, Licensee shall then begin paying to Licensor the greater of the then-current rental per year, as increased by annually, 0 . . of the total revenue collected annually from Licensee's sublicenses at the Premises. The annual amount shall be paid in twelve monthly increments, each equal to one-twelfth of the annual total. Each monthly payment shall be made on or before the 20th day of each month.

Licensor shall have the right, no more than once per calendar year, to inspect and audit all of Licensee's documents, agreements, and records relating to the Premises, including any documents, agreements, and records of Licensee regarding billing and collection of fees payable or paid under any agreement related to the Premises, and Licensee shall, for as long as this Agreement remains in effect and for three (3) years following any expiration or termination of this Agreement, maintain copies of all such documents and records. In the event Licensor elects to inspect and audit any such documents and records and/or the payments made by the any person related to the Premises, if Licensor determines that Licensee has failed to pay Licensor any material amounts owed to Licensor hereunder, Licensee shall, in addition to paying Licensor any amounts found by such inspection and audit to remain unpaid, reimburse Licensor for its costs to complete such inspection and audit.

## 16. TERM:

This Agreement shall be for an initial term of ten (10) years, commencing on the date that Licensee starts construction ("Commencement Date"). The License shall automatically renew for three (3) additional term of five (5) years unless terminated under terms herein.

## 17. INTERFERENCE:

Licensor grants to Licensee the use of the Premises exclusively for the construction and use of the Tower and Facilities for the installation of radio communications equipment. The equipment installed by Licensee or its sublicensees shall transmit only on frequencies licensed for such equipment. Licensee shall be responsible for performing all radiofrequency ("RF") engineering studies to ensure that the placement of radio equipment at the Premises will not cause interference to existing equipment located near the Premises by Licensor or Licensor's Licensees, lessees or vendors, and Licensee shall submit such studies to Licensor for approval prior to installation.

If any radio equipment installed by Licensee causes RF interference with such existing equipment of Licensor or Licensor's Licensees, lessees or vendors, Licensee shall be responsible for eliminating or minimizing to an acceptable degree such RF interference within 48 hours after receipt after written notice of such interference from Licensor to Licensee by, for example, removing, replacing or repositioning the equipment causing such interference (hereinafter, the "Interfering Equipment"). In the event such interference is not eliminated or minimized to an acceptable degree within the aforesaid 48 hour period, Licensee or its client, as the case may be, shall discontinue use of the Interfering Equipment (except for intermittent operation for the purpose of correcting such interference). If said interference is not corrected within thirty (30) days after Licensee's receipt of the aforesaid notice from Licensor, Licensee shall remove the Interfering Equipment within an additional ten (10) day period.

## 18. INSURANCE:

Licensee and/or its contractors shall, at its sole cost and expense, procure and maintain during the life of this Agreement the following insurance coverage:
(a) General Liability insurance providing bodily injury including death, personal injury and property damage coverage with a combined single limit of at least $\$ 2,000,000$ each occurrence or claim and an aggregate limit of at least $\$ 4,000,000$. This insurance shall contain broad form contractual liability. Exclusions for explosion, collapse and underground hazard shall be removed. Coverage purchased on a claims made form shall provide for at least a two (2) year extended reporting or discovery period if (a) the coverage changes from a claims made form to an occurrence form, (b) there is a lapse/cancellation of coverage, or (c) the succeeding claims made policy retroactive date is different for the expiring policy.
(b) Automobile Liability insurance providing bodily injury and property damage coverage with a combined single limit of at least $\$ 2,000,000$ each occurrence or claim. This insurance shall cover all motor vehicles including hired and non-owned, and mobile equipment if excluded from coverage under the general public liability insurance.
(c) Workers' Compensation insurance covering Licensee statutory liability under the workers' compensation laws of the state(s) affected by this Agreement, and Employers' Liability. If such insurance will not cover the liability of Licensee in states that require participation in state workers' compensation fund, Licensee shall comply with the laws of such states. If Licensee is self-insured, evidence of state approval must be provided.
(d) Railroad Protective Liability insurance naming the Licensor as the insured with a combined single limit of $\$ 2,000,000$ per occurrence with a $\$ 6,000,000$ aggregate. The Licensee may meet this obligation with a commercial general liability policy with Endorsement CG2417Contractual Liability - Railroads, which amends the definition of an insured contract to include construction or demolition operations on or within 50 feet of a railroad. A binder of insurance for Railroad Protective Liability must be submitted to the Licensor and the original policy or a certified duplicate original policy must be forwarded to the Licensor when available.

Where permitted by law and subject to Licensee's indemnification obligations herein, Licensee and its insurers shall endorse the required insurance policy (ies) to waive their right of subrogation against Licensor. Licensee and its insurers also waive their right of subrogation against Licensor for loss of its owned or leased property or property under its care, custody and control. Licensee's insurance shall be primary with respect to any insurance carried by Licensor. The policy (ies) required under (a) and (b) above shall provide severability of interests and shall name Licensor as an additional insured with respect to liability arising from Licensee's operations for which Licensee has legally assumed responsibility herein.

Prior to commencing the any construction work, Licensee shall furnish to Licensor certificate(s) of insurance evidencing the required coverage. The certificate(s) shall contain a provision that obligates the insurance company (ies) issuing such policy (ies) to notify Licensor in writing of any material alteration including any change in the retroactive date in any "claims-made" policies or substantial reduction of aggregate limits, if such limits apply, or any cancellation at least thirty (30) days prior thereto.

The insurance policy (ies) shall be written by a reputable insurance company (ies) acceptable to Licensor or with a current Best's Insurance Guide Rating of B and Class VII or better and authorized to do business in the state(s) in which the Job Site is located.

The fact that insurance is obtained by Licensee shall not be deemed to release or diminish the liability of Licensee and/or its contractors, including, without limitation, liability under the indemnity provisions of this Agreement. Damages recoverable by Licensor shall not be limited by the amount of the required insurance coverage.

## 19. INDEMNIFICATION/HOLD HARMLESS:

Licensee agrees that it shall not, through its actions or omissions, (i) endanger the property or employees of Licensor located at the Premises or (ii) expose any person, including but not being limited to Licensor's employees, contractors, agents or Licensees, or Licensor's property, operations or facilities to any additional hazards. Licensee shall indemnify and hold Licensor and its affiliates, and the officers, agents and employees of each, harmless against and from any and all liability, loss, damage, claims, demands, costs and expenses (including court costs and attorneys' fees) arising directly out of Licensee's use of the Premises, including, without limitation its construction activity thereon pursuant to this Agreement, except for those
claims that are due to or caused solely by the negligence or intentional misconduct of Licensor, its affiliates, or the officers, agents, assigns, contractors and employees.

## 20. ASSIGNMENT:

The Licensee shall not assign this Agreement, or any interest therein, without the written consent of Licensor. Such consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned, or delayed. No assignment by Licensee shall relieve Licensee of any of its obligations and liabilities assumed hereunder.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Licensor agrees that Licensee shall have the right to freely assign its rights and obligations hereunder to any parent company, a wholly-owned subsidiary or affiliate of Licensee, an entity in the business of developing or operating telecommunication towers (excluding FCC licensed wireless carriers and existing Tower sublessees) or a purchaser of all or substantially all of Licensee's assets. The issuance of stock by Licensee shall not be deemed to be an assignment under the provisions of this Paragraph.

Subject to the provisions of this Paragraph, this Agreement shall be binding upon and insure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns.

## 21. SUBLEASE AUTHORITY:

Licensor acknowledges that Licensee's intent is to design the Tower and Facilities to accommodate sublicensing in the Premises to FCC licensed wireless carriers. Licensee shall not sublicense in the Premises to FCC licensed wireless carriers, in whole or in part, without Licensor's written consent. Such consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned, or delayed. Prior to sublicensing to FCC licensed carriers in the Premises, Licensee shall provide to Licensor a copy of the sublicensee's application, construction drawings, sublease agreement and construction schedule. Licensee shall not sublicense the Premises, in whole or in part, to unlicensed wireless carriers or other entities, without Licensor's written consent, which consent shall be in Licensor's sole and absolute discretion. Licensor hereby explicitly reserves the right to condition such consent upon additional financial consideration if the sublease is less than $\$ 1750$ per month (or $\$ 1250$ per month for DISH Wireless).

## 22. CASUALTY/CONDEMNATION:

In the event there is a total or partial destruction of the Premises by fire or other casualty (hereinafter, a "Casualty") and the Premises are, in Licensee's judgment, thereby rendered insufficient for Licensee's continued operations thereat and/or restoration thereof would not, in Licensee's reasonable judgment, be economically feasible and/or such restoration could not, in Licensee's reasonable judgment, be accomplished within a period of ninety (90) days from the date of such Casualty, Licensee shall have the right to terminate this Agreement upon thirty (30) days' notice to Licensor. In the event Licensee elects not to terminate this Agreement,
(a) Licensee shall have the right to restore those portions of the Premises upon which its Tower and Facilities are located and to reconstruct same thereupon at Licensee's sole cost and expense.
(b) In the event those portions of the Premises upon which Licensee's Tower and Facilities are located are, in Licensee's judgment, incapable of being restored, Licensor shall, upon request of and in consultation with Licensee, designate an alternative location at the Premises upon which Licensee may reconstruct its Tower and Facilities.

In the event the Premises, that portion of the Premises upon which Licensee's Tower and Facilities are located, or any significant portion of either is condemned or is otherwise subjected to a taking by any governmental authority exercising the power of eminent domain, this Agreement shall terminate as of the date upon which Licensee is required by the governmental authority to cease its operations at the Premises. Licensee shall be entitled to seek their own award against the condemning authority.

## 23. ARBITRATION:

All controversies relating to, in connection with, or arising out of this Agreement, its modification or making, the authority or obligations of the parties hereto, and whether involving the principals, agents, brokers or others who actually subscribe hereto, shall be settled by arbitration. The arbitration proceedings shall be held in the county and state in which the Premises is located and in accordance with the laws of the aforesaid state. The arbitration proceeding is to be governed by the American Arbitration Association and the "Rules of Arbitration" (hereinafter, the "Rules") as they exist at the time of the arbitration (including provisions as to payment of fees and expenses) and presided over by one arbitrator selected in accordance with the aforementioned Rules. Arbitration is the sole remedy hereunder. All notices or service in reference to arbitration or enforcement shall be deemed given if transmitted as required by the aforementioned Rules. The parties agree that any dispute or controversy related solely to an engineering matter, as mutually determined by Licensee and Licensor, shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the foregoing, except that the one presiding arbitrator shall be a professional licensed engineer or engineering consultant selected in accordance with the Rules.

## 24. FORCE MAJEURE:

To the extent that either party to this Agreement is prevented from discharging its duties by an event of Force Majeure, such as by reason of flood, war, fire, explosion or other catastrophe or act of God, both parties shall be temporarily excused from the performance of their obligations under this Agreement until such time as the Force Majeure event has abated.

## 25. INTEGRATED AGREEMENT:

It is agreed and understood that this Agreement including the Exhibits attached hereto and made a part hereof contains all of the agreements, promises, and understandings between Licensor and Licensee and that no prior written, verbal or oral agreements, promises or understandings shall be binding upon either Licensee or Licensor in any dispute, or proceeding at law.

## 26. GOVERNING LAW:

The performance of this Agreement shall be interpreted, construed, and regulated by the laws of the state of California.

## 27. LICENSOR'S REPRESENTATIONS:

Licensor covenants, represents and agrees it has the full right, power and authority to enter into, execute and deliver this Tower Construction Agreement.

## 28. SURVIVORSHIP:

This Agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of any respective successors and assigns of Licensor and Licensee, subject to prior restrictions on assignments by Licensee.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event there is any successor to Licensee, Licensee and/or such successor must notify Licensor of such succession within five (5) days after such event.

## 29. SEVERABILITY:

The unenforceability, invalidity, or illegality of any provision of this Agreement shall not render the remaining provisions unenforceable, invalid or illegal.

## 30. NOTICES:

All notices hereunder must be in writing and shall be validly given if sent via Registered or Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, addressed as follows (or any other address that the party to be notified may have designated to the sender by like notice):

To Licensor: Union Pacific Railroad Company
1400 Douglas Street - 0640
Omaha, Nebraska 68179
Attn.: Mike Wallman
To Licensee: CitySwitch - II, LLC
1900 Century Place, Suite 320
Atlanta, GA 30345
Attn: Legal

## 31. AUTHORITY TO SIGN:

Licensor and Licensee each represent that the signatories of this Agreement presently have full authority to enter into this Agreement and to bind and obligate their respective organizations to the terms, rights and obligations under this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have set their hands and seals this date.

ACCEPTED BY: Licensor Union Pacific Railroad Company

BY:

PRINT NAME: $\qquad$

TITLE: $\qquad$
DATE: $5 / 3 / 2020$

ACCEPTED BY: Licensee CitySwitch II-A, LLC


PRINT NAME: Robert Raville President \& CEO
TITLE: $\qquad$
DATE:


## ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF LICENSEE:

STATE OF GEORGIA COUNTY OF FULTON
)
) ss.:
)

On this 21 day of APRIL, 2022 before me personally appeared Rob Raville , known to me (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence) to be the persons described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged that she executed the same as his free act and deed.

WITNESS my hand and Official Seal at office this 21 day of APRIL, 2022.

My Commission Expires:


## ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF LICENSOR:

 before me personally appeared known to me (or/proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence) to be the persons described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged that she executed the same as his free act and deed.

WITNESS my hand and Official Seal at office this


My Commission Expires:
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## Exhibit A

## Location Print Depicting the Premises





[^0]:    Sergia Muiroz - Interim Genergl Manager
    Mika Pachaco - Managor, Water Dept.
    Jamie Asbury - Manager, Energy Dept.
    Matthew H Smelser - Depuly Mgr, Energy Dept
    Daryl Bucklay ~Mgr. of Distribution Srucg. \& Maint. Oprins., Enargy Depl,
    Geoffrey Holbrook - General Counsal
    Mleheil P, Kemp = Superintendent General, Flest Bervices and Reg. R Environ, Compliance
    Leura Carvantes. - Bupervisor, Real Estats
    Jassloa Humea - Envivonmental Prolect Mgr. Br,, Water Dapt

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ In accordance with Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the "Court Order") Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to theCourt Order.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ In accordancewith Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the "Court Order"), Quest prepared th is Exhibit 1 and attached it to the Court Order.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ In accordancewith Paragraph 1 of the Easement Deed by Court Order inSettlement of Landowner Action (the "Court Orden"), Qwest prepared this Exhibit 1 and attached it to the Court Order.

