

Section 106 Not Required

NEPA/NHPA Screening Checklist Report

December 11, 2018

KC13XC327

548 Southwest Tower Park Drive Lee's Summit, Missouri 64081 Trileaf # 647163

Prepared For:
Sprint
6300 Legacy Drive
Plano, Texas 75024

Prepared By:
Trileaf Corporation

1051 Winderley Place, Suite 201
Maitland, FL 32751



Network Practice NP-700-001

NEPA/NHPA SCREENING CHECKLIST

Project Type: Si			Type:	Cascade ID:	Location:		
3		CC Tower Structure	W040W0007	Address: 548 Southwest Tower Park Drive,			
		ility Structure	KC13XC327	Lee's Summit, Missouri 64081 Latitude/Longitude: 38° 54' 33",			
Existing Facility 🛛 🖾 O		ther Non-Tower Structure		-94° 26' 54"			
1 Will th	e facility be	located	in an officially designated	wilderness area in	ner 47 CFR §1 1307(a)(1)?		
Yes □		N/A ⊠	Consulting Agency To Co				
					tions according to 47CFR Section 1.1306 Note 1.		
			in a designated wilderness Consulting Agency To Co				
Yes □	No □	N/A ⊠			tions according to 47CFR Section 1.1306 Note 1.		
					cies or designated critical habitats; or eatened species or likely to result in		
					s determined by the Secretary of the		
Interio	r pursuant t	o the En	dangered Species Act of 19	973, per 47 CFR §1	.1307(a)(3)?		
Yes □	No □	N/A ⊠	Consulting Agency To Co Comments: This category is I		ate Equivalent tions according to 47CFR Section 1.1306 Note 1.		
4. Will th	ο facility off	fact distr	icts situs huildings struc	tures or objects s	ignificant in American history,		
					re eligible for listing in the National		
Registe	er of Historic		per 47 CFR §1.1307(a)(4)?	1			
Yes □	No ⊠	N/A □	Consulting Agency To Co				
			Comments: See NEPA/NHPA	Screening Checklist Sumi	mary below.		
5. Will th	e facility aff	fect India	n religious sites, per 47 CF	FR §1.1307(a)(5)?			
Yes □		N/A □	Consulting Agency To Co	ntact: THPO, NHO	s & Bureau of Indian Affairs		
			Comments: See NEPA/NHPA	Screening Checklist Sum	mary below.		
6. Will th	e facility be	located	in a floodplain, per 47 CFR	? §1.1307(a)(6)?			
Yes □		N/A ⊠	Consulting Agency To Co				
					tions according to 47CFR Section 1.1306 Note 1.		
7 \\/: + -	a faailiku inu			- footunes non 47	OFD \$1.4207(a)/7)2		
7. Will the Yes □		voive a si N/A ⊠	gnificant change in surface Consulting Agency To Co				
res 🗆	NO L	IV/A 🖂		•	tions according to 47CFR Section 1.1306 Note 1.		
				•			
	e facility be 7(a)(8)?	equippe	d with high intensity white	e lights in a reside	ntial neighborhood, per 47 CFR		
Yes □		N/A □	Consulting Agency To Co				
			Comments: It is assumed tha	t Sprint will not utilize h	nigh intensity white lights in residential areas.		
9. Faciliti	ies that may	result in	human exposure to radio	frequency radiatio	on in excess of the applicable safety		
standa	rds specified	d in 47 C	FR §1.1307 (b).		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
Yes □	No □	N/A ⊠	Consulting Agency To Co Comments: This category wa				
L							
	•			knowledge the abo	ove information is accurate.		
	1	hu	B. Settle		TDU 545 0		
Prepare	ed By:	60		Cor	mpany: TRILEAF Corporation		
(Print name): John B. Sinnott Date: 12/11/2018							
Site Development Project Manager has reviewed and approved this Checklist prior to commencement of site construction.							
3.10 DOVO		,	.gas i stromou und appro		F		
I	Bv:				Date:		



NEPA/NHPA Screening Checklist Summary

INTRODUCTION

This checklist summary was prepared in accordance with Sprint's policy document titled *NEPA/NHPA Requirements for Antenna Sites (NEPA/NHPA Screening), Network Practice (NP-700-001)* dated June 11, 2018 the Nationwide Programmatic Agreement for the Collocation of Wireless Antennas (Collocation PA) as amended, and FCC Rules 47 CFR §1.1320 and §1.1307 using information provided by one or more of the following: (i) the FCC licensee and/or authorized agent; (ii) the owner of the building or other structure upon which the installation will be mounted; and (iii) publicly available municipal and regulatory records (as applicable). Information used to answer the below questions was provided to TRILEAF from the aforementioned sources to the best of their actual knowledge and in good faith.

The Note 1 exclusion per 47 CFR 1.1306 as referenced in the above checklist states:

"The provisions of § 1.1307(a) requiring the preparation of EAs do not encompass the mounting of antenna(s) and associated equipment (such as wiring, cabling, cabinets, or backup-power), on or in an existing building, or on an antenna tower or other man-made structure, unless § 1.1307(a)(4) is applicable...."

Therefore, items 1-3 and 6-9 in the above checklist are either exempt from review, or were not reviewed by Trileaf. Therefore, the following criteria were reviewed as part of this project:

- Will the facility affect districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture, that are listed, or are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, per 47 CFR §1.1307(a)(4)?
- Will the facility affect Indian religious sites, per 47 CFR §1.1307(a)(5)?

PROPOSED UNDERTAKING

Sprint proposes to remove three (3) RRU's and replace three (3) 2.5 panel antennas with three (3) MIMO antennas with integrated RRU's at a centerline height of 60 feet on an existing 98-foot water tower. All equipment will be installed within an existing equipment cabinet located at the base of the water tower.

PROJECT REVIEW

Per the Nationwide Programmatic Agreement for the Collocation of Wireless Antenna (Collocation PA), as amended, and 47 CFR 1.1320, an antenna may be mounted on a building or



non-tower structure without such collocation being reviewed through the Section 106 review process, provided none of the following are true:

Collocation of Antennas on Buildings and Non-Tower Structures			No
1.	Is this collocation site located on tribal land?		\boxtimes
2.	Is the building or non-tower structure over 45 years old, and are the criteria established in Stipulation VI of the Collocation PA for collocations of small antennas or the exclusions provided for in 47 CFR 1.1320 not applicable?		
3.	Is the building or non-tower structure located inside the boundary of a historic district, and the collocation does not meet the criteria established in Stipulation VII of the Collocation PA for collocations of small or minimally visible antennas?		\boxtimes
4.	Is the building or non-tower structure within 250 feet of the boundary of the historic district, and the antenna is visible from the ground level of the historic district, and the collocation does not meet the criteria established in Stipulation VII of the Collocation PA for collocations of small or minimally visible antennas?		\boxtimes
5.	Is the building or non-tower structure a designated National Historic Landmark, and the collocation does not meet the criteria established in Stipulation VII of the Collocation PA for collocations of small or minimally visible antennas?		
6.	Is the building or non-tower structure listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and the collocation does not meet the criteria established in Stipulation VII of the Collocation PA for collocations of small or minimally visible antennas?		
7.	The collocation licensee or the owner of the building or non-tower structure has received written or electronic notification that the FCC is in receipt of a complaint from a member of the public, an Indian Tribe, a SHPO or the Council, that the collocation has an adverse effect on one or more historic properties?		

Review Details:

- 1) Trileaf reviewed the USA Federal Lands database, as well as tribal land maps provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and determined that the non-tower structure is not located on tribal land.
- 2) Trileaf reviewed Jackson County Property Appraiser information and historical aerial imagery. The age of the water tower could not be confirmed; however, aerial imagery indicates that the water tower was constructed prior to 1962. Therefore, the non-tower structure is older than 45 years.
- 3) According to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the building/non-tower structure is not located within a historic district.
- 4) According to the NRHP, the building/non-tower structure is not located within 250 feet of an historic district.
- 5) According to the NRHP, the building/non-tower structure is not a National Historic Landmark.
- 6) According to the NRHP, the building/non-tower is not listed on the NRHP, or eligible for listing on the NRHP.



7) Trileaf was not made aware by the licensee of any written or electronic notification that the FCC is in receipt of a complaint from a member of the public, native American tribe, SHPO, or council that the collocation has an adverse effect on historic properties.

The age of the water tower was determined to be greater than 45 years, but the remaining questions are marked "No" (i.e. the age of the water tower is the only trigger for Section 106 review); therefore, further consideration of Section 106 exclusions via the Collocation PA and 47 CFR 1.1320 is warranted. Trileaf reviewed the provided construction drawings and determined that Stipulation VI of the Collocation PA is not applicable due to the proposed undertaking not meeting the definition of a small wireless antenna deployment. However, exclusionary conditions and specific criteria as provided for in the 47 CFR 1.1320 are applicable as follows:

CONDITIONS:

- 1. There is an existing antenna on the building or structure: **Yes, Sprint is already installed** on the water tower.
- 2. The new antenna complies with all zoning conditions and historic preservations conditions applicable to existing antennas in the same vicinity that directly mitigate or prevent effects, such as camouflage or concealment requirements: **Yes, Sprint plans to paint to match, if applicable**.
- 3. The deployment of the new antenna involves no new ground disturbance: According to the provided construction drawings, there is no plan for any new ground disturbance.
- 4. The deployment would otherwise require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) solely because of the age of the building or structure: **Yes, as determined per 2001**NPA review.

CRITERIA (Visible Replacement Antennas):

- 1. This is a replacement for a pre-existing antenna: Yes, Sprint plans to replace three (3) 2.5 panel antennas with three (3) MIMO antennas with integrated RRU's.
- 2. The new antenna will be located in the same vicinity* as the pre-existing antenna: Yes, the new antennas are to be installed on the same water tower, and the center-point of the new antenna is within ten feet of the center-point of the pre-existing antenna.
- 3. The new antenna will be visible only from adjacent streets and surrounding public spaces that also afford views of the pre-existing antenna: **Based on line of sight estimates, the new antenna will not be visible from any adjoining streets and public spaces from which the existing antenna facility are also not already visible.**
- 4. The new antenna is not more than three (3) feet larger in height or width (including protuberances) than the pre-existing antenna: According to the provided construction drawings, Sprint plans to install MIMO antennas which are not more than 3 feet higher or longer than the existing antennas.



5. No new equipment cabinets are visible from the adjacent streets or surrounding public spaces: According to the provided construction drawings, no new equipment cabinets are proposed to be constructed.

* A visible new antenna is in the "same vicinity" as a pre-existing antenna if it is on the same rooftop, façade, or other surface and the center-point of the new antenna is within ten feet of the center-point of the pre-existing antenna.

Conclusions

In accordance with 47 CFR 1.1320 and Sprint's NEPA/NHPA Requirements for Antenna Sites (NEPA/NHPA Screening) policy, Section 106 review is NOT required.

Ju B. Sittle	12/11/2018
Preparer's Signature	Date
John B. Sinnott	TRILEAF Corporation
Preparer's Name	Company