

APPENDIX A
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

1. Project title:

Devers-Mirage 115 kilovolt (kV) Subtransmission System Split Project (Proposed Project)

2. Lead agency name and address:

California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3298

3. Contact persons and phone numbers:

Milissa Marona
Regulatory Project Manager
(626) 302-4872

4. Project location:

The Proposed Project would be located in eastern Riverside County within the Coachella Valley. The Electrical Needs Area includes the cities of Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, and unincorporated areas of Riverside County, including the Thousand Palms community.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770

6. General plan designation:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has primary jurisdiction over the Proposed Project because it authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. Such projects are exempt from local land-use and zoning regulations and discretionary permitting; however, CPUC General Order 131-D, Section III.C requires "the utility to communicate with, and obtain the input of, local authorities regarding land use matters and obtain any non-discretionary local permits." SCE has considered local and state land-use plans as part of the environmental review process and will obtain applicable non-discretionary local permits.

7. Zoning:

The Proposed Project would be located within several zoning districts in Riverside County, California, including portions of the cities of Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Cathedral City, and Indian Wells. The remaining portions of the Proposed Project are located within unincorporated Riverside County, including the community of Thousand Palms.

The Proposed Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Loop-In would cross or run adjacent to lands zoned as Open Space, Residential, Utilities, and Commercial.

The Farrell Substation is located within land zoned Industrial. As the Proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) proceeds north, it crosses or runs adjacent to lands zoned as Single-Family Residential (the Contempo/Alexander development), Watercourse, and Open-Space. The proposed Contempo/Alexander development project, involving the subdivision of 3.5 acres into ten lots north of via Escuela and west of Gene Autry Trail, has been approved by the Palm Springs City Council.

The Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) crosses or runs adjacent to lands zoned as Open Space, Residential, and Commercial.

As indicated in the City of Rancho Mirage General Plan (2005), land use designations near the intersection of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive include Medium-Density Residential to the northwest, Commercial to the northeast, and Commercial and Master-Planned Community Development to the southeast.

As indicated in the Cathedral City General Plan (2005), land use designations near the intersection of Date Palm Drive and Varner Road include Commercial and Industrial south of the intersection, and Open Space along Varner Road and north of the intersection.

As indicated in the City of Palm Desert General Plan (2004), land use designations near the intersection of Portola Avenue and Gerald Ford Drive include a Medium-Density Residential Development to the southeast, Low-Density Residential to the southwest and northwest, and an Open Space/Park to the northeast.

The installation of new equipment and the reconfiguration or improvement to existing facilities or components would be implemented at the following substations: Devers, Mirage, Concho, Indian Wells, Santa Rosa, Eisenhower, Farrell, Garnet, Thornhill, and Tamarisk. With the exception of a new driveway to be constructed at the Farrell Substation, all of the proposed substation reconfigurations and improvements would be within the walls or fences of the existing substations.

8. Description of Project:

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) proposes to construct the Devers-Mirage 115 kilovolt (kV) Subtransmission System Split Project (referred to as the Proposed Project). The Proposed Project is necessary to maintain electric system reliability, enhance operational flexibility, and serve projected electrical demand in the cities of Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, and unincorporated areas of Riverside County,

including the Thousand Palms community (Electrical Needs Area). Construction is scheduled to begin by the second quarter of 2009, or immediately following receipt of all project approvals. The Proposed Project is scheduled to be operational by mid-2010 to ensure that safe and reliable electric service is available to serve customer electrical demand in the Electrical Needs Area.

Devers 115 kV Subtransmission System Split

The portion of the Proposed Project necessary to accomplish a split of the Devers 115 kV Subtransmission System into the Devers 115 kV Subtransmission System and the Mirage 115 kV Subtransmission System includes the elements described below.

Mirage-Santa Rosa, Mirage-Santa Rosa-Tamarisk, Mirage-Capwind-Devers Tamarisk, and Mirage-Concho 115 kV Subtransmission Lines

Create the Mirage-Santa Rosa, Mirage-Santa Rosa-Tamarisk, Mirage-Capwind-Devers-Tamarisk, and Mirage-Concho 115 kV subtransmission lines in accordance with the following scope-of-work:

- Replace approximately 1,783 feet of the existing Mirage-Tamarisk single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line with a new, higher capacity double-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line and replace support structures within existing SCE rights-of-way (ROWs) from Mirage Substation to Calle Francisco, in the community of Thousand Palms
- Build a new single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line on the west side of the existing SCE ROW from Calle Francisco to Calle Desierto (approximately 2,447 feet) on new support structures
- Build a new single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line on the east side of the existing SCE ROW, from Calle Desierto through the Tri-Palm Country Club golf course (approximately 1,293 feet) on new wood poles
- Replace approximately 2,130 feet of the existing Devers-Capwind-Concho-Mirage 115 kV subtransmission line with a new, higher capacity double-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line and replace support structures within existing SCE ROWs from the Tri-Palm Country Club golf course, to Interstate 10 (I-10)
- Replace an existing single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission wood pole on the northwest corner of Portola Avenue and Gerald Ford Drive, with a new double-circuit tubular steel pole (TSP), located south of I-10, approximately 50 feet north of the existing wood pole at the intersection of Portola Avenue and Gerald Ford Drive in the City of Palm Desert
- Install two new 115 kV subtransmission line positions at Mirage Substation; upgrade two existing 115 kV subtransmission line positions at Santa Rosa Substation; upgrade two existing 115 kV subtransmission line positions at Tamarisk Substation; and upgrade two existing 115 kV subtransmission line positions at Devers Substation
- Replace one 115kV circuit breaker at Tamarisk Substation and replace two 115 kV circuit breakers at Devers Substation

- Transfer existing fiber optic cable to the new support structures from Calle Francisco to Calle Desierto and install fiber optic and digital telecommunications equipment at Concho, Devers, Mirage, Santa Rosa, and Tamarisk substations
- Replace two TSPs, one light-weight steel (LWS) pole, and one wood pole at the intersection of Dinah Shore Drive and Bob Hope Drive with four TSPs, and three LWS poles with three 115 kV pole switches
 - At the northwest corner of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive, replace one TSP with one new LWS pole to obtain the required vertical rise of the existing conductors that would connect to one new TSP.
 - At the southwest corner of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive, replace one wood pole with one new LWS pole to obtain the required vertical rise of the existing conductors that would connect to one new TSP.
 - At the southeast corner of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive, replace one TSP with one new LWS pole to obtain the required vertical rise of the existing conductors that would connect to one new TSP.
 - At the northeast corner of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive, replace one TSP with one new TSP pole to obtain the required vertical rise.
 - Split the existing Garnet-Santa Rosa 115 kV subtransmission line at the intersection of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive by removing the span of wire that connects the southwest and northeast corner poles
 - Split the Santa Rosa-Tamarisk at the same intersection by dead-ending and grounding the Santa Rosa leg at the northwest corner pole
 - Connect the open Tamarisk leg of the former Santa Rosa-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission line to the open Garnet leg of the former Garnet-Santa Rosa 115 kV subtransmission line at the northeast corner pole of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive
 - Create the Mirage-Santa Rosa-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission line by tapping the former southern segment of the Garnet-Santa Rosa 115 kV subtransmission line to the Mirage-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission line at the northwest corner pole
 - Create the reconfigured Mirage-Capwind-Devers-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission line by installing a span of conductor between the former north segment of the Garnet-Santa Rosa 115 kV subtransmission line and the former west segment of the Santa Rosa-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission line at the northwest corner of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive
 - Split the existing Garnet-Santa Rosa 115 kV subtransmission line by dead-ending and grounding the Garnet leg to the new TSP installed east of Date Palm Drive and south of Varner Road
 - Connect the existing Devers-Capwind-Mirage 115 kV subtransmission line to the former Santa Rosa leg of the former Garnet-Santa Rosa 115 kV subtransmission line at the new TSP installed east of Date Palm Drive and south of Varner Road to form the reconfigured Mirage-Capwind-Devers-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission line

Devers-Eisenhower-Thornhill and the Eisenhower-Tamarisk 115 kV Subtransmission Lines

Create the new Devers-Eisenhower-Thornhill and the Eisenhower-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission lines by rearranging and modifying the existing Tamarisk-Thornhill and Devers-Eisenhower 115 kV subtransmission line in accordance with the following scope of work:

- Install two TSPs inside Eisenhower Substation.
- Rearrange the existing Tamarisk-Thornhill 115 kV subtransmission line and attach the Tamarisk tap to the switchrack at Eisenhower Substation to create the Eisenhower-Tamarisk 115 kV subtransmission line.
- Attach the Thornhill tap of the existing Tamarisk-Thornhill 115 kV subtransmission line to the existing Devers-Eisenhower 115 kV subtransmission line to create the Devers-Eisenhower-Thornhill 115 kV subtransmission line.
- Upgrade one existing 115 kV subtransmission line position at Devers Substation, upgrade one existing 115 kV subtransmission line at Thornhill Substation, upgrade three existing 115 kV subtransmission lines at Eisenhower Substation, and upgrade one existing 115 kV subtransmission line at Tamarisk substation.
- Replace two 115 kV circuit breakers at Devers Substation and replace three 115kV circuit breakers at Eisenhower Substation.
- Install fiber optic and digital telecommunication equipment at Devers, Eisenhower, Tamarisk, and Thornhill substations.

After the split of the Devers 115 kV Subtransmission System, the following work is necessary to relieve a thermal overload condition that will be created on the newly reconfigured Devers 115 kV Subtransmission System and to maintain transformer emergency loading criteria at Mirage Substation.

Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line

Create the Proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) in accordance with the following scope-of-work:

- Replace approximately 5.3 miles of the existing Devers-Farrell-Windland¹ single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line with a new higher capacity double-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line and replace support structures within existing SCE ROWs and franchise locations² between the Farrell and Garnet substations in the City of Palm Springs.

¹ "Windland" collectively refers to Altwind, Buckwind, Seawest I, Seawest II, Seawest III, and Wintec VI substations.

² The term franchise location is used to refer to public street ROWs where SCE has a franchise agreement with the local governmental agency.

- Install a new 115 kV subtransmission line position at Farrell Substation and upgrade an existing 115 kV subtransmission line position at Garnet Substation.
- Install a new circuit breaker at Farrell Substation.
- Transfer existing fiber optic cable to the new double-circuit support structures for approximately 5.3 miles and install fiber optic and digital telecommunications equipment at the Devers, Farrell, and Garnet substations.

Mirage 220/115 kV Substation

- Install one new 280 megavolt amperes (MVA) 220/115 kV transformer, two new 220 kV circuit breakers, and five new 115 kV circuit breakers at Mirage Substation.

Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Transmission Line Loop-In

The portion of the Proposed Project necessary to resolve a forecasted post-transient voltage problem that would exist by 2009 on the Devers 220 kV Transmission System and interconnected Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and Metropolitan Water District (MWD) facilities includes the following elements:

Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Loop-In at Mirage Substation

The Proposed Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Loop-In at Mirage Substation would include the following work.

- Loop the existing Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV transmission line into the Mirage Substation along the existing ROW, for approximately 0.8 mile, on double-circuit lattice steel towers (LSTs), forming the new Devers-Mirage and Mirage-Coachella Valley 220 kV transmission lines in accordance with the following scope of work.
 - Install approximately 7,240 feet of single-circuit 220 kV transmission line on eight new, double-circuit LSTs. The new LSTs would be strung with single 1,033 thousand circular mil (kcmil) aluminum-stranded conductors with a steel-stranded reinforced core (ACSR) conductors on new polymer insulators.
 - Remove 4 LSTs and 3,770 feet of existing single-circuit 220 kV transmission line in or near the existing Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV transmission line ROW north of the Mirage Substation.
 - Install one new TSP and 1,000 feet of single-circuit 220 kV transmission line at Mirage Substation and rearrange the Julian Hinds 220 kV transmission line from the existing LSTs on the west side of the approximately 0.8-mile ROW to existing LSTs on the east side of the approximately 0.8-mile ROW.
 - Install 1,540 feet of single-circuit 220 kV transmission line and remove 820 feet of single-circuit 220 kV transmission line between the 220 kV switchrack located inside Mirage Substation and the three LSTs and one TSP adjacent to the north fence of Mirage Substation.

- Install two new 220 kV transmission line positions at Mirage Substation.
- Install three new 220 kV circuit breakers at Mirage Substation.
- Install digital telecommunications equipment within existing SCE building facilities at Edom Hill Communications Site, Mirage Substation, and Devers Substation.

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” or “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agricultural Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils
	Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Hydrology/Water Quality		Land Use/Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population/Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature _____

Date _____

Signature _____

Date _____

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 offsite as well as onsite, 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, and 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 Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiring, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed I 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 that 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.

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURAL 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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VII. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC.				
Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources and Explanation of Answers

This section contains a brief explanation for all answers provided in the environmental checklist form.

I. AESTHETICS

Construction of the Proposed Project would not have a substantial effect on scenic vistas and would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The Proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Except where otherwise required by ministerial permit, most of the construction would occur during daylight hours, minimizing the need for lighting. Therefore, a substantial new source of light or glare is not anticipated, and the impact would be less than significant.

Operational impacts to residential viewers along the Proposed Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Loop-In would be less than significant because the loop-in would run adjacent to existing 115 kV and 220 kV structures and would match the spans of the existing 220 kV transmission lines where possible. Likewise, LST and pole configurations and heights would be similar to existing transmission line structures.

Operational impacts to residential viewers along the Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) are expected to be less than significant because Alternative Route 1 would

replace an existing 115 kV subtransmission line on single-circuit wood pole with new double-circuit steel poles. New pole heights would be similar to the existing poles and spans between poles would match the existing spans where possible.

Residential viewers on the eastern edge of the Tri-Palm Estates community would have views of the Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4). The proposed route would parallel the existing 115 kV double-circuit line and would be seen in the context of the existing facilities from viewers in Tri-Palm Estates. Because the proposed route would be visually similar to the existing 115 kV subtransmission line, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Operational impacts to residential viewers associated with the proposed subtransmission line reconfiguration at the intersection of Bob Hope Drive and Dinah Shore Drive are expected to be less than significant because the line reconfiguration would replace existing pole structures and would not create a discernable change to the visual character of this area. This intersection is not associated with a scenic corridor or vista. The subtransmission line reconfiguration would not compromise the visual character of the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa Mountains.

Operational impacts to viewers associated with the proposed subtransmission line reconfiguration at the intersection of Date Palm Drive and Varner Road would be limited to travelers on Varner Road, Date Palm Drive, and I-10. Impacts to these viewers would be less than significant because the line reconfiguration would replace existing subtransmission poles. Furthermore, the line reconfiguration would occur in a highly modified area and would not further degrade the visual character.

Operational impacts to viewers associated with the proposed subtransmission line reconfiguration at the intersection of Portola Avenue and Gerald Ford Drive are limited to transportation viewers on Portola Avenue and Gerald Ford Drive, and several residences associated with the community southwest of the intersection. Operational impacts would be less than significant because the new proposed pole would be placed approximately 50 feet from the existing pole and would be seen in context of the existing subtransmission line. This replacement would not degrade the existing visual character.

Operational impacts associated with the proposed substation modifications would be viewed in the context of the existing substation equipment. Improvements would primarily occur within perimeter walls and fences, and most would be essentially imperceptible. However, a few major equipment improvements would be visible and could potentially impact the sensitive viewers associated with the Mirage, Farrell, and Eisenhower substations.

In summary, operation of the Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, would not substantially damage scenic resources, and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Operation of the Proposed Project would not have lighting associated with it that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in this area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. The Proposed Project would not cause potential conflicts with land zoned for agricultural use or land subject to Williamson Act contracts. The Proposed Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

With the exception of fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and NO_x, associated with the construction phase of the project, construction emissions would not exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds. Particulate and NO_x emissions and from nearly all facets of the construction activities are likely to exceed the daily significance thresholds. The implementation of the procedures listed in Air Quality, Section 4.3 of SCE's PEA and compliance with all rules and regulations administered by the SCAQMD (i.e., low emitting fuel usage and Rule 403), would reduce NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions generated during construction activities to the greatest extent possible.

While emissions from the remainder of construction activities are expected to be below significance thresholds, impacts to air quality from NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} are significant and unavoidable, and no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce construction air quality impacts to a less than significant level. Consequently, project construction impacts related to air quality would be significant and unavoidable.

Once constructed and operating, the Proposed Project would not result in long-term air emissions from stationary sources. Operational emissions associated with the Proposed Project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds and would not conflict with the adopted Air Quality Management Plan. None of the elements of the Proposed Project would generate odors that could potentially affect individuals in the immediate area, nor would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Consequently, there are no operational impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential impacts from construction activities include temporary and/or permanent disturbance, displacement, and/or removal of special status species or their habitat. Such impacts would be temporary, resulting from surface disturbance at tower construction sites, wire-pulling and wire-splicing sites, and construction and staging yards. Ground disturbance may result in habitat degradation as a result of vegetation removal, topsoil removal, soil compaction, or erosion. Vegetation loss also may affect wildlife dependent on plants for food or cover

With the implementation of APMs and species-specific measures for Coachella Valley milkvetch, Coachella Valley Fringe-toed Lizards, and Burrowing Owls, impacts to protected

species and native vegetation would be minimized. As a result, impacts to biological resources due to the Proposed Project would be less than significant. There would be no effect on riparian habitats or natural communities as identified in regional plans, and no effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404. The Proposed Project does not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources, nor does it conflict with the provisions of any habitat conservation plan. The Proposed Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species. As a result, impacts to biological resources due to the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Loop-In would have no impact on historical resources.

Garnet Hill has been identified as a Native American cultural resource. It has not been determined if construction of the Proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) would affect this resource. While it is unlikely that the site would be directly impacted by the proposed route, the resource might be indirectly impacted. However, the implementation of APMs CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3, and mitigation measure CUL-MIT-3 (as described in the Proponent's Environmental Assessment [PEA]) would reduce the potential impacts to less than significant.

Implementation of the Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4) could impact three cultural resources. None have been officially evaluated for the NRHP but, for the purposes of this report, each is treated as eligible for listing on the NRHP and the CRHR. The sites include CA-RIV-785, 33-15429, and 33-15430. The replacement of existing 115 kV subtransmission poles and the access road alteration and management would potentially impact sites 33-15429, CA-RIV-785, and 33-15430. Previous investigations at CA-RIV-785 identified buried features as well as human remains. Given the potential for additional buried features and possible human remains at these three sites, APMs CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3 shall be employed during construction activities. The implementation of mitigation measures CUL-MIT-1 and CUL-MIT-2 would reduce the potential impacts to less than significant.

No cultural resources were identified on the BLM land associated with this project. Therefore, no historic properties will be affected, and the segment would have no impact on historic resources. No cultural resources were identified along the subtransmission line reconfiguration or within or adjacent to the substation. The reconfiguration of the subtransmission line and substations would have no impact on historic resources.

Operation of the Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4) Project might result in direct or indirect impacts if the replaced subtransmission poles are located within the existing historic resources. Implementation of CUL-MIT-2 would reduce potential impacts to the historic resources to less than significant.

There would be no operational impacts to cultural resources along the proposed 220 kV transmission loop-in, Proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1), or at the subtransmission line reconfiguration sites and substation properties associated with this project.

These segments would have no impact to historic resources. In summary, impacts to cultural resources due to the construction and operation of the subtransmission line alternative routes would be less than significant with the implementation of APMs CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3, and mitigation measures CUL-MIT-1, CUL-MIT-2, and CULMIT-3.

One paleontological resource was identified along the Proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) in the Garnet Hills. The Imperial formation that is located in the Garnet Hills contains significant vertebrate fossils. Implementation of APMs PA-1 through PA-6 would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

In summary, impacts to paleontological resources, of the Imperial Formation, due to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project and alternatives would be less than significant with the implementation of APMs.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The Proposed Project would be constructed along existing routes, and existing roads within SCE ROWs and franchise locations would be graded to improve access for construction vehicles and equipment. However, pole sites located on land without existing access would require temporary access from the nearest existing roadway. No new roads would need to be constructed for the Proposed Project. A new driveway at the northwest corner of the Farrell Substation would be constructed for the Proposed Project.

Due to its close proximity to major active faults, the Proposed Project could experience moderate levels of earthquake-induced ground shaking generated by large earthquakes occurring at one of these faults. A final engineering design geotechnical study would identify potential ground shaking hazards and appropriate seismic designs of support structures to mitigate the effects of ground shaking (APM GEO-1). Since the Proposed Project does not include the construction of any human-occupied structures, the AP Act does not apply. A final engineering design geotechnical study would identify potential ground rupture hazards, and towers and poles would be located to avoid any identified active faults (APM GEO-2).

SCE designs overhead electric lines to meet or exceed GO 95 wind loading criteria. SCE's design standards incorporate lateral wind loading requirements that exceed seismic loading forces. Consequently, impacts from potential seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Liquefaction is not likely to occur within the geological study area because the depth to groundwater (see Section 4.8: Hydrology of SCE's PEA) exceeds the depth where liquefaction would typically occur (approximately 50 feet below the ground surface). Implementation of foundation design recommendations would further reduce any potential impact during construction (APMs GEO-1 and GEO-2).

The geological study area is located on a relatively flat area and project construction would not involve extensive excavation, grade, or elevation changes. The Proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

The Proposed Project is located on a geologic unit or soil that could be unstable, although on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would not likely be caused by construction of the Proposed Project. Given the site topography, there is negligible potential for landslides or other slope stability concerns from project construction. The geological study area is not situated in an area prone to subsidence, and construction of the Proposed Project would not include activities that could induce subsidence. Implementation of foundation design recommendations would further reduce any potential impact during construction (APM GEO-2).

The Proposed Project would not be located on expansive soil. Since the Proposed Project would be located on alluvial soils, it may be susceptible to seismically induced settlement.

Septic systems are not required for the Proposed Project.

In summary, impacts to geology and soils due to the construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant with the implementation of APMs. APMs would be implemented during construction to minimize soil erosion.

During operation of the Proposed Project there would be a minimal impact to soil erosion, or loss of topsoil. The Proposed Project would have minimal impact on geologic or soil resources on site or within the surrounding area due to maintenance activities. These activities would be comparable to SCE's existing maintenance activities along the existing transmission and subtransmission routes and at the project substations. Since the Proposed Project would be located on alluvial soils, it might be susceptible to seismically induced settlement. The Proposed Project is located on a geologic unit or soil that could be unstable, although on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would not be caused by operation of the Proposed Project. Routine maintenance and inspection would identify potential for impacts to geologic or soil resources. Implementation of foundation design recommendations would further reduce any potential impacts during construction (APM GEO-2).

There would be no operational impacts related to septic systems, because existing facilities would be utilized.

In summary, geologic and soils impacts to the operation of the Proposed Project components would be less than significant.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Typical construction activities have the potential to create sparks from mechanical equipment operation, welding, gasoline and diesel engines, electrical equipment, and cigarette smoking. Construction-related fire hazards could cause fires. However, risks related to fire caused by construction of the Proposed Project would be minimal and less than significant.

Hazardous materials to be used during the construction of the Proposed Project include gasoline, diesel fuel, oil, lubricants. There are no feasible alternatives to these materials for operation of construction vehicles and equipment. No acutely hazardous materials (AHMs) would be used or stored on-site during construction. Best management practices (BMPs) would

be implemented during construction to reduce the potential for or exposure to accidental spills or fires involving the use of hazardous materials.

Due to the low volume and low toxicity of the hazardous materials, the potential for environmental impacts from hazardous material incidents during construction is less than significant. The most likely incidents involving these hazardous materials are associated with minor spills or drips. Impacts from such incidents would be avoided by thoroughly cleaning up minor spills as soon as they occur. A site specific Construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), including BMPs, would be followed to ensure quick response to minor spills and minimal impacts to the environment.

Operation of the Proposed Project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Proposed Project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites nor would operation of the Proposed Project components impact operation of an airport or private airstrip. The Proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan nor would it expose people or structures to wildland fires. Therefore, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

SCE would file a Notice of Intent (NOI) to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit would include the development and implementation of a SWPPP. SCE would conduct all construction activities under the terms and conditions of the SWPPP. Implementation of the SWPPP would help stabilize graded areas and waterways and reduce erosion and sedimentation. The construction SWPPP would identify BMPs to be implemented during construction activities. Mulching, seeding, or other suitable stabilization measures would be used to protect exposed areas during construction activities.

Construction of the Proposed Project would involve the use of a variety of potential sources of water quality degradation, such as diesel fuel, lubrication oil, hydraulic fluids, antifreeze, and other construction-related materials. If unchecked, these contaminants could be carried by runoff into local drainages. The possibility of either accidental releases or normal discharges from construction equipment and tools, and in turn their introduction into local drainage and water systems, would be minimal with implementation of SCE standard control procedures. The potential for significant effects to water quality would be avoided through implementation of APMs, BMPs, and compliance with permit conditions. Implementation of the APMs and BMPs and permit condition compliance would reduce the potential impacts to surface water to less than significant levels and would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

The Proposed Project would not create substantial amounts of new impermeable surfaces that could reduce groundwater absorption rates. The Proposed Project would not include any facilities that would use groundwater and would therefore not deplete groundwater supplies. The

Proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

The Proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) would require pole replacement within the Whitewater River drainage. However, there would be no measurable change to the amount of existing ground disturbance within the drainage. The Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The Proposed Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. The Proposed Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Loop-In and the Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4) would not be located within the Whitewater River drainage.

SCE would obtain a grading permit from the City of Palm Springs, if needed, to grade the new driveway at Farrell Substation. Application for and receipt of a grading permit from the City of Palm Springs would be preceded by preparation of a soils engineering and geology report as well as a project specific grading plan. Construction activities conducted when the ground is wet would accelerate the potential for increased runoff, due to a reduction in infiltration and evaporation. SCE would implement BMPs, APMs (HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2), and SWPPP conditions to prevent transport of excavated sediments to local waterways and would thereby avoid significant effects to water quality. APM HYDRO-3 is intended to avoid significant impacts to water quality from construction of the access roads on the Mirage 220 kV ROW, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description. SCE also would implement all other erosion control measures, BMPs, permit conditions, and APMs to protect water quality during construction of the driveway and access roads and avoid significant effects. In summary, impacts to water quality due to the construction of the driveway and access roads would be less than significant with the implementation of APMs.

The Proposed Project would not cause rerouting of drainage in the area. Any erosion would be managed through BMPs, permit conditions, and APMs. The Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

The Proposed Project would not place structures within a 100-year or 500-year flood hazard area that could impede or redirect flood flows and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The Proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 1) would span the Whitewater River drainage and Mission Creek, and, therefore, portions of the line could be subject to flood damage if the river were to flood (City of Palm Springs General Plan III-3). The Proposed Devers-Coachella 220 kV Loop-In and the Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4) also fall within a 100-year floodplain boundary, and, therefore, portions of the line could be subject to flood damage if the area were to flood. However, the Whitewater River Basin Thousand Palms Flood Control Project is designed to reduce the potential for flooding in the area.

The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

In summary, impacts to hydrology and water quality due to the construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant with the implementation of BMPs, APMs, and SWPPP conditions.

SCE would visually inspect the Proposed Project components at least once a year by driving the routes. Occasional maintenance would be required, but maintenance work would not likely require ground disturbance that could cause erosion and sedimentation. Maintenance vehicles would use existing access roads. In summary, operation of the Proposed Project would not likely affect water quality. Project operation would not violate water quality standards or discharge requirements or impact water quality in nearby drainages.

The operation of additional substation equipment associated with the Proposed Project and the construction of the Farrell Substation driveway would not change drainage patterns and would not increase erosion at the substation sites. Operation of the substation improvements would not require use of groundwater. In summary, operation of the existing substations associated with the Proposed Project would have no impact on water quality and would not affect drainage patterns or runoff.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Construction of the Proposed Project would not cause the physical division of an established community or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would be constructed within the Coachella Valley MSHCP. However, construction of the proposed 220 kV transmission line loop-in and 115 kV subtransmission lines would be within existing SCE ROWs or franchise locations. Thus, the Proposed Project would not conflict with Coachella Valley MSHCP or any other applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant.

A Study of Aeronautical Considerations (2007) was conducted to identify any special considerations for construction of the Proposed Project that may arise out of its proximity to aeronautical land and airspace uses. Preliminary project plans were evaluated with respect to four public-use airports: Banning Municipal (BNG), Bermuda Dunes (UDD), Jacqueline Cochran Regional (TRM), and Palm Springs International Airport (PSP). There are no public-use heliports in the area. The project construction sites are sufficiently distant from BNG, UDD, and TRM to render them immaterial. Therefore, only the Palm Springs International Airport could be affected by the Proposed Project.

Federal and state laws require advance notice of the construction of several subtransmission poles along a portion of the proposed 115 kV subtransmission line between Farrell and Garnet substations, as outlined in the Study of Aeronautical Considerations (2007). Notice would be submitted to the FAA electronically, in accordance with FAA procedures and as far in advance of construction as possible. Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 requires the FAA to acknowledge receipt of each notice and to perform an aeronautical study of the proposed construction or alteration outlined therein. The study results in an FAA "determination" of the effect of the proposal on the "safe and efficient use of the airspace." The determination is normally held valid for a term of 18 months from the date of its issuance. Consequently, the timing of each notice would be coordinated with the Proposed Project's construction schedule in

order to avoid the need to seek an extension of the determination or to re-file the notice. Construction managers would be aware of the need to address certain activities that may impact aviation safety (e.g., production of dust and glare or the use of cranes). SCE would survey the affected structures to determine the NAD 83 coordinates of their precise locations, distances from Palm Springs International Airport Runway 13R-31L, and MSL elevations. Survey data would serve to verify the estimates used in this report and to determine the significance of associated errors. These data also would be necessary in the event that SCE wishes to challenge an FAA determination pursuant to the appeals provisions of the regulation. Use of a crane for construction at any given location also would be evaluated for a potential need to notice the FAA. A crane to be used at a site that is within 20,000 feet of a public-use runway and that is expected to reach a height that would penetrate a slope of 1-foot of elevation for each 100 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway must be noticed to the FAA. Additionally, a crane that is expected to extend more than 200 feet above the ground at any site must be noticed. The FAA may recommend obstruction marking and/or lighting of a structure in any of its determinations, and SCE would issue the applicable notice as indicated.

All substation modifications, with the exception of the new driveway to be constructed on the northwestern corner of Farrell Substation, would take place within existing substation walls or fences. The addition of the driveway would not increase the use of the property, nor intensify the existing use. Therefore, impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant. In response to aeronautical considerations, final design of the modifications to the Proposed Project substations and associated structures (including landscaping) would recognize the Part 77 height criteria discussed above as applicable for the proposed substation modifications. As indicated in the Study of Aeronautical Considerations (2007), SCE would conduct surveys to determine potential effects on aeronautical operations that might result from construction of proposed modifications at Eisenhower Substation and submit notification according to FAA procedures. The facility design would reflect the desirability of a comfortable margin of space below the airspace surfaces.

The operational impacts associated with all elements of the Proposed Project would be comparable to the potential construction impacts to existing and planned land use, discussed above. In summary, impacts to land use and planning due to the operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on aeronautical operations in the Coachella Valley. The Study of Aeronautical Considerations indicates that the permanent structures to be constructed for the Proposed Project would not obstruct the navigable airspace at public-use aircraft landing areas and, therefore, are not likely to hamper aeronautical operations in the area.

Operation of 750 feet of the proposed Farrell-Garnet 115 kV subtransmission line would take place within a ROW designated for the subtransmission line use on BLM lands and would not conflict with other existing or planned uses on BLM lands.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of significance to the region and the state, and the project components are not located on land delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. In summary, the construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not impact mineral resources.

XI. NOISE

The Proposed Project would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in local general plans or noise ordinances or applicable standards of other agencies. The Proposed Project would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. The Proposed Project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. During construction, the Proposed Project would cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Portions of the Proposed Project are located within an airport land-use plan of a public airport or public-use airport but would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels. The Proposed Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in short-term and temporary impacts to population and housing that would be less than significant.

Construction of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to induce population growth. Project construction activities would occur over an approximate 15-month period. SCE's personnel and contractors (under the supervision of SCE personnel) would perform construction tasks required for the Proposed Project. This work force primarily would consist of local workers and workers who would commute to the various construction sites. Construction of the Proposed Project would not require a large temporary workforce that might displace existing housing or people or necessitate relocation or the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. If any non-local workers are employed, they would likely commute from within Riverside County or nearby communities and would require only a temporary need for accommodations. Therefore, the Proposed Project construction would not increase the demand for housing in the project area and would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the area.

Construction of the Proposed Project would not affect population and housing in the City of Palm Springs or neighboring communities and would not conflict with existing or planned housing. The Proposed Project would be constructed within existing SCE ROWs and franchise locations, existing substation sites, or on vacant land where housing does not exist currently. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not displace existing housing or people.

In summary, construction impacts resulting from the Proposed Project related to population and housing would be less than significant.

Operation of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to induce population growth. After construction, the Proposed Project facilities would be unstaffed (with the exception of Devers Substation which is currently staffed) and, therefore, would not create any permanent on-site employment opportunities that could potentially require housing.

SCE personnel would generally visit the transmission and subtransmission line routes and/or substation sites for electrical switching and routine maintenance in a manner that is comparable to the existing maintenance schedule. Routine maintenance includes equipment testing,

equipment monitoring and repair, as well as emergency and routine procedures for service continuity and preventive maintenance. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project would not generate a large operation-related workforce that would require permanent housing. In addition, extending the electrical infrastructure to meet the demand for electricity is a result of, not a precursor to, development in the region. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Operation of the Proposed Project would have no impacts to population and housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not unduly burden local police or fire services. At the completion of the work day, construction crews would lock up and secure each worksite to prevent theft or vandalism associated with work equipment and supplies. Additionally, SCE would utilize private patrols to monitor all elements of the Proposed Project. Work crews also would minimize potential fire hazards through the implementation of standard SCE work plans. If required, public services, such as police and fire, would be provided by the City of Palm Springs and/or the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. However, construction of the Proposed Project would not significantly affect police and fire protection response times or create higher demand for these public services. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not require the provision of new or additional local police or fire services.

Construction of the Proposed Project may require the limited use of existing medical facilities in the area, in the unlikely event of an accident. However, as medical emergencies are expected to be minimal, potential medical emergencies among construction crews would not unduly burden the local hospitals or medical facilities. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not require the provision of new or additional medical facilities.

The Proposed Project would not cause a direct or indirect increase in the local population in the area, because the construction work force primarily would consist of local workers. Further, construction activities would be temporary and short-term. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would not affect the enrollment or capacity of the schools within the surrounding area. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not require the provision of new or additional school facilities. In addition, construction of the Proposed Project would not increase the use of parks or recreational facilities, nor would the project result in the need to construct or expand recreational facilities in the area.

In summary, project-construction impacts related to public services would be less than significant.

SCE would utilize private patrol services to monitor the facilities to verify that all elements of the Proposed Project are safe and secure. Although unlikely, in the event of an emergency, the private patrol services would contact local police or fire services. Therefore, the need for local police and fire services would be limited, and the Proposed Project would not require the provision of new or additional services. In addition, operation of the Proposed Project would not cause an increase in the local population. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not require the provision of new or additional medical or school facilities. In summary, impacts to public services due to operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

XIV. RECREATION

The majority of the Proposed Project would not be constructed adjacent to or within recreational areas. However, construction of the Proposed Project would occur within portions of the Tri-Palm Golf Course, where the Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4) would be built adjacent to an existing 115 kV subtransmission line, within SCE ROWs and franchise locations. Construction activities might cause temporary impacts to recreational users utilizing this area. For safety reasons, golf course users would be prohibited from the work areas intermittently during project construction (APM REC-1). Construction activities occurring within the recreation areas would follow applicable safety measures and traffic controls to ensure public safety during construction. Construction impacts would be temporary in nature and would be considered less than significant.

Because the construction work force would consist primarily of local workers, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not increase the use of parks or recreational facilities, nor would the project result in the need to construct or expand recreational facilities in the area.

In summary, impacts to recreation due to project construction would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project components would operate as unattended facilities and would not increase the local population. The project components would operate within existing SCE ROWs and franchise locations and would not result in a loss of parkland or recreational facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not increase the use of existing parks or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

In summary, the operation of the Proposed Project would not impact recreation.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

The Proposed Project would run adjacent to or cross a number of local roadways. The Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4) would cross I-10. Roadways located within the cities of Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert, as well as Riverside County, would be utilized. Regional access to the area would be provided by use of I-10.

Construction traffic to and from the Proposed Project would include construction crews and construction equipment for transmission and subtransmission line construction, substation modifications, and telecommunication improvements.

Various staging areas would be utilized along the proposed transmission and subtransmission line routes to provide convenient storage and access for construction. If any work were to require modifications or activities within local roadway ROWs, appropriate local permits would be obtained prior to the commencement of construction activities (APM TRA-1). This process would involve the preparation of appropriate management plans and provisions to ensure local streets are not damaged or that damage would be repaired (APM TRA-2). In the event that oversized loads or other special construction vehicles are utilized, appropriate permits and

procedures would be followed to ensure that the equipment and materials are safely hauled and do not damage state or federal roadway facilities.

All material for the transmission and subtransmission lines and substation modifications would be delivered by truck. The majority of the truck traffic would use major streets and would be scheduled during off-peak traffic hours. Concrete truck deliveries might need to be made during peak hours, when footing work is being performed. The transformer at Mirage Substation would be delivered by a heavy transport vehicle and off-loaded on site by large cranes with support trucks.

Traffic caused by the construction of the Proposed Project would be temporary, short-term, and minimal. The traffic volumes that would be generated by activities associated with the construction of the Proposed Project would not significantly affect intersection or roadway operations in the area due to the limited number of trips that would be generated. However, the Proposed Mirage-Santa Rosa 115 kV Subtransmission Line (Route 4) would cross I-10 and, as a result, there could be potential traffic delays from construction activities occurring at that location. SCE would be required to obtain encroachment permits from CalTrans in order to complete construction activities that cross I-10 (APM TRA-1). Through coordination with CalTrans, measures would be taken to minimize traffic delays along I-10. Because the movement of heavy equipment and materials to various work sites and marshalling yards has the potential to cause temporary traffic delays, such activities would occur in off-peak hours, in order to avoid the morning and evening peak vehicular travel times on weekdays, to the extent possible (APM TRA-3). In addition, SCE would implement a traffic management plan, approved by the local jurisdiction, prior to commencing construction activities. In summary, the Proposed Project would not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

It is not anticipated that the construction of the Proposed Project would require alterations to local roadways. However, if any work requires modifications or activities within the local road ROWs, appropriate local permits would be obtained. This process would involve the preparation of appropriate management plans and provisions to ensure that local streets are not damaged or that any damage is repaired.

Construction of the Proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns and would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

Substation upgrades and modifications associated with the Proposed Project would be contained within substation property boundaries, thereby leaving adjacent roads unobstructed. Therefore, substation construction would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Parking for routine maintenance of any of the components associated with the Proposed Project would be accommodated on substation sites or within existing SCE ROWs or franchise locations. During the construction of the Proposed Project, parking for construction workers also would be accommodated on the substation sites or within SCE ROWs and franchise locations. Overall, the Proposed Project would not result in inadequate parking capacity.

Construction of the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

In summary, impacts to traffic and transportation due to the construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Once completed and operational, the Proposed Project would not generate vehicular trips in the area on a consistent basis. Periodic maintenance or emergency repairs might be required occasionally, as problems would arise along the proposed lines (approximately once a month). However, the crews required for maintenance and repairs of these lines would generate a very small number of trips.

Following the completion of the upgrades and modifications to the 10 substations associated with the Proposed Project, the substations would continue to operate as unattended facilities. Crews occasionally would access the substation sites for periodic repairs and/or maintenance at the facilities (approximately once a week). However, these periodic trips would not cause traffic or transportation impacts at any of the intersections or roadways in the surrounding area. In addition, parking for routine maintenance would be accommodated on the substation sites or within existing SCE ROWs or franchise locations. The Proposed Project would not result in any change to air traffic or rail patterns.

In summary, impacts to traffic and transportation due to the operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Water Use and Wastewater Generation

Construction of the Proposed Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB. It would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, new storm-water drainage facilities, or expansion of existing facilities. The Proposed Project would not require wastewater disposal, and thus construction activities would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.

Construction of the Proposed Project would not have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or require new or expanded entitlements and would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Proposed Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's commitments. The only demand for water would be for use by construction workers and water brought in for dust control. Potable water for drinking and portable restrooms would be brought in for construction and disposed of accordingly. Non-potable water would be transported to the various construction areas for dust-suppression purposes.

In summary, impacts to water use and wastewater generation due to construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Solid Waste Generation

Construction of the Proposed Project would not be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Limited waste materials would be generated, including materials associated with the construction of transmission and subtransmission lines and substation modifications. Following installation of the new LWS poles, the existing wood poles would be removed completely (including the portion below ground surface). Depending on their condition and chemical treatment method, the wood poles to be replaced would be reused by SCE, returned to the manufacturer, disposed of in a Class I hazardous-waste landfill, or disposed of in the lined portion of a RWQCB-certified municipal landfill. Non-hazardous waste materials generated during construction would be either recycled or disposed of at approved landfills. Scrap metal and wood poles generated during removal of the existing LSTs and overhead lines would be recycled, to the extent possible.

Construction of the Proposed Project would comply with all federal, state, and local standards related to solid waste. In summary, impacts to solid-waste generation due to construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Natural Gas Pipelines

Construction activities could potentially disrupt services provided by underground and other overhead utilities. Prior to construction, surveys would be conducted to locate all underground and overhead utilities in the project area. Before any subsurface ground disturbance occurs (e.g., foundation work), SCE would contact Underground Service Alert to verify the location of existing underground utilities to avoid impacts. Construction of the Proposed Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Loop-In would be in the proximity of three Southern California Gas Company high-pressure, natural gas (30- and 36-inch) pipelines. SCE will design the LSTs and associated tower footings to avoid interference or contact with these three pipelines. Accordingly, two APMs (PUSVC-01 and PUSVC-02) are proposed regarding these natural gas pipelines. SCE also would design construction activities and methods to avoid disruption of overhead utility lines owned by third parties.

In summary, impacts to natural gas pipelines due to construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Operation of the Proposed Project would not impact other utilities. The Proposed Project would not require any additional connections to an existing municipal wastewater distribution system. The Proposed Project would not require any new connectors or use of water, wastewater, gas, or electric supply during the operational phase. Additionally, the operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the generation of waste material.

In summary, operation of the Proposed Project would not impact utilities.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Prior to implementation of the APMs, the Proposed Project would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce wildlife habitat, and reduce the numbers or range of a

rare, threatened, or endangered species. With the implementation of the APMs, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

The Proposed Project would not lead to impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

The Proposed Project would not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK