

APPENDIX A
CEQA CHECKLIST

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

APPENDIX A ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Project Title

West of Devers Upgrade Project (“WOD”)

Lead Agency Name and Address

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

Contact Person and Phone Number

Mr. Brent Gokbudak
Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”)
TDBU - Major Projects Organization
714-255-4854

Project Location

WOD is located in incorporated and unincorporated areas of Riverside County and San Bernardino County, California. Specifically, the Proposed Project components are located in the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Colton, Grand Terrace, Loma Linda, Palm Springs, Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands, San Bernardino, and Yucaipa, and unincorporated areas of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The Proposed Project component in the City of Rancho Cucamonga is limited to improvements within the Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) at Etiwanda Substation.

Project Sponsor’s Name and Address

Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”)
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770

General Plan Designation

The California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) has primary jurisdiction over the proposed West of Devers Upgrade Project (Proposed Project or Project), because it authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. Although such projects are exempt from local land use and zoning regulations and permitting, CPUC G.O. 131-D Section XIV.B states that “Local jurisdictions acting pursuant to local authority are preempted

from regulating electric power line projects, distribution lines, substations, or electric facilities constructed by public utilities subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction. However, in locating such projects, the public utilities shall consult with local agencies regarding land use matters.” SCE has considered local land use plans as part of the environmental review process.

The Project Study Area includes the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Colton, Grand Terrace, Loma Linda, Palm Springs, Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands, San Bernardino, and Yucaipa, and unincorporated areas of Riverside and San Bernardino counties. The Proposed Project component in the City of Rancho Cucamonga is limited to improvements within the Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room (MEER) at Etiwanda Substation; therefore, the City of Rancho Cucamonga is not included for further discussion. The existing West of Devers (WOD) corridor traverses a combination of residential, commercial, agricultural, recreation, and open space land uses. General Plan land use designations in the WOD area are shown in Table 1, General Plan Land Use Designations.

Table 1: General Plan Land Use Designations

Segment	Project Component	Jurisdiction(s)	GP Land Use Designation(s)
<i>Transmission</i>			
Segment 1	Transmission	Loma Linda, Redlands, San Bernardino County	Commercial, Industrial, Office, Open Space, Residential, Specific Plan, Transportation
Segment 2	Transmission	Colton, Grand Terrace, Loma Linda, San Bernardino County	Commercial, Open Space, Residential, Specific Plan, Transportation
Segment 3	Transmission	Loma Linda, Redlands, Riverside County	Agriculture, Commercial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Specific Plan, Residential
Segment 4	Transmission	Banning, Calimesa, Riverside County	Agriculture, Commercial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Specific Plan
Segment 5	Transmission	Banning, Riverside County	Commercial, Industrial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential
Segment 6	Transmission	Riverside County	Industrial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Transportation
<i>Subtransmission</i>			
Segment 1	Subtransmission	Loma Linda, Redlands, San Bernardino County	Commercial, Industrial, Office, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Specific Plan, Transportation
<i>Distribution</i>			
Segment 1	Distribution	Loma Linda, San Bernardino County	Commercial, Office, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Specific Plan, Transportation
<i>Telecom</i>			
Segment 1	Telecom	Loma Linda, Redlands	Commercial, Industrial, Office, Open Space, Residential, Specific Plan
Segment 2	Telecom	Grand Terrace	Industrial
Segment 3	Telecom	Redlands, Riverside County	Commercial, Open Space, Residential

Table 1: General Plan Land Use Designations

Segment	Project Component	Jurisdiction(s)	GP Land Use Designation(s)
Segment 4	Telecom	Banning, Beaumont, Riverside County	Commercial, Office, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Specific Plan
Segment 6	Telecom	Riverside County	Public Facilities
<i>Access Roads</i>			
Segment 1	Access Roads	Loma Linda, Redlands, San Bernardino County	Industrial, Office, Open Space, Residential, Specific Plan, Transportation
Segment 2	Access Roads	Colton, Grand Terrace, Loma Linda, San Bernardino County	Commercial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Specific Plan
Segment 3	Access Roads	Loma Linda, Redlands, Riverside County, San Bernardino County	Agriculture, Commercial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Specific Plan
Segment 4	Access Roads	Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Riverside County	Agriculture, Commercial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Specific Plan
Segment 5	Access Roads	Banning, Riverside County	Commercial, Industrial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential
Segment 6	Access Roads	Riverside County	Commercial, Industrial, Open Space, Public Facilities, Residential, Transportation
<i>Staging Yards</i>			
Segment 1	Lugonia	Redlands	Commercial
Segment 1	Mountain View 1	San Bernardino	Residential
Segment 2	Grand Terrace	Grand Terrace	Residential
Segment 3	Poultry	San Bernardino County	Residential
Segment 3	San Timoteo	San Bernardino County	Residential
Segment 4	Beaumont 1	Beaumont	Commercial
Segment 4	Beaumont 2	Beaumont	Commercial
Segment 5	Hathaway 1	Banning	Office
Segment 5	Hathaway 2	Banning	Office
Segment 6	Devers	Riverside County	Public Facilities
<i>Substations</i>			
n/a	Tennessee	Yucaipa	Residential
n/a	Etiwanda	Rancho Cucamonga	Industrial
Segment 1	San Bernardino	Redlands	Industrial, Commercial
Segment 1	Timoteo	Loma Linda	Commercial
Segment 2	Vista	Grand Terrace	Residential

Table 1: General Plan Land Use Designations

Segment	Project Component	Jurisdiction(s)	GP Land Use Designation(s)
Segment 3	El Casco	San Bernardino County	Open Space
Segment 4	Maraschino	Beaumont	Public Facilities
Segment 4	Banning	Banning	Public Facilities
Segment 6	Devers	Riverside County	Public Facilities

Zoning

The CPUC has primary jurisdiction over the Proposed Project, because it authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. However, SCE has considered local and State land use plans as part of the environmental review process, even though such projects are exempt from local land use jurisdictions, zoning regulations, and permits.

The Proposed Project is located primarily within existing SCE right-of-way (ROW) and other public ROW. The zoning designations for the lands crossed by the Proposed Project are predominantly open space/, parks and recreation, rural residential, residential, commercial, industrial, public facilities, and specific plan.

Project Description

The Proposed Project would upgrade the existing WOD system by replacing existing 220 kilovolt (kV) transmission lines and associated structures with new, higher-capacity 220 kV transmission lines and structures; modifying existing substation facilities; removing and relocating existing subtransmission (66 kV) lines; removing and relocating existing distribution (12 kV) lines; and making various telecommunication improvements. In particular, the Proposed Project would:

- Upgrade substation equipment within SCE’s existing Devers, El Casco, Etiwanda, San Bernardino, and Vista substations in order to accommodate continuous and emergency power on the upgraded WOD 220 kV transmission lines. Upgrade SCE’s existing Timoteo and Tennessee substations in order to accommodate the 66 kV subtransmission line relocations.
- Remove and upgrade the existing 220 kV transmission lines and structures primarily within the existing WOD corridor as follows:¹
 - Segment 1 would be approximately 3.5 miles in length and extend south from San Bernardino Substation to the San Bernardino Junction and include the following existing 220 kV transmission lines: Devers-San Bernardino, Etiwanda-San Bernardino, San Bernardino-Vista, and El Casco-San Bernardino.

¹ The proposed transmission line elements have been divided into six segments for ease of description in this Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (PEA).

- Segment 2 would be approximately 5 miles in length and extend west from the San Bernardino Junction to Vista Substation and include the following existing 220 kV transmission lines: Devers-Vista No. 1 and Devers-Vista No. 2.
- Segment 3 would be approximately 10 miles in length and extend east from the San Bernardino Junction to El Casco Substation and include the following existing 220 kV transmission lines: Devers-Vista No. 1, Devers-Vista No. 2, El Casco-San Bernardino, and Devers-San Bernardino.
- Segment 4 would be approximately 12 miles in length and extend east from the El Casco Substation to San Gorgonio Avenue in the City of Banning and include the following existing 220 kV transmission lines: Devers-Vista No. 1, Devers-Vista No. 2, Devers-El Casco, and Devers-San Bernardino.
- Segment 5 would be approximately 9 miles in length and extend east from San Gorgonio Avenue in the City of Banning to the eastern limit of the Morongo Indian Reservation² at Rushmore Avenue and include the following existing 220 kV transmission lines: Devers-Vista No. 1, Devers-Vista No. 2, Devers-El Casco, and Devers-San Bernardino.
- Segment 6 would be approximately 8 miles in length and extend east from the eastern limit of the Morongo Indian Reservation to Devers Substation and include the following existing 220 kV transmission lines: Devers-Vista No. 1, Devers-Vista No. 2, Devers-El Casco, and Devers-San Bernardino.
- Remove a portion (approximately 2 miles) of the existing San Bernardino-Redlands-Timoteo and San Bernardino-Redlands-Tennessee 66 kV subtransmission lines from within the existing WOD ROW and reconstruct as follows:
 - The relocated San Bernardino-Redlands-Timoteo 66 kV Subtransmission Line would be approximately 2 miles in length and would reconnect to the San Bernardino-Redlands-Timoteo 66 kV Subtransmission Line inside Timoteo Substation.
 - The relocated San Bernardino-Redlands-Tennessee 66 kV Subtransmission Line would be approximately 3.5 miles in length and would reconnect to the San Bernardino-Redlands-Tennessee 66 kV Subtransmission Line at Barton Road.
- Remove a portion of the existing Dental and Intern 12 kV distribution circuits within the WOD ROW and relocate the circuits as follows:
 - The relocated Dental 12 kV Distribution Circuit would be approximately 1.5 miles in length and would re-connect to the existing Dental 12 kV circuit.
 - The relocated Intern 12 kV Distribution Circuit would be approximately 2.25 miles in length and would re-connect to the Intern 12 kV circuit.
- Install telecommunication lines and equipment for the protection, monitoring, and control of transmission lines and substation equipment.

² Approximately 3 miles of existing ROW would be abandoned and replaced with a new 3-mile alignment pursuant to the SCE-Morongo ROW agreement. In addition, this segment consists of an alternative to a new 3-mile alignment (220 kV Transmission Line Route Alternative 1), which is further explained in Section 3.14 Project Alternatives.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The Proposed Project corridor begins in the urbanized areas of Grand Terrace and Loma Linda on the west and terminates just within the city limits of Palm Springs on the east. The Project Study Area transects urban and suburban areas, canyon areas, portions of the reservation trust land (the Reservation) of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Morongo), and low desert areas. The 220 kV transmission lines would be located within existing WOD corridor with the exception of an approximately 3-mile segment located in Segment 5. Land uses within the corridor, other than electric transmission infrastructure, include trails/open space and limited areas of agricultural/nursery use. The Project Study Area transects drainageways, roadways, parks, a portion of a landfill property, an aggregate (sand and gravel) operation, and roadways. Land uses near the Project Study Area include residences, commercial businesses, agricultural uses, community uses such as schools and fire stations, landfill operations, and the Banning Municipal Airport.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. Most of these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of SCE’s Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs). However, there are impacts related to air quality that would remain significant.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forestry | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 (EIR) 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 off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, 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 Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) **Earlier Analysis Used. Identify** and state where they are available for review.
 - b) **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures 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
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

1. AESTHETICS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. AIR QUALITY

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife 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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Pub. 42. ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv. Landslides? 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 system where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. GREENHOUSE GASES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<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"/>

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 preexisting 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<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 a course of a stream or river, or a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<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 storm water 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. Expose people of structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. NOISE

WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. NOISE

WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project located 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"/>

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through an extension of roads or other infra-structure)?	<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"/>

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS TO THE FOLLOWING:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. RECREATION

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. 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. 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"/>

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The following discussion addresses all Proposed Project components, including substation modifications, 220 kV transmission lines, 66 kV subtransmission lines, 12 kV distribution lines, telecommunication facilities, and the establishment of staging yards.

Aesthetics

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in permanent visual changes within the Project Study Area, including the replacement of existing 220 kV, double-circuit transmission structures with new, taller double-circuit structures, installation of transmission lines, telecommunications infrastructure, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) marker balls and lighting, construction of new access roads, relocation of subtransmission and distribution lines, and substation modifications. The Proposed Project would be located within viewsheds where numerous existing utility structures are established features in the landscape setting. A comparison between the set of Key Observation Point (KOP) existing views and corresponding simulation images included in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, demonstrates that the Proposed Project would not substantially change the existing landscape character found within these viewsheds. Therefore, the Project Study Area’s existing visual character, distinguished by features associated with urban and suburban communities in Segments 1 and 2, and with rural areas and rural communities in Segments 3, 4, 5, and 6, would not be substantially transformed by the Proposed Project, and impacts would be less than significant. No scenic vistas are designated for protection by Federal, State, or local governments within the Project Study Area. No impact would occur to scenic vistas. (Section 4.1, Aesthetics)

Agricultural Resources

The Proposed Project would convert approximately 2.1 acres of Prime Farmland, 0.9 acre of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 0.8 acre of Unique Farmland. The conversion of Prime

Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance and Unique Farmland for the Proposed Project would be less than the thresholds established in Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

The Proposed Project would be located on land zoned for agriculture in the cities of Banning and Redlands and in Riverside County. Public utility transmission lines and poles are an allowable use for all of these zones; therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the use of lands zoned for agriculture. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to the conversion of Farmland and agricultural zoning. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would have no impact on forest or timberlands or a Williamson Act contract. (Section 4.2, Agriculture and Forestry Resources)

Air Quality

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in emissions that exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) emissions thresholds for carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{2.5}). Compliance with APMs AIR-1 and AIR-2, which require preparation of an Exhaust Emissions Control Plan (target goal of a project-wide fleet average reduction of 20 percent NO_x) and a Fugitive Dust Control Plan, respectively, would reduce project-related impacts, but these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. During operation of the Proposed Project, emissions would be primarily those produced from vehicles (including helicopters) during occasional site visits for routine maintenance and emergency repair. Operation of the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to air quality. (Section 4.3, Air Quality)

Biological Resources

Biological impacts of the Proposed Project are divided into several categories: (1) riparian/riverine/wetland habitats; (2) endangered or threatened species and designated critical habitat; (3) upland habitat for special-status species; (4) wildlife movement; and (5) municipal ordinances and adopted habitat conservation plans. (Section 4.4, Biological Resources)

Riparian/Riverine/Wetland Habitats. Under existing State and Federal regulations, direct physical impacts to virtually all water bodies are subject to the regulatory authority and jurisdiction of some combination of either the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and/or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and/or the local Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). In accordance with existing programs and policies, agency policies support avoiding any net loss of area or function of regulated waters, and may require mitigation ratios in excess of 1:1 to offset direct impacts to these resources. The Proposed Project is being designed to avoid or minimize impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive land cover types to the extent practicable. Project design combined with compliance with applicable Federal and State permits (e.g., Clean Water Act [CWA] Section 404, Fish and Game Code Section 1602) and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), as described in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, would reduce impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive land cover types to less than significant levels. In addition, implementation of APMs BIO-1

Revegetation Plan and BIO-9 Jurisdictional Water Permits, would reduce impacts to a level less than significant.

In addition, for projects covered by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WR-MSHCP) or Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CV-MSHCP), the WR-MSHCP includes provisions for the conservation of riparian/riverine and vernal pool habitats and the CV-MSHCP provides for the conservation of wetland communities. Measures required under these conservation plans to compensate for impacts to wetland communities, riparian/riverine areas, and vernal pool habitat within the MSHCP planning areas, should SCE apply and obtain status as a Participating Special Entity (PSE) under either or both MSHCPs (in concert with compliance with permit conditions from regulatory agencies), would be sufficient to offset the impacts of the Proposed Project to reduce to a less than significant level.

Endangered or Threatened Species and Designated Critical Habitat. Three species of animals that are federally or State listed as threatened or endangered were identified in the Project Study Area. No threatened or endangered plant species were identified in the Project Study Area, though potential for special-status plants and animal species occurs in portions of the Project Study Area. Critical Habitat for the Coachella Valley milk-vetch, and coastal California gnatcatcher occur within the Project Study Area and Critical Habitat for the San Bernardino kangaroo rat, Santa Ana sucker, and southwestern willow flycatcher, occurs within 200 feet of various portions of the Proposed Project, though the Proposed Project will not directly impact Critical Habitat for the San Bernardino kangaroo rat or Santa Ana sucker.

APMs BIO-1 Revegetation Plan, BIO-2 Biological Monitoring, and BIO-7 Special Status Plants, which includes pre-construction surveys and more detailed evaluation, would minimize impacts to native plant species, and APM BIO-8 Coachella Valley Milk-Vetch would specifically focus on the Coachella Valley milk-vetch, and would assure that if Coachella Valley milk-vetch (which is not expected to occur in the Project Study Area) is encountered, potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Applicant Proposed Measures BIO-1 Revegetation Plan, BIO-2 Biological Monitoring, and implementation of WEAP training would minimize direct effects on coastal California gnatcatchers if it should occur within the Project Study Area. In addition, APM BIO-10 Coastal California Gnatcatcher and Designated Critical Habitat would provide for conservation of habitat value to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

Applicant Proposed Measures BIO-1 Revegetation Plan, BIO-2 Biological Monitoring, implementation of WEAP training and standard use of Best Management Practices would further minimize the potential for significant impacts to jurisdictional drainage features. Implementation of BMPs as described in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, as well as APM BIO-9 Jurisdictional Water Permits, would address and mitigate direct impacts to jurisdictional drainage features and would reduce impacts to the drainages associated with the Critical Habitat areas to less than significant levels.

The focused surveys conducted for the Proposed Project indicate that the three listed animal species, desert tortoise, least Bell's vireo, and Stephens' kangaroo rat, are only sparsely distributed in limited areas subject to potential project effects, but more concentrated occurrences were not found within the potential project impact area. Therefore, several APMs have been identified that would minimize or compensate for impacts, such that impacts would be considered less than significant. Applicant Proposed Measures BIO-1 Revegetation Plan, BIO-2 Biological Monitoring, and BIO-5 Desert Tortoise, would reduce the potential for the Proposed Project to impact individual tortoises. Applicant Proposed Measure BIO-1 would significantly reduce the temporary effects on habitat for desert tortoises. Impacts to desert tortoises within the CV-MSHCP would be considered covered, and therefore not significant if SCE becomes a PSE and implements the requirements of that plan. Coverage under the CV-MSHCP means that SCE will have contributed to conservation objectives that are intended to offset impacts to these species by preserving and protecting habitat for them.

Additionally, APM BIO-6 Least Bell's Vireo, which would minimize impacts to least Bell's Vireo and result in compensatory mitigation, and APMs BIO-1 Revegetation Plan, BIO-2 Biological Monitoring, as well as Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training as described in Chapter 3, which would also serve to minimize impacts to this species.

Applicant Proposed Measure BIO-12 included provisions for avoiding impacts to individual Stephens' kangaroo rats, as well as revegetation of temporarily affected habitat (APM BIO-1 Revegetation Plan). Additional measures may be required through formal Section 7 consultation. When combined with APM BIO-2 Biological Monitoring and WEAP training described in Chapter 3, the potential impacts to Stephens' kangaroo rat would be reduced to a level less than significant.

With implementation of the applicant proposed measures, the Proposed Project's impacts to these species are expected to be avoided or minimized to less than significant levels.

Upland Habitat for Special-Status Species. The Proposed Project traverses a variety of upland habitats that support associated special-status species in addition to the threatened and endangered species discussed above. The long term viability of these species is directly related to the long term preservation of their various habitats, and this long term habitat preservation in exchange for permitted development in less important areas is a central tenet of the MSHCPs that include most of the Project Study Area. The footprint of impacts associated with the transmission line consists of widely spaced, relatively small areas associated with facilities and the related access roads. The configuration of Proposed Project impacts results in a lower level of edge effects when compared to a comparable area of development, as the habitat immediately adjacent to the facilities and access roads would remain suitable to support various special-status species.

The Proposed Project's permanent impacts to upland habitats would be mitigated by conservation in accordance with the adopted MSHCPs, if SCE obtains PSE status, and/or by implementation of APMs BIO-1, Revegetation Plan, BIO-2, Biological Monitoring, APM BIO-

3, Nesting Birds, and BIO-10 Coastal California Gnatcatcher and Designated Critical Habitat, which would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Wildlife Movement. While there may be temporary impacts to local wildlife movement along and across the Proposed Project Area during construction, these temporary impacts are not considered to be significant impacts to wildlife movement since the duration of construction activity at any specific location along the 48-mile corridor would be relatively short in duration. As part of their overall conservation strategies, the MSHCPs in the region emphasize preserving and improving linkages between important habitat preservation areas, in order to avoid or minimize cumulative impacts to wildlife movement. The Proposed Project would not appreciably affect the design and implementation of the planned MSHCP habitat linkages because of the relative widely-spaced, localized nature of the individual structures/facilities along the existing WOD corridor. The Proposed Project would not preclude wildlife movement opportunities along the alignment since wildlife movement routes (e.g., vegetated and unvegetated drainage features, canyon-like areas, dirt roads) would be relatively undisturbed by the short-term and limited nature of construction and operation activities of the Proposed Project. Thus, the Proposed Project impacts to wildlife movement would be less than significant.

Municipal Ordinances and Adopted Habitat Conservation Plans. The MSHCPs specifically recognize the need for infrastructure development in the region and within the plan areas. The Proposed Project would rely upon the existing utility corridor that was in place when the MSHCPs were developed. If SCE seeks and ultimately obtains take authorization as a PSE, the PSE process would ensure consistency with the MSHCPs. SCE intends to seek PSE status. It should be noted that regardless of MSHCP participation, Section 7 Consultation would be required, and incidental take authorization outside of the MSHCP areas may be required.

The USFWS and CDFW would assess the effects of the Proposed Project on the MSHCPs during their evaluation of any alternative incidental take authorization process. It is anticipated that required conservation measures would ensure that the Proposed Project would not adversely impact the conservation required in each MSHCP to offset cumulative impacts to covered species. The Proposed Project's impacts would be less than significant with implementation of APMs described above.

The Proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (e.g., tree preservation policies or ordinances).

Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Ground-disturbing activities during construction of the Proposed Project have the potential to affect cultural resources. APM CUL-1 and APM-CUL-2 require the application of standard-practice mitigation scenarios and the preparation of a Construction Monitoring and Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential construction impacts to less than significant. Most regular Operations and Maintenance (O&M) activities of overhead facilities are performed from existing access roads

with no surface disturbance. Repairs to facilities, such as repairing or replacing poles and structures, could occur in previously disturbed areas. Therefore, no impacts to resources during operation of the Proposed Project are anticipated.

Ground-disturbing activities during construction of the Proposed Project have the potential to affect paleontological resources. APM PAL-1, governing construction- and operation-phase of the project, requires preparation of a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, which would identify monitoring and treatment requirements for sensitive paleontological resources of significance. Implementation of this measure would reduce potential construction impacts to less than significant. Repairs to facilities, such as repairing or replacing poles and structures, could occur in previously disturbed areas. Therefore, no impacts to resources during operation of the Proposed Project are anticipated. (Section 4.5, Cultural and Paleontological Resources)

Geology and Soils

Since the Proposed Project would involve construction of new improvements that would be constructed upon the existing soils, potential soil and seismic issues would be considered in design and construction of project improvements. Proposed Project components would be designed to minimize the potential for significant risks. The final design and construction of all Proposed Project components would incorporate appropriate engineering design and common construction practices to address such hazards. Practices that may be used to minimize impacts could include, but are not limited to, removal of unstable materials, avoidance of highly unstable areas, construction of pile formations, ground improvements of liquefiable zones, installation of flexible bus connections, and incorporation of slack in cables. The incorporation of engineering design and common construction practices would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Normal operation of the lines would be controlled remotely through SCE control systems, and manually in the field as required. SCE inspects the transmission, subtransmission, telecommunications and distribution overhead facilities in a manner consistent with CPUC GO 165, a minimum of once per year via ground and/or aerial observation. Maintenance would occur as needed and could include activities such as repairing conductors, washing or replacing insulators, repairing or replacing other hardware components, replacing poles and structures, tree trimming, brush and weed control, and access road maintenance. Most regular O&M activities of overhead facilities are performed from existing access roads with no surface disturbance. Repairs to facilities, such as repairing or replacing poles and structures, could occur in undisturbed areas. The routine inspection and maintenance of the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to geology and soils. (Section 4.6, Geology and Soils)

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Proposed Project emissions, including construction would generate up to 1,626 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per year, which is well below the SCAQMD threshold of 10,000 metric tons of CO₂e. The Proposed Project would facilitate progress towards achieving California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) goals by

allowing full deliverability of new renewable resources located in the Blythe and Desert Center areas. Achieving the goals established by California's RPS is a major component of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Scoping Plan to reduce GHG emissions in compliance with AB 32. As a result, the Proposed Project is consistent with the Scoping Plan. In addition, the Proposed Project would support renewable generation in excess of the current RPS that may be needed to satisfy AB 32 or Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 GHG reduction goals. The Proposed Project's impacts would be less than significant. (Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Proposed Project would not be constructed or operated on a site listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Section 65962.5, and is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Proposed Project construction would result in less than significant impacts associated with the transport, use, disposal, or foreseeable upset of, accidents involving, hazardous materials. The Proposed Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Proposed Project would be required to adhere to all applicable laws and regulations to reduce the potential impacts from hazards, including impacts associated with emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, as well as compatibility with adopted airport land use plans. In addition, Proposed Project construction and operation would be required to adhere to standard fire prevention protocols to reduce the potential impacts associated with wildland fires. Therefore, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts. (Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)

Hydrology and Water Quality

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. The Proposed Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area and does not cross areas subject to dam or levee inundation. The Proposed Project would not substantially interfere with existing drainage patterns, nor would it install large-scale impervious surfaces that would excessively contribute to storm water runoff. BMPs would be adopted to reduce the potential for storm water runoff and pollution. Additionally, the Proposed Project would be required to prepare Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) and implement site-specific BMPs detailed in the SWPPPs. Construction BMPs would include, but not be limited to, erosion control and sediment control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on site and reduce the amount of storm water flow from areas of active construction.

The Proposed Project would be subject to post-construction requirements. Ongoing O&M activities would be conducted according to the explanation provided in Section 3.12, Project Operation and Maintenance, of the Project Description. Access road and drainage improvement activities would help minimize erosion and the potential for sedimentation.

The change in impervious surfaces and maintenance activities would not be substantially different than the existing condition. The change in the rate of storm water runoff and contribution of additional sources of polluted runoff associated with the Proposed Project would

be minor compared to existing conditions. As a result, impacts related to degradation of water quality would be less than significant. (Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality)

Land Use and Planning

The Proposed Project would not divide an established community; conflict with an applicable land use policy, plan, or regulation; or, conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. The majority of the Proposed Project would occur in existing SCE or public ROW, or on existing parcels (substations and staging yards), and thus, would not physically divide an established community or conflict with a current land use designation. In the locations where the Proposed Project would be constructed in areas outside of existing ROW, Proposed Project construction would not divide an established community due to the fact that all construction activities would be temporary. The Proposed Project operation would not conflict with locally adopted land use plans, policies, or regulations. As described above under Biological Resources, the Proposed Project, with APMs incorporated, would not conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. (Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning)

Mineral Resources

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State, or 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, because no mineral resource extraction activities currently occur within the boundaries of the Proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant. (Section 4.11, Mineral Resources)

Noise

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to noise. The construction noise generated by the Proposed Project would occur intermittently over 36 to 48 months in locations throughout the Project Study Area. The Proposed Project's construction noise impact at any location would be short in duration and less than significant. Noise due to the operation of the Proposed Project would be similar to existing conditions and would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in noise. Impacts would be less than significant. (Section 4.12, Noise)

Socioeconomics, Population and Housing, and Environmental Justice

Construction of the Proposed Project is anticipated to have less than significant impacts related to socioeconomics, population and housing, and environmental justice. Construction of the Proposed Project, while lasting approximately 36 to 48 months, would not include substantial numbers of workers (up to approximately 334 workers at the height of construction). The labor

demands of the Proposed Project would be met by existing SCE employees and by hiring specialty electrical transmission contractors. Similarly, it would not create new opportunities for local industry or commerce or impact population growth in the area. The number of positions required during the construction phase, combined with the large employment base to draw from in Southern California, would not directly or indirectly induce new population growth in the area, and likewise, there would be little to no need for additional housing. Also, the Proposed Project would not require the displacement of persons or homes.

Construction of the Proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable construction air quality impact because construction-related emissions would exceed the thresholds for various pollutants. However, any potential construction impacts would be short-term in nature, and low-income and minority populations would not be disproportionately affected.

Therefore, the Proposed Project would not disproportionately impact low income or minority populations. There would be no impacts related to this topic. (Section 4.11, Socioeconomics, Population and Housing, and Environmental Justice)

Public Services

Neither Proposed Project construction nor operation would result in a negative impact on a performance objective for police or fire services; an increase in school enrollment; or an increase in the use of libraries, parks, or other public facilities. There would be a less than significant impact on the performance objectives of these resources. (Section 4.14, Public Services)

Recreation

The Proposed Project would not increase the use of existing parks or require the construction of new recreation facilities. No impacts related to the construction or expansion of parks and recreation facilities would occur as a result of Proposed Project. During construction, local parks may be used by workers during their lunch or break periods; however, the short duration of construction activity in the vicinity of any specific park near the 48-mile corridor, and the limited number of construction workers would not result in a significant increase in the use of existing parks or recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Furthermore, impacts related to disruption of access to existing recreational opportunities from construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. (Section 4.15, Recreation)

Transportation and Traffic

Construction of the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to transportation. The worst-case trip generation is approximately 2,400 peak-hour trips or 3,100 passenger car equivalents (PCEs). These trips will not all utilize the same route or affect the same roadways. Instead, they would be spread over the 7 substations, 10 staging areas, and 48-mile transmission corridor. The traffic generated during construction activities for the Proposed Project would occur for a short period of time (approximately 36 to 48 months) and dispersed

throughout different portions of the project route. Operation and maintenance traffic to and from the Proposed Project would be very similar to existing conditions and is not expected to conflict with applicable congestion management programs. Impacts to traffic would be less than significant. (Section 4.16, Transportation and Traffic)

Utilities and Service Systems

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to utilities and service systems. The Proposed Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB; therefore, the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not result in the construction of new water, wastewater, or storm water facilities. The Proposed Project would not significantly affect water supplies or affect wastewater treatment capacities. The waste that would require disposal by the Proposed Project would be accommodated in landfills that have the permitted capacity to accept the waste. Impacts to utilities and service systems would be less than significant. (Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems)

Mandatory Findings of Significance

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 rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

a. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project corridor begins in the urbanized areas of Grand Terrace and Loma Linda on the west and terminates just within the city limits of Palm Springs on the east. The Project Study Area transects urban and suburban areas, canyon areas, portions of the Reservation Trust Land (the Reservation) of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Morongo), and low desert areas. The Proposed Project has the potential to degrade the quality of the natural environment; however, the implementation of APMs BIO-1 through BIO-12 reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Similarly, ground-disturbing activities during construction of the Proposed Project have the potential to affect cultural and paleontological resources. APM CUL-1 and APM-CUL-2 require the application of standard-practice mitigation scenarios and the preparation of a Construction Monitoring and Unanticipated Cultural Resources Discovery Plan. APM PAL-1 requires preparation of a Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, which would identify monitoring and treatment requirements for sensitive paleontological resources of significance. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential impacts to cultural and paleontological resources to less than significant.

The Proposed Project, with APMs incorporated, would not 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 rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

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.)

b. Potentially Significant. Construction-related emissions of CO, VOCs, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} associated with the construction of 220 kV transmission lines, 66 kV subtransmission lines, and 12 kV distribution lines are regionally significant and require mitigation. There would be a cumulatively considerable net increase of the criteria pollutants that are in nonattainment status in the South Coast Air Basin and Salton Sea Air Basin. The APMs identified in Section 4.3.6, Applicant Proposed Measures, require a detailed Exhaust Emissions Control Plan (which would include reduction measures such as the use of Tier 3 construction equipment, and use of particle traps on construction equipment) and a detailed Fugitive Dust Control Plan (which would include reduction measures such as dust suppression of disturbed surfaces (including unpaved roads), low speeds on unpaved roadways, etc.). While the application of APMs would reduce project-related emissions, emissions are not expected to be reduced to less than significant levels. The Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative short-term air quality impacts is significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

c. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable short-term construction impacts to air quality. These impacts will cease at the conclusion of project construction activities. The operation impacts of the Proposed Project, with APMs incorporated, are less than significant. Therefore, based on the project description and the preceding responses, development of the Proposed Project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings because all potentially significant operation impacts of the Proposed Project can be reduced to a less than significant level.