1. Project title:

Antelope Transmission Project – Segment 1

2. Lead agency name and address:

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

3. Contact person and phone number:

Mr. Thomas Burhenn
Manager of Regulatory Operations
(626) 302-9652

Mr. Daniel C. Pearson
Manager of Land Services, Environmental Affairs Division
(626) 302-9562

4. Project location:

The project extends from the existing SCE Antelope Substation site located in the City of Lancaster, to the existing SCE Pardee Substation site located in the City of Santa Clarita. The proposed (and Alternative 2) 25.6-mile-long 500 kV T/L route would mostly follow the alignment of the existing Antelope-Pole Switch 74 66 kV line, including about 13 miles within the Angeles National Forest. The Alternative 1 500 kV T/L route (approximately 27.9 miles long) would mostly follow the alignment of an existing Los Angeles Department of Water and Power R-O-W, including about 14.4 miles within the Angeles National Forest.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

[1] http: //ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/Appendix_G.html

6. General plan designations:

The proposed project occurs within the general plan areas of the Cities of Lancaster and Santa Clarita, the County of Los Angeles, within the management area of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Angeles National Forest. The Alternative 1 500 kV T/L route also traverses land under the jurisdiction of the USDI, Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

These planning and management areas contain numerous land use designations, which are summarized in Table 4.10-1 and 4.10-2 of the PEA.

7. Zoning:

The proposed project occurs within the zoning areas of the Cities of Lancaster and Santa Clarita, and the County of Los Angeles. These areas contain numerous zoning designations, which are summarized in Table 4.10-1 and 4.10-2 of the PEA.

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Transmission Line Facilities: If selected, the new 25.6-mile-long proposed T/L would use single- and double-circuit tower construction, including an estimated total of 115 (114 new and one existing) 500 kV towers. Approximately 119 existing 66 kV towers and associated hardware would be removed from the Antelope – Pole Switch 74 66 kV line within the existing Saugus-Del Sur R-O-W. The removed 66 kV towers would be recycled and/or disposed of in an appropriate manner offsite. Grading may be required at some of the tower sites to accommodate the new 500 kV tower foundations. Existing access and spur roads would be repaired and new spur roads would be built at about 20 tower locations. Approximately 24 new pulling locations and 15 new splicing locations would need to be constructed.

If selected, the new Alternative 1 T/L would be similar with regard to those construction features described previously for the Proposed T/L and would include about 130 four-legged single circuit towers, one existing four-legged double circuit tower, and several double circuit tubular steel poles.

Primary and Secondary Marshalling Yards: The Primary Marshalling Yard would be established on about 5 acres in proximity to the Antelope Substation site. Yard preparation would include application of a road base, designation of equipment and materials storage

areas, installation of perimeter fencing, and implementation of all relevant SCE health & safety and environmental protection plans and programs. The site would be utilized for the duration of construction activity. Secondary Marshalling Yards would be established for short-term utilization near construction sites, would use previously disturbed areas to the fullest extent practicable, and would fully consider the results of any biological and cultural resources studies that are implemented for site-selection purposes.

Subtransmission and Distribution: The Antelope Substation would be expanded 1,145 feet by 1,185 feet and an additional 200-foot-wide R-O-W strip would be located adjacent to the expanded substation southern and eastern perimeter fences for placement of future 66 kV lines. Eighteen 70-foot-tall wooden poles would be replaced with 18, 70-foot-tall light weight steel poles, which includes three 1,000-foot-long segments of double-circuit 66 kV subtransmission line which includes new conductor installation. The existing Antelope Pole Switch 66 kV line located on the Saugus-Del Sur R-O-W between mile 1.1 to mile 18.6 would be removed to make room for the new Antelope-Pardee 500 kV line. The 4-mile-long 12 kV circuit on one side of the Antelope-Pole Switch 74 66 kV line structure from Elizabeth Lake/Pine Canyon Road to Avenue J would be relocated to new distribution poles within the expanded Saugus-Del Sur R-O-W.

Antelope Substation Facilities: Installation of facilities would include two additional 220 kV line positions to terminate a new 220 kV Generation Tie Line and the proposed Antelope-Pardee 500 kV T/L, including the extension of the 220 kV switchyard four positions to the south. The expansion would create new line positions 10, 11, 12 and 13. Six new 220 kV circuit breakers, four line and eight bus deadend structures, and 14 220 kV disconnect switches would be installed in this segment. New protective relay equipment would be installed in a new Mechanical Electrical Equipment Room adjacent to the existing Control Room. Upgrade of existing 220 kV buses to 3700 Ampere (A) Rating. Additional property would be acquired adjacent to the Antelope Substation to accommodate the facilities improvements for the future voltage rating increase from 220 kV to 500 kV.

Pardee Substation Facilities: Two new 220 kV circuit breakers and four new 220 kV disconnect switches and new protective relaying would be installed.

Information Technology Facilities: A secondary path Optical Ground Wire would be installed on all new T/Ls to provide redundancy for the existing SCE infrastructure between Antelope and Pardee substations.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

Surrounding land use in the northern portion of the proposed project within the City of Lancaster and unincorporated Los Angeles County include, primarily, low-density residential, light agriculture, and open space. The middle portion in the Angeles National Forest is within designated utility corridors with associated and secondary recreational opportunities land uses. The land use and setting in the Santa Clarita Valley southernmost portion is primarily medium-density, single-family residential suburban development and business park/light industrial.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Potential special use permitting may be required from the USFS and the BLM (Alternative 1 only). Encroachment permits, and notifications and letters of permission, may be required for crossings over water-supply features, utility corridors, and transportation corridors. California Department of Fish & Game Section (CDFG) 1601 permits (stream and lake alteration agreement), and Corps of Engineers Section 404 permits, may be required for potential direct affects to State and federal jurisdictional waters. If endangered species issues arise during project implementation, incidental take permitting through coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Memorandum of Understanding permitting through coordination with the CDFG, may become necessary.

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.

____ Aesthetics	____ Agriculture Resources	____ Air Quality
____ Biological Resources	____ Cultural Resources	____ Geology / Soils
____ Hazards & 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 off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
    b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
    c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated

or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

	Potentially 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?			✓	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			✓	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	
II. AGRICULTURE 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?			✓	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			✓	
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?			✓	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		✓		
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		✓		
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)?		✓		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		✓		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		✓		

	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?		✓		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		
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?		✓		
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?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?		✓		
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?		✓		
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?		✓		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?		✓		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		✓		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		✓		
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:		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.		✓		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		✓		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		✓		
iv) Landslides?		✓		
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		✓		
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?		✓		
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?		✓		
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?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		✓		
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?		✓		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		✓		
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?				✓
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?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		✓		
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?		✓		
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		✓		
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)?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 on- or off-site?		✓		
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		✓		
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?		✓		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		✓		
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?				✓
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			✓	
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?			✓	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			✓	
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?			✓	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✓	
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?		✓		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		✓		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓		
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓		
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?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
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)?				✓
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
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:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?				✓
Police protection?				✓
Schools?				✓
Parks?				✓
Other public facilities?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
XV. TRANSPORTATION/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)?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		✓		
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?				✓
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✓
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		✓		
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?		✓		
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
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?				✓
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✓
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?				✓
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				✓
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		✓		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		✓		
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✓	

SOURCES AND EXPLANATIONS OF ANSWERS:

I. AESTHETICS

Project construction and operation would have less than significant impacts on scenic vistas, scenic resources, and would not create substantial new sources of light or glare.

Degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the proposed 500 kV T/L route (including Alternative 2) would be less than significant with mitigation incorporation, including project design to minimize aesthetic impacts, and construction debris removal, as specified in Section 5.2 of the PEA. The degradation of the existing visual character or quality along the Alternative 1 route would also be less than significant with mitigation incorporation, as specified previously.

The visual setting along the proposed route (including Alternative 2) and the Alternative 1 route is already affected by the presence of existing T/L facilities. The proposed project (and alternatives) would result in less than significant incremental increases in visual impacts along the route(s).

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Project construction and operation would have less than significant impacts on State-designated or locally-important farmlands, zoning for agricultural use, Williamson Act contracts, or substantially impairing farming and grazing activities and commerce, because only a minimal amount of farmland and grazing land conversion would occur in a regional context, and construction activities would be temporary and intermittent.

III. AIR QUALITY

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation, as specified in Section 5.4 of the PEA. Mitigation incorporation would avoid or minimize the potentials for:

- Conflicts with an applicable air quality plan
- Violating an air quality standard
- Contributing substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation
- Substantial net contribution towards a cumulative increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in a non-attainment condition

- Exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations
- Creating objectionable odors affecting a great number of people

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation, as specified in Section 5.5 of the PEA, upon sensitive species, riparian habitats, other sensitive native habitats, wetlands, species migrations, wildlife corridors, local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, or upon any established or pending State or County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation, as specified in Section 5.6 of the PEA, upon sensitive archaeological, historic, and paleontological resources. Mitigation incorporation would include conducting a full-scale cultural resources reconnaissance, and construction activity monitoring to protect and recover cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact upon people and structures with mitigation incorporation that pertains to the effects of earthquake fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, expansive and collapsible soils, subsidence, and landslides. Mitigation incorporation would include implementation of geotechnical and engineering studies and incorporation of the resultant design recommendations.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation pertaining to risks associated with:

- Transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials
- Reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions causing hazardous material release into the environment

- Hazardous emissions and handling of acutely hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school
- Impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan
- Causing wildland fires and urban interface fires

Mitigation incorporation would include implementation of the Construction SWPPP, SPCC Plan, and related plans and through development and implementation of other plans and programs required under State and federal law.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation, as specified in Section 5.9 of the PEA. Mitigation incorporation would avoid or minimize the potential for:

- Violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements
- Causing substantial erosion through altering existing drainage patterns and/or streamcourses
- Causing substantial flooding through altering existing drainage patterns and/or streamcourses
- Generate polluted water or overload stormwater drainage systems
- Otherwise substantially degrade water quality
- Placement of structures within a 100-year floodplain that will impede or redirect floodflows

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact pertaining to existing land uses, future planning, and/or land management by the cities of Lancaster and Santa Clarita, the County of Los Angeles, the BLM, and the USFS. Neither would the proposed project physically divide an established community nor conflict with a HCP or a NCCP.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact pertaining to limiting the availability of mineral and energy resources within any federal, State, or local jurisdiction.

XI. NOISE

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation, as specified in Section 5.12 of the PEA. Mitigation incorporation would avoid or minimize the potentials for:

- Exposing persons to noise levels above thresholds in local plans, ordinances, and State agency standards
- Exposing persons to excessive ground-borne vibrations and noise levels
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above the pre-project ambient level
- Substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels above the pre-project ambient level

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

No adverse impacts are identified for project construction and operation. Population and housing resources would not be adversely affected.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

No adverse impacts are identified for project construction and operation. No public services would be affected.

XIV. RECREATION

No adverse impacts are identified for project construction and operation. No recreation areas or activities would be affected in city, State, and county areas. Less than significant impacts upon recreational opportunities and uses in the Angeles National Forest would be achieved through stipulations in a USFS Special Use Permit issued to the project.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation that includes the development of local traffic management and detour plans as specified by local jurisdictions, and any other SCE plans developed according to Section VII, above.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Project construction and operation would have no impacts pertaining to:

- Exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Causing construction or expansion of water delivery or wastewater treatment facilities
- Causing construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities
- Affect available water supplies and entitlements
- Affecting wastewater treatment provider services
- Affecting landfill capacity from project solid waste disposal

Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation pertaining to complying with federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste disposal because: 1) removed existing facilities would be recycled and/or disposed of in an approved manner offsite; and 2) construction debris removal would be continuously conducted.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

As discussed in Section 5.2, the proposed project (including all the alternatives) has the potential to incrementally impact the quality of the aesthetic visual environment in the Haskell Canyon and Copper Hill residential areas within the Santa Clarita area, and potentially, in the Leona Valley and Green Valley areas along the Alternative 1 route. However, due to the existing T/L facilities in these areas, the proposed project (and alternatives) would not be expected to "substantially degrade" the environment and impacts are deemed less than significant. As discussed in Section 5.6, the proposed project has the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California prehistory. Implementation of mitigation as discussed in Section 5.6 would reduce the potential impacts to Cultural Resources to a less than significant level.

For the reasons described in Section 7.0, the proposed project (including the Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 T/L routes and associated facilities) does not have the potential to cause impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable to the point of being significant.

For the reasons discussed in this PEA, the proposed project (including the Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 T/L routes and associated facilities) does not have environmental effects that would cause unavoidable, substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.