3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The following impact assessment summary and checklists are based on the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study Checklist and summarizes the threshold of significance and findings for impacts analyzed for Site C of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PGandE) Delta Distribution Planning Area Capacity Increase Project (project).

3.1 AESTHETICS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would result in physical changes to the landscape altering a recognized scenic vista or area of unique or outstanding visual character.* ***Finding****: The project is sited on relatively flat, low-lying terrain located at the base of a hill. In addition, the project utilizes a low-profile substation design. The project will not obstruct or substantially affect a scenic vista because the introduction of the new substation will not substantially alter views of the hillsides and ridgelines, including Mount Diablo, that are currently experienced by the public. See Chapter 4: Aesthetics, Attachment 4-A, Figures 4-3 and 4-4*	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would result in physical changes to the landscape altering a recognized scenic resource within a state scenic highway.* ***Finding****: There are no designated or eligible state scenic highways within the project viewshed.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to result in physical changes to the landscape altering the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.* ***Finding****: The project involves the installation of a landscaped, low-profile design substation adjacent to an existing 230 kilovolt transmission line. To the extent the project is visible, it will generally be seen against a hillside or landscape backdrop, making project facilities less visible. Also, because the project incorporates the installation of perimeter landscape screening and other aesthetic mitigation measures, and because it will not be highly visible to the public, the project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. See Chapter 4: Aesthetics, Attachment 4-A, Figures 4-3 and 4-4.*	☐	☑	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. ***Finding****: The project will not create a new source of substantial light that could adversely affect nighttime views in the area because project lighting will be directed on-site and will utilize non-glare bulbs, and landscaping will largely screen facility lighting. New structures will be treated with a non-reflective finish; consequently, the project will not create a new source of substantial glare, which would adversely affect views in the area.*	☐	☑	☐	☐

3.2 AGRICULTURAL

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Department 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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would convert important farmlands to urban uses.* ***Finding****: The project will not convert important farmlands to urban uses.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would result in a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.* ***Finding:*** *The project will not result in a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? ***Finding****: The project will result in a permanent loss of approximately 5.13 acres of farmland and permanently impact an additional approximate 0.44 acre (access road). This is considered a less than significant impact as it represents 0.6 percent of the total land in agricultural use within the City of Antioch.*	☐	☐	☑	☐

3.3 AIR QUALITY

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.3 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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a significant adverse impact if air quality emissions from the construction or operation of the project were to exceed the San Francisco Bay Area air quality standards (see Chapter 5: Air Quality).* ***Finding****: The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality attainment plans.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a significant adverse impact if it violated any air quality standard or contributed substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.* ***Finding****: The project will not 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)? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a significant adverse impact if it resulted in a considerable cumulative increase in any criteria pollutant in the project region that is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state air quality standard.* ***Finding****: Construction of the project will produce temporary air emissions in the form of fugitive dust; adoption of Bay Area Air Quality Management District-recommended mitigation measures will result in less than significant impacts.*	☐	☐	☑	☐

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *Refer to 3.3 a), above.* ***Finding****: The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations from ground disturbance or from construction equipment and vehicle exhaust.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *Refer to 3.3 a), above.* ***Finding****: Construction and operation of the project will not require the use of equipment or materials that would cause objectionable odors.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to cause the substantial loss of designated species either directly or through substantial habitat modifications.* ***Findings:*** *This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on species identified as having a special status by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) with incorporation of mitigation measures listed in Chapter 6: Biological Resources.*	☐	☑	☐	☐
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to substantially diminish the habitat value of riparian habitat or other state- or federally recognized sensitive natural communities through physical modification to such areas.* ***Findings:*** *The project will have a less than significant impact on riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFG and USFWS with implementation of the mitigation measures listed in chapters 4 through 14.*	☐	☐	☑	☐

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands if it were to directly remove, fill, or cause hydrologic interruption such that wetland functions and/or values were substantially reduced or diminished.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands because it will not directly remove, fill, or cause hydrologic interruption such that wetland functions and/or values are reduced or diminished. No wetlands occur within the Site C substation and a substantial riparian buffer zone will be established to protect Sand Creek during construction. The bridge at Sand Creek will be built when the creek is dry and, therefore, will not cause hydrologic interruption. Mitigation for this impact will reduce it to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures listed in Chapter 6: Biological Resources.*	☐	☑	☐	☐
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a significant adverse effect if it were to interfere substantially with the movement of fish and wildlife through migration corridors by removing, obstructing, or physically changing corridors so as to diminish use. Additionally, the project would have a significant adverse effect it were to obstruct or diminish the quantity or quality of native nursery habitat.* ***Findings:*** *This project will have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species and will not substantially interfere with the established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nurseries. The bridge to be installed at Sand Creek will be large enough to accommodate any future needs to provide passage for downstream salmon. There is sufficient open space surrounding the project site that it will not impede wildlife movement through the area.*	☐	☐	☑	☐

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a significant adverse impact if it were to conflict with applicable local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.* ***Findings:*** *The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy. There will be no tree trimming or removal required during construction and currently there are no trees in the area that would require trimming in the future.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a significant adverse impact if it were to hinder the implementation of an applicable Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Open Space Plan.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not hinder the implementation of an applicable Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Open Space Plan.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to directly alter or change the context of the project area such that the scientific, cultural, or social value of a historical resource within the project area is diminished, or if the project would cause damage to, disrupt, or adversely affect an important prehistoric or historic archaeological resource such that its integrity could be compromised or eligibility for future listing on the California Register of Historic Resources diminished.* ***Finding****: No historical resources are present based on archival research and a field inventory. Ground-disturbing construction activities have the potential to directly impact potential cultural resources in the project area by disturbing both surface and subsurface soils. These impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures listed in Chapter 7: Cultural Resources.*	☐	☑	☐	☐

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of unique archaeological resource as defined by CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions; has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest or best available example of its type; or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person).* ***Finding****: Subsurface and surface disturbance could result in the loss of integrity of cultural deposits, loss of information, and the alteration of a site setting. Potential indirect impacts, primarily vandalism, could result from increased access to and use of the general area during construction. There is also the potential for inadvertent discoveries of buried archaeological materials during construction, although the low number of recorded sites in the general area suggests a low potential. These impacts will be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures listed in Chapter 7: Cultural Resources.*	☐	☑	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would result in physical changes to the landscape, directly affecting or changing the context within which a paleontological resource or unique geologic feature exists, thereby diminishing its value.* ***Finding****: Minimal excavation combined with moderate sensitivity of paleontology will result in no impact.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would result in physical changes to the landscape causing the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.* ***Findings:*** *No sites with human remains have been identified in the project area. If any such sites are discovered during construction, appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented.*	☐	☑	☐	☐

3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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:				
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. ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to expose people or structures to geological hazards or related hazards, such as ruptures of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic shaking, seismic-related ground failure (e.g., liquefaction), landslides, soil erosion or loss of topsoil, unstable geologic unit, expansive soils, or soils incapable of supporting septic systems.* ***Findings:*** *There are no Alquist-Priolo fault zones and no active surface-fault traces in the project area.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? ***Findings:*** *Various faults in the area are capable of generating strong ground shaking in the project area but the project facilities will be engineered to withstand expected ground motions without substantial adverse effects; therefore, the impacts from ground shaking are determined to be less than significant.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? ***Findings:*** *The project is located in relatively flat terrain that is not prone to liquefaction and other related ground failures. The potential for an impact due to strong ground shaking is less than significant.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
iv) Landslides? ***Findings:*** *The project is located in relatively flat terrain that is not prone to landslides.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ***Findings:*** *The project will involve minimal soil disturbance and grading, and topsoil will be salvaged and used for reclaiming areas of temporary disturbance. The loss of topsoil will be negligible due to the fact that the site and access road are located in an area where runoff is slow and the hazard of soil erosion is none to slight. Additionally, erosion control Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used where grading occurs. Based on these considerations, the impacts will be less than significant.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? ***Findings:*** *The project will be located in relatively flat terrain and conditions prone to lateral spreading, landslides, and other seismically induced ground failures do not occur. Based on these considerations, impacts related to direct (i.e., shaking) and secondary effects of ground shaking, including seismically induced lateral spreading, landslides, and other ground failures, will be less than significant.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
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? ***Findings:*** *The soils in the project area are expansive. Design-level geotechnical studies will evaluate the site-specific soil conditions and the expansive soil condition will be accounted for in the design of project facilities, resulting in less than significant impacts.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? ***Findings:*** *Septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems are not proposed.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to expose the public and environment to hazardous materials.* ***Findings:*** *Maintenance of the substation and transmission interconnection line will require the periodic transport of hazardous materials, such as petroleum products. The materials will be transported, used, and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
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? ***Findings:*** *Implementation of spill prevention, control, and counter measure regulations (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations Section 112) for the substation construction will render the potential for a release of hazardous materials to the environment unlikely.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ***Findings:*** *No existing or proposed schools are located within 0.25 mile of the project.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were located on a recognized hazardous materials site and would cause the public or environment to come into contact with such materials.* ***Findings:*** *The project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in a project area that is within 2 miles of an airport.* ***Findings:*** *The project is not located within 2 miles of an airport.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Findings:*** *The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it impeded emergency response or evacuation plans.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any emergency plans.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death due to wildland fires.* ***Findings:*** *Transmission lines and electrical substation facilities could pose a fire hazard when a conducting object, such as a tree limb, comes into proximity to a line, or when a live-phase conductor falls to the ground. The overhead transmission interconnection for the project is located in open space areas, but typical PGandE fire hazard abatement practices will be implemented. The project will not significantly increase the potential for wildfires close to urban areas or residences.*	☐	☐	☑	☐

3.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to cause conditions exceeding Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality standards or other surface waterbody standards established in the applicable Basin Plan (See Chapter 10: Hydrology and Water Quality).* ***Findings:*** *Soil erosion and subsequent downstream sedimentation and reduced surface water quality could potentially increase during construction of the project facilities, including the access road. However, implementation of measures outlined in a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan will reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
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)? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to severely degrade or deplete an aquifer or interfere with groundwater recharge.* ***Findings:*** *Groundwater will not be substantially depleted or degraded by the project. A well will be installed on the site that will provide irrigation for landscape plants. This will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supplies. With implementation of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan, potential groundwater quality impacts from hazardous material spills will be less than significant. There will be less than significant impacts to groundwater recharge from construction of impervious surfaces at the substation.*	☐	☐	☑	☐

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to cause accelerated erosion or siltation of waterbodies in the project vicinity.* ***Findings:*** *Construction of the project facilities, including an access road and bridge that crosses Sand Creek, will not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. PGandE will develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that will include BMPs to be implemented during construction.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to cause or increase the severity of flooding on- or off-site.* ***Findings:*** *Construction of the project facilities, including the access road, will not substantially increase runoff or result in on- or off-site flooding because the project will not substantially change the amount of impervious surfaces in the project area. Rainfall will either infiltrate or sheet flow to unpaved areas.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or contribute additional sources of polluted runoff.* ***Findings:*** *There are no existing or planned stormwater drainage systems in the project area. No polluted runoff will occur.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to degrade water quality to the degree that it impairs its beneficial use.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not 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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to place housing within a 100-year flood plain.* ***Findings:*** *This project does not include the construction of housing.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows.* ***Findings:*** *No structures are planned within 100-year floodplains.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would cause a substantial adverse effect if it were to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss of property, injury, or death as a result of flooding or failure of a levee or dam.* ***Findings:*** *The project is not near any dams or large waterbodies, or steep terrain.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to expose people, structures, or land to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as a result of changes to hydrological conditions.* ***Findings:*** *The project is not near any steep terrain or coastal hazards areas subject to potential tsunamis, high tides, or future sea-level rises.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to physically divide a community by a permanent barrier, such as a freeway, canal, or railroad, by which pedestrian or vehicle access to community features and services would be substantially impaired.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not 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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to conflict with City of Antioch General Plan objectives and policies or zoning ordinances adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.* ***Findings:*** *The project will conform to applicable City of Antioch General Plan objectives, policies, and zoning ordinances.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ***Findings:*** *The project will not conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if significant mineral resources identified by the California Department of Conservation would be precluded from extraction.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not 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.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if locally important mineral resources identified by the City of Antioch General Plan would be precluded from extraction. The adverse effect may occur as a result of physical barrier to the mineral resource area or the creation of a conflicting land use between the project and the mineral resource area.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not 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.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.11 NOISE

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if construction or operation of the project would result in noise levels in excess of City of Antioch noise standards applicable to relevant land uses.* ***Findings:*** *Construction will involve equipment that will generate noise. However with the implementation of mitigation, impacts will be less than significant.*	☐	☑	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if construction or operation of the project would result in the generation of vibration or groundborne noise levels capable of damaging sensitive structures or interfering with land uses activities.* ***Findings:*** *Construction will involve equipment that will generate groundborne noise and vibration; however, the nearest residence is located approximately 0.4 mile away and therefore, vibration impacts will be less than significant.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ***Findings:*** *Noise impacts during operation will be less than significant even when a worst-case scenario was analyzed assuming residential development within 200 feet of the substation.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ***Findings:*** *Noise impacts during operation will be less than significant even when a worst-case scenario was analyzed assuming residential development within 200 feet of the substation.*	☐	☐	☑	☐

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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? ***Findings:*** *The project is not located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public-use airport.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Findings:*** *The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	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 extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to induce unplanned population growth in the City of Antioch (greater than that projected by the General Plan). The adverse effect would result in increased demand on public infrastructure, public services, housing, circulation, or other city resources identified in the General Plan elements.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not induce population growth because the proposed increase in electric power is in response to growth that has occurred and is continuing to occur.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if physical construction and operation of the facility would require substantial numbers of existing housing to be displaced or require replacement housing to be constructed elsewhere.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not displace any existing housing.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ***Findings:*** *The project will not displace any people.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to create an increased need for new governmental facilities and services provided by fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities, or would require construction of such services and associated facilities causing other significant environmental impacts to occur.*				
Fire protection? ***Finding:*** *The demand for fire protection will not change as a result of the project.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
Police protection? ***Finding:*** *The demand for police protection will not change as a result of the project.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
Schools? ***Finding:*** *The demand for schools will not change as a result of the project.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
Parks? ***Finding:*** *The demand for parks will not change as a result of the project.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
Other public facilities? ***Findings:*** *The demand for other public services, such as hospitals and maintenance of public facilities, will not change as a result of the project.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.14 RECREATION

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it were to create an increased need for new governmental facilities and services provided by parks or would require construction of such services and associated facilities causing other significant environmental impacts to occur.* ***Finding:*** *The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Findings:*** *The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.15 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would cause an increase in traffic beyond the capacity of existing transportation systems.* ***Findings:*** *Construction traffic is not anticipated to significantly affect the number of trips or volume to capacity ratio on roads.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if project traffic volumes increased existing traffic levels such that the county's level of service standards were exceeded.* ***Findings:*** *The traffic volume generated during project construction will be minimal compared to existing traffic levels.*	☐	☐	☑	☐
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it would result in changes to air traffic patterns that could result in substantial safety risks.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not impact air traffic patterns.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if construction or operation would result in hazardous design features being created on existing or planned roadways. An adverse effect would also result from incompatible roadway uses, inadequate emergency access, inadequate parking capacity, or inability to implement adopted alternative transportation programs.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not permanently affect design features of roadways.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if construction or operation would result in prolonged lane closures.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not impact emergency access or regional and residential roads.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? ***Findings:*** *The project will not affect street parking in residential areas or parking areas.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? ***Findings:*** *The project will not conflict with adopted alternative transportation policies.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

3.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if construction or operation would result in wastewater discharges exceeding waste discharge requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not be subject to wastewater treatment requirements because no wastewater will be generated.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it required the construction, operation, or expansion of a water treatment facility, which could cause other significant environmental effects.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if it required new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities, the construction and operation of which would cause other significant environmental effects.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.*	☐	☐	☐	☑

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if new or expanded water supply entitlements would be needed that would cause other significant adverse environmental effects.* ***Findings:*** *The project will not require new water supplies.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
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? ***Findings:*** *The project will not generate wastewater.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ***Threshold of Significance:*** *The project would have a substantial adverse effect if its solid waste disposal needs accelerated the capacity of a landfill to be reached.* ***Findings:*** *The project will generate minimal amounts of solid waste during construction activities.*	☐	☐	☐	☑
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ***Findings:*** *The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.*	☐	☐	☐	☑