

# Contents – Appendix 2

1. Introduction and Purpose .....	Ap.2-1
1.1 CEQA/NEPA Requirements.....	Ap.2-1
1.2 Screening Methodology.....	Ap.2-2
2. Federal Plans and Documents .....	Ap.2-2
2.1 U.S. BLM Management California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 1980 as Amended.....	Ap.2-2
2.2 U.S. BLM Phoenix South Resource Management Plan .....	Ap.2-8
2.3 Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, Public Draft, Volumes 1–4, October 15, 2004 .....	Ap.2-9
2.4 Federal Environmental Reports.....	Ap.2-12
3. Local Plans and Policies .....	Ap.2-16
3.1 La Paz County, Arizona.....	Ap.2-16
3.2 Maricopa County, Arizona .....	Ap.2-17
3.3 Riverside County, California.....	Ap.2-21
3.4 San Bernardino County, California .....	Ap.2-48
3.5 City of Banning, California .....	Ap.2-64
3.6 City of Beaumont, California .....	Ap.2-67
3.7 City of Blythe, California .....	Ap.2-70
3.8 City of Calimesa, California.....	Ap.2-77
3.9 City of Cathedral City, California .....	Ap.2-81
3.10 City of Coachella, California .....	Ap.2-85
3.11 City of Colton, California.....	Ap.2-92
3.12 City of Desert Hot Springs, California .....	Ap.2-96
3.13 City of Grand Terrace, California.....	Ap.2-100
3.14 City of Loma Linda, California .....	Ap.2-102
3.15 City of Redlands, California.....	Ap.2-109
3.16 Town of Quartzsite, Arizona.....	Ap.2-114
4. Policies Specific to Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative.....	Ap.2-114
4.1 Forest Service, Land and Resource Management Plans (Forest Plans) .....	Ap.2-114
4.2 Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan.....	Ap.2-119
4.3 City of Palm Springs, California .....	Ap.2-127
4.4 City of San Jacinto Draft General Plan, 2000.....	Ap.2-134
5. Other Reference Documents .....	Ap.2-136
5.1 Joshua Tree National Park Final General Management Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement, Backcountry and Wilderness Management Plan, October 1994 .....	Ap.2-136
5.2 Yuma Proving Ground Final Range Wide EIS .....	Ap.2-137
5.3 California Recreational Trails Plan, 2002 .....	Ap.2-137
5.4 Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, Riverside Extended Mountain (REMAP) Area Plan, 2003.....	Ap.2-137
5.5 City of Indio, California.....	Ap.2-138

# 1. Introduction and Purpose

This Policy Screening Report provides a preliminary or screening evaluation of federal, State, and local government policies applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives. This analysis includes, in one document, policies applicable to the Devers–Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Project and its alternatives, and serves as a tool for focusing the technical sections of the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) on relevant policies. Because the Proposed Project route covers many agency jurisdictions, over 30 plans and documents have been identified for this project. The policies associated with these plans are evaluated in this report. However, only those policies that warrant further consideration are addressed in Section 4 of the EIR/EIS.

The policies are organized by plan and then by environmental issue area for the Proposed Project and alternatives with a separate section for the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative, which includes the introduction of new plans specific to this alternative. Because of the large volume of policies that were identified for the Proposed Project and alternatives, some of the policies have been summarized or abbreviated to make this document easier to read.

## 1.1 CEQA/NEPA Requirements

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not specifically require that a policy analysis be completed for a project. In fact, the only mention of policy analysis is in the CEQA Checklist, Appendix G, which lists under the land use portion of the checklist the following:

*Would the project 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?** [Emphasis added]*

Although CEQA does not specifically address policy analysis other than in the checklist, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) addresses policy analysis. 40 CFR 1502.16(c) (Environmental Consequences) states: “It shall include discussions of: Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian Tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned.” Additionally, 40 CFR 1506.2(d) states:

*To better integrate environmental impact statements into state or local planning processes, statements shall discuss any inconsistency of a proposed action with any approved State or local plan and laws (whether or not federally sanctioned). Where an inconsistency exists, the statement should describe the extent to which the agency would reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law.*

However, the decision-maker retains the authority to go forward with a project despite the potential conflict (CEQ 40 FAQ Response 23c).<sup>1</sup> In addition, the Record of Decision must explain how the decision was made and what mitigation measures are being imposed to reduce impacts (CEQ, 40 FAQs, Response 23c).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference refers to “Memorandum: Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQs (Council of Environmental Quality) NEPA Regulations (40 Questions).”

<sup>2</sup> Other federal regulations address streamlining EISs including 40 CFR 1502.15 (Affected Environment) and 40CFR 1502.21 (Incorporation by Reference).

To assist with the CEQ requirement for a policy analysis, this screening report documents all policies considered in preparation of the EIR/EIS, and provides the rationale or need for additional review of specific policies or plans in the environmental document. In addition, the intent of this document is to streamline the policy analysis and to focus the EIR/EIS impact analysis on those policies that are directly relevant to the Proposed Project and/or alternatives or are necessary for a project decision by the lead agencies.

## 1.2 Screening Methodology

The Policy Screening Report summarizes each applicable federal, State, and local agency plan. As part of this summary, applicable policies are identified and categorized by issue area. Each policy is assessed to determine its relevancy to the Proposed Project and alternatives. Applicable policies that are not relevant to the Proposed Project are “screened out” or are not carried forward for evaluation in the EIR/EIS. Policies that are relevant to the Proposed Project and alternatives and that require additional analysis to determine consistency will be further analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

For purposes of this screening effort, relevant policies or standards relate to the Proposed Project’s compatibility with the intent of specific policies. To that end, this report documents the rationale for suggesting further analysis of specific policies.

Sections 2 and 3 discuss policies from federal and local plans, respectively, for those jurisdictions that would be traversed by the Proposed Project and all alternatives, except the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative, unlike the other alternatives that generally follow the same route as the Proposed Project, would travel a distinctly separate route through several additional jurisdictions not traversed by the Proposed Project. Therefore, several different plans and policies would be applicable only to the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative. These plans and policies are discussed in Section 4. Other documents that were reviewed or considered for the EIR/EIS are discussed in Section 5.

# 2. Federal Plans and Documents

## 2.1 U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980 as Amended

The 25-million-acre CDCA contains over 12 million acres of public lands spread within the area we know as the California Desert, which includes the following three deserts: the Mojave, the Sonoran, and a small portion of the Great Basin. The 12 million acres of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are half of the CDCA. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, potential alternative substation sites, and a fiber optic repeater/series capacitor within the CDCA planning area. Aside from specific policies, the goal of the CDCA Plan is to guide development of public lands, and resources, including economic, educational, scientific, and recreational uses, in a manner that enhances wherever possible — and that does not diminish, on balance — the environmental, cultural, and aesthetic values of the Desert and its productivity. This goal is to be achieved in the Plan through the direction given for management actions and resolution of conflicts. Direction is stated first on a geographic basis in the guidelines for each of the four multiple-land use classes. Within those guidelines further refinement or direction is in the goals for each Plan element.

The CDCA includes 12 Plan elements. Each of the Plan elements provides a desert-wide perspective of the planning decisions for one major resource or issue of public concern. Each element also provides more specific application, or interpretation, of multiple-use class guidelines for a given resource and its associated activities. Direction is also expressed in certain site-specific Plan decisions such as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. In order to complete and carry out the Plan, the Bureau of Land Management has, under its California State Office, established a California Desert District which is responsible for maintaining and implementing the Plan and carrying out the management of the public lands within the CDCA. The Plan includes an analysis of and a commitment to a level of implementation appropriate to the public resources and management needs of the Desert.

The Plan does not include specific policies regarding utility corridors. However, the following policies apply to the construction and operation of the transmission line project.

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980 as Amended		
Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Wildlife Element, Pages 28-30</b>		
Goals 1–5: The Wildlife Element includes five goals that direct the BLM to mitigate for impacts, develop and implement detailed plans, manage wildlife habitats, and to consider crucial habitats in all decisions.	The Wildlife Element goals require programmatic actions that are the responsibility of the BLM, but the results of these programmatic actions will be considered in the BLM's evaluation of the ROW grant.	NO
Policy 1: The protection afforded federally and State-listed species will remain the same for all multiple-use classes. Any federal action which may impact either the habitat or individuals of federally listed species must be put into formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). Species officially proposed for listing, which may be impacted through the federal action, may be dealt with through conference with the FWS.	The Proposed Project requires formal consultation with the USFWS, which the BLM performs as part of the review process. The results of the consultation are presented in this EIR/EIS. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 2: Discovery of previously unknown but significant wildlife values may serve as the basis for initiating the amendment of a multiple-use class designation. Designation of "Critical Habitat" for a federally listed species may necessitate a change in multiple-use class designation.	The Proposed Project would be placed in a designated utility corridor, which was studied when the existing transmission line was permitted. As such, there is a low possibility that studies associated with the Proposed Project would discover significant wildlife values. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with policy.	NO
Policy 3: Protective provisions, stipulations, or objectives for wildlife will be considered in all permits, licenses, activity plans, etc., to avoid or minimize habitat deterioration.	Permits, licenses and activity plans would be considered to avoid or minimize habitat deterioration. This policy will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Vegetation Element, Pages 37-38</b>		
Goal 1: Maintain the productivity of the vegetative resource while meeting the consumptive needs of wildlife, livestock, wild horses and burrows, and man. Provide for such uses under the principles of sustained yield.	The Proposed Project would not change the productivity of vegetative resources. The Proposed Project would be placed in an existing corridor where once in operation the corridor would continue to serve as open space area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980 as Amended**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Goal 2: Manage those plant species on the federal and State lists of threatened and endangered species and their habitats so that the continued existence of each is not jeopardized. Stabilize and, where possible, improve populations through management and recovery plans developed and implemented cooperatively with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game.	The loss of habitat due to the Proposed Project may require mitigation to manage those plant species federally and State listed. This policy will be addressed further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Goal 3: Manage those plant species officially designated as sensitive by the BLM for California and their habitats so that the potential for federal or State listing is minimized. Include consideration of sensitive species habitats in all decisions such that impacts are avoided, mitigated, or compensated.	Plant species officially designated as sensitive by the BLM and their habitats may be affected by the Proposed Project. This policy will be addressed further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Goal 4: Manage unusual plant assemblages (UPAs) so that their continued existence is maintained. In all actions, include consideration of UPAs so that impacts are avoided, mitigated or compensated.	UPAs affected by the Proposed Project may require mitigation. This policy will be addressed further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Goal 5: Manage wetland and riparian areas in the CDCA, with the following specific objectives: (a) To avoid the long-term and short-term impacts associated with the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetland and riparian areas; (b) To preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetland and riparian areas which may include constraining or excluding those uses that cause significant long-term ecological damage; (c) To include practical measures to minimize harm in all actions causing adverse impacts on wetlands and riparian areas; and (d) To retain all wetlands and riparian habitats presently under BLM administration wherever high resource values exist and adverse impacts cannot be mitigated.	This policy requires the management of wetland and riparian areas in the CDCA. This policy will not be evaluated further because the Proposed Project would not cross any riparian drainage.	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**7.0 Transmission Facilities, Interim VRM Classifications, Table 1: Multiple Use Class Guidelines, Page 15**

In the absence of established Visual Resource Management Classes (VRM Classes), Interim VRM Classes have been prepared for the BLM covering those BLM lands crossed by the project but not covered by the Coachella Valley Plan Amendment.	The Proposed Project would cross BLM-administered land for which Interim VRM Classifications have been developed. This policy will be addressed further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
--	---	-----

**Coachella Valley California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendment/FEIS (2002)**

Table 2-2 on Page 2-4 of the Coachella Valley California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendment/FEIS (BLM, 2002) specifies the following: "Based on the general characteristics of the BLM-managed public lands within the Coachella Valley, Visual Resource Management (VRM) Classifications would be assigned as follows (Figure 2-2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM-managed lands within ACECs and the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument (except for designated wilderness which is Class 1): Class 2"</li> </ul>	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would pass through the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument and would be subject to VRM Class 2 management objectives. This policy will be addressed further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
--	--	-----

**LAND USE**

**11. Land-Tenure Adjustment, Table 1: Multiple-Use Class Guidelines, Page 17**

Class C, L, & I – Public land will not be sold. [#4, 83] Class M & Unclassified Lands – Sale of public land may be allowed in accordance with FLPMA and other applicable federal laws and regulations. Sales in WSAs will not be allowed until after Congressional action. [#4, 83]	The Proposed Project would be placed within an existing corridor. Because the BLM would be issuing a new or revised right-of-way grant to SCE for the Proposed Project, but would maintain ownership of the land, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
--	--	----

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980 as Amended

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Lands Actions – Disposal, Rights-of-Way, Access and Withdrawals – Page 144, Appendix B: Interim Management Guidelines (for Lands Under Wilderness Review)</b>		
<p>1. Disposal: With the exceptions provided below, lands under wilderness review may not be disposed of through any means, including public sales, exchanges, patents under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, color of title classes I and II, sales under the Unintentional Trespass Act, agricultural leases, desert land entries (except where a vested right was established prior to October 21, 1979), or State selections. (Lands tentatively approved for State selection in Alaska are exempt from wilderness review and are not subject to the Interim Management Policy.)</p> <p>Disposal of the following types may be permitted under normal BLM procedures: mining patents; desert land entries in which a vested right was established prior to October 21, 1976; exchanges approved prior to October 21, 1976, under authority of the Taylor Grazing Act, Section 8; and homestead entries in which a vested right was established prior to October 21, 1976.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be placed within an existing corridor. Because the BLM would be issuing a new or revised right-of-way grant to SCE for the Proposed Project, but would maintain ownership of the land, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>2. Rights-of-Way: Existing rights-of-way may be renewed if they are still being used for their authorized purpose. New rights-of-way may be approved only for temporary uses that satisfy the nonimpairment criteria.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be placed within an existing corridor but new towers will be added, upgraded, or improved. The Proposed Project would be developed within a designated corridor and would be consistent with this policy. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>3. Right-of-Way Corridors: Right-of-way corridors may be designated on lands under wilderness review.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would traverse the New Water Mountains Wilderness Area within a designated utility corridor. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>4. Access to Mining Claims and Non-Federal Land: Construction of permanent access routes will not be approved on lands under wilderness review, except two conditions: (a) when such access qualifies as part of the same manner and degree of grandfathered mineral uses and there is no reasonable, less impairing, alternative access available, and (b) when necessary for operations on mining claims that had a valid discovery prior to October 21, 1976, under criteria described in Section J of this policy, and there is no reasonable, less impairing, alternative access available. Temporary access routes may be approved only if they satisfy the nonimpairment criteria.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be placed within an existing corridor but new towers will be added, upgraded, or improved. However, no new roads would be located within a wilderness area or on lands under wilderness review. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>5. Withdrawals. Existing withdrawals for military purposes or the specific purposes of agencies other than the BLM may be renewed if the withdrawal is still serving its purpose. No new withdrawals may be made for such purposes, except temporary withdrawals that satisfy the nonimpairment criteria.</p> <p>Withdrawals transferring land to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Forest Service, or National Park Service may be approved if the land is part of an already designated unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System or is part of a wilderness study area mandated by Act of Congress.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be placed within an existing corridor. Because the BLM would be issuing a new or revised right-of-way grant to SCE for the Proposed Project, but would maintain ownership of the land, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980 as Amended

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>14. Motorized-Vehicle Access/Transportation, Table 1: Multiple-Use Class Guidelines, Pages 19-20</b>		
<p>Class C – Motorized-vehicle use is generally not allowed unless provided for in individual wilderness legislation and management plans or if necessary to serve valid existing rights, and for emergency use for public safety, or protection of wilderness values.</p> <p>Class L – New roads and ways may be developed under right-of-way grants or pursuant to regulations or approved plans of operation. Motorized vehicle use will be allowed on existing routes of travel until designation of routes is accomplished. [#3, 1982]</p> <p>Class M – Motorized-vehicle use will be allowed on “existing” routes of travel unless closed or limited by the authorized officer. New routes may be allowed upon approval of the authorized officer [#3, 1982].</p> <p>Class I – Same as Class M. In addition, the vehicle open areas are available for unrestricted vehicle access except where private land, ACECs, and active mining areas are included [#3, 1982].</p>	<p>Motorized vehicle use would be associated with construction and maintenance of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would require the issuance of a new or revised right-of-way grant from BLM, and any motorized-vehicle use would be conducted pursuant to this grant. This policy will be evaluated further in the Wilderness and Recreation section of the report.</p>	YES
<p>Class L, M, &amp; I – Periodic or seasonal closures or limitations [#3, 1982] of routes of travel may be required.</p>	<p>This policy applies to recreational motorized vehicle use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>15. Recreation, Table 1: Multiple-Use Class Guidelines, Pages 19-20</b>		
<p>Class C – This class is suitable for nonmechanical types of recreational experience which generally involve low to very low user densities.</p> <p>Class L – This class is suitable for recreation which generally involves low to moderate user densities.</p> <p>Class M – This class is suitable for a wide range of recreation activities which may involve moderate to high user densities.</p> <p>Class I – This class is suitable for recreation activities which generally involve high user densities.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that has been designated for public facility or open space use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with recreational use designations. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>Class C – Permanent or temporary facilities for resource protection and public health and safety may be allowed at the discretion of authorized officer or in accordance with approved Wilderness Plans.</p> <p>Other Classes – Permanent or temporary facilities for resource protection and public health and safety are allowed.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that has been designated for public facility or open space use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with recreational use designations. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>All Classes – Trails are open for non-vehicle use and new trails for non-motorized access may be allowed.</p>	<p>This policy applies to recreational motorized vehicle use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>Motorized-Vehicle Access Element, Goals, Page 75</b>		
<p>Provide for constrained motorized vehicle access in a manner that balances the needs of all desert users, private landowners and other public agencies.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that has been designated for public facility or open space use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with recreational use designations. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>When designating or amending areas or routes for motorized vehicle access, to the degree possible, avoid adverse impacts to desert resources.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that has been designated for public facility or open space use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with recreational use designations. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980 as Amended

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
Use maps, signs and published information to communicate the motorized vehicle access situation to desert users. Be sure all information materials are understandable and easy to follow.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that has been designated for public facility or open space use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with recreational use designations. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Appendix B: Interim Management Guidelines (For Lands Under Wilderness Review), Recreation, Page 144</b>		
No new permanent recreational roads, structures, or installations will be permitted, except structures for human health and safety or the minimum necessary for public enjoyment of wilderness values.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that has been designated for public facility or open space use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with recreational use designations. The alternatives would also be consistent with this policy.	NO
Recreational use of off-road vehicles (ORVs) is permitted on designated and existing routes and within "open" areas designated prior to approval of FLPMA (October 21, 1976).	This policy applies to recreational motorized vehicle use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Organized ORV events may be allowed to pass through areas under wilderness review on existing ways and trails, so long as the BLM has determined that such use satisfies the nonimpairment criteria.	This policy applies to recreational motorized vehicle use. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**CULTURAL & PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Cultural Resources**

The Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) covering the implementation of the Desert Plan among the Bureau of Land Management, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation outlines the implementation of the Cultural Resource Element.	This policy consists of a MOA that includes programmatic policies that are the responsibility of the agencies and would not be applied to the Proposed Project.	NO
---	---	----

**Record of Decision for California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendment for the Coachella Valley, December 27, 2002 – Cultural Resources – Page 5<sup>3</sup>**

Cultural Resources: All management actions shall comply with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which provides for the protection of significant cultural resources. In furtherance of this Act, the 36 Code of Federal Regulations 800 procedures shall be conducted pursuant to the State Protocol Agreement (1998) between the BLM and the California State Historic Preservation Officer. An appropriate level of inventory shall be conducted for all actions with a potential to affect cultural resources.	The requirements of this policy would be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
Native American Concerns: For all public land activities adjacent to reservation lands, the BLM shall consult with the relevant tribes to determine potential impact to Native American trust assets and cultural values and to develop mitigation measures as needed.	The requirements of this policy would be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, Native American consultation, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO

**TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

Policy 1: Provide for constrained motorized vehicle access in a manner that balances the needs of all desert users, private landowners and other public agencies.	The Proposed Project would not provide additional long-term access over existing conditions in the Plan area.	NO
---	---	----

<sup>3</sup> The Proposed Project APE within this area has been surveyed and contains 52 known archaeological sites

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980 as Amended

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
Goals 1 and 2: Assure the availability of known mineral resource lands for exploration and development, and encourage the development of mineral resources in an environmentally sound manner.	The Proposed Project would not restrict access to or availability of minerals, and would not impact mining operations on federal lands. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Note: No applicable policies were identified for agriculture; noise; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; and socioeconomics.		

## 2.2 U.S. BLM Phoenix South Resource Management Plan

This *Phoenix Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS)* is being prepared by and to guide the Arizona Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in its management of approximately 911,000 acres of public land in Arizona within the Phoenix Resource Area. The Plan is currently under revision and public hearings, with an estimated publication and approval date of late 2006. The RMP area’s public land provides valuable public recreation opportunities and exhibits important wildlife, archaeological, wilderness, scenic and recreational values. Often the protection of these important resource values conflicts with development pressures, requiring that difficult choices be made. It is the BLM’s goal to provide a long-term approach to resolving these conflicts through the RMP/EIS.

The Phoenix RMP area is divided into two distinct geographic regions: the northern region and the southern region, covering all or parts of eight Arizona counties. The following details these two geographic areas:

- The northern region, which includes Apache and Navajo Counties, encompasses approximately 228,700 acres of scattered public land lying north of the Sitgreaves National Forest and south of the Navajo Indian Reservation.
- The southern portion of the RMP area includes 682,640 acres of scattered public land in central and south central Arizona. The land is among private and State holdings and Indian reservations, and has about 75 percent of the State’s 2.7 million people and includes the major metropolitan areas of Phoenix and Tucson.

The Harquahala Generating Station switchyard is located within the southern portion of the RMP. The Proposed Project would construct a new 500 kV transmission line, including towers, from the Harquahala Generating Station west through approximately 20 miles of the southern portion of the RMP.

U.S. BLM Phoenix South Resource Management Plan

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
The Phoenix South Resource Management Plan provides Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class management objectives pertaining to the protection and management of visual resources.	The Proposed Project would cross public lands administered by the BLM Phoenix District. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Note: No other applicable policies were identified in this plan.		

## 2.3 Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, Public Draft, Volumes 1–4, October 15, 2004

The Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional plan focusing on the conservation of federal and State-listed species, other rare and sensitive species, and their habitats. The plan balances environmental protection and economic development objectives in the plan area and simplifies compliance with endangered species related laws. The MSHCP satisfies the legal requirements for the issuance of permits that will allow the take of species covered by the plan in the course of otherwise lawful activities. The plan, to the maximum extent practicable, provides measures to minimize and mitigate the impacts of the taking and provides for conservation of Covered Species. The MSHCP is regulated by the Coachella Valley Association of Governments in cooperation and coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The Cities of Cathedral City, Coachella, Desert Hot Springs, Indian Wells, Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, and Rancho Mirage are within the MSHCP jurisdiction, principally on the floor of the Coachella Valley. Together these jurisdictions make up approximately 16 percent of the plan area. The remaining 84 percent of the plan area is unincorporated. Approximately 45 percent of the land covered by the plan is privately held. Though not included in the MSHCP, Indian Reservations within the plan area include the Morongo, Agua Caliente, Santa Rosa, Cabazon, Twentynine Palms, Torres-Martinez Band, and Augustine. The balance of the plan area is public land managed by various local, State, and federal agencies, including BLM, USFWS, University of California, Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy (CVMC), U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Reclamation, California Department of Fish and Game, State Parks, and special districts, and open space lands owned by the cities and the county. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers within the MSHCP planning area. While the Amendment/Environmental Assessment does not include specific policies regarding utility corridors, the following measures apply to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

### Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, Public Draft, Volumes 1–4, October 15, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Section 4.3 Conservation Areas, Pages 4-20 through 4-192.</b>		
The Cabazon Conservation Area consists of the San Gorgonio River and several tributaries in the westernmost part of the Plan Area, and portions of the San Jacinto Mountains and the San Bernardino Mountains, which function as a sand source area. The Conservation Area contains Essential Habitat for Peninsular bighorn sheep, mesquite hummocks, southern sycamore–alder riparian woodland, sand source areas, fluvial sand transport areas, and the Fornat Wash Biological Corridor.	The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.	NO

Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan,  
 Public Draft, Volumes 1–4, October 15, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<p>The desert tortoise population in the Stubbe and Cottonwood Canyons Conservation Area centers on the mesas to the west of the Whitewater River. The Stubbe Canyon and Cottonwood Canyon also contains suitable migration and breeding Habitat for least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, summer tanager, yellow-breasted chat, and yellow warbler. Other Conserved Habitat and Natural Communities</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>Snow Creek/Windy Point Conservation Area provides Core Habitat for wildlife, including the Coachella Valley milkvetch, Coachella Valley giant sand-treader cricket, Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard, Coachella Valley Jerusalem cricket, Coachella Valley round-tailed squirrel, and Palm Springs pocket mouse, Peninsular bighorn sheep, burrowing owl and migratory birds. Active desert dunes, ephemeral desert sand fields, Sonoran creosote bush scrub, and semi-desert chaparral constitute the natural communities in the Snow Creek and Windy Point Conservation Area. Stubbe and Cottonwood Canyons and the Whitewater River are two biological corridors that provide sand transport via Stubbe Canyon Wash and the Whitewater River and retain and allow large mammal movement between the San Jacinto and San Bernardino Mountains.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>The Whitewater Canyon Conservation Area contains historic Habitat for the arroyo toad, riparian birds, and some habitat for the desert tortoise and triple-ribbed milkvetch. Natural community such as Sonoran cottonwood-willow riparian forest, desert palm woodlands, sand source, fluvial sand transport areas, and biological corridors are conserved in Whitewater Canyon.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>The Whitewater Floodplain Conservation Area contains Core Habitat for the Coachella Valley milkvetch, Coachella Valley giant sand-treader cricket, Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard, Coachella Valley round-tailed squirrel, and Palm Springs pocket mouse and natural communities such as active desert sand fields, ephemeral desert sand fields, Sonoran creosote bush scrub, and Sonoran mixed woody and succulent scrub. Essential Ecological Processes provides fluvial sand transport and groundwater recharge ponds. Linkage and biological corridor between the Snow Creek/Windy Point Conservation Area and the Core Habitat portion of the Whitewater Floodplain Conservation Area. Multiple biological corridors and linkages exist along Whitewater River including the Snow Creek/Windy Point Conservation Area and the Whitewater Floodplain Conservation Area, the south recharge ponds and the Snow Creek/Windy Point Conservation Area, and possibly between this area and the Willow Hole Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>The Upper Mission Creek/Big Morongo Canyon Conservation Area encompasses the Mission Creek and Big Morongo Canyon watersheds and the portions of the Mission Creek flood control channel and Morongo Wash within the City of Desert Hot Springs. This Conservation Area includes sand source and the upper of the fluvial sand transport system that provides blow-sand to the Willow Hole Preserve. Two bridges on Highway 62 provide movement corridors under highway that provide habitat connectivity for wildlife.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	<p>NO</p>

Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan,  
 Public Draft, Volumes 1–4, October 15, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<p>Willow Hole Conservation Area contains Core Habitat for the Coachella Valley milkvetch, Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard, the Coachella Valley round-tailed ground squirrel, and Palm Springs pocket mouse. The conservation area also contains suitable migration and breeding habitat for the riparian species covered by the plan. Five 36" culverts that exist under Palm Drive serve as biological corridors for the species listed above. The stabilized and partially stabilized desert dunes in the area also protect the largest concentration of mesquite hammocks in the Plan Area.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	NO
<p>Thousand Palms Conservation Area includes the existing CVFTL Preserve and the sand source/transport area to the west of it. The conservation area constitutes the largest unfragmented habitat area on the Coachella Valley floor and represents the hot-dry end of the gradient of Habitat conditions. This conservation area is linked to the Willow Hole Conservation Area through the Edom Hill Conservation Area and to Joshua Tree National Park through the Indio Hills/Joshua Tree National Park Linkage Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	NO
<p>The East Indio Hills Conservation Area includes the portion of the Indio Hills east of the Indio Hills Palms Conservation Area and the alluvial fan area between toe of slope on the south side of the hills and the flood control berm north of the Coachella Canal. This conservation area provides core habitat for the Mecca aster along with habitat found on the Thousand Palms Conservation Area and core habitat on the Indio Hills Palms Conservation Area. The area contains suitable migration and breeding habitat for the riparian bird species covered by the plan.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	NO
<p>The Desert Tortoise and Linkage Conservation Area encompass most of the land between the Mecca Hills and Orocopia Mountains Wilderness and Joshua Tree National Park in the eastern portion of the Plan Area. The conservation area contains core habitat for the desert tortoise, Mecca aster, Orocopia sage, and riparian bird species covered by the Plan.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	NO
<p>The Mecca Hills/Orocopia Mountains Conservation Area consists predominantly of the Mecca Hills Wilderness and the Orocopia Mountains Wilderness which contains Core Habitat for the Mecca aster and Orocopia sage. This conservation area provides core habitat for the Desert Tortoise, migration and breeding Habitat for the riparian bird species and Mecca aster. This area links the plan are with protected BLM lands to the east and the Desert Tortoise and Linkage Conservation Area to the Joshua Tree National Park.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	NO
<p>The Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains Conservation Area encompasses all of the desert slopes of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains. The conservation area contains Core Habitat for the Peninsular bighorn sheep and potentially for the gray vireo and is linked with the Anza Borrego Desert State Park, the San Bernardino National Forest areas and Mt. San Jacinto State Park.</p>	<p>The biological assessment considered the information for this conservation area and incorporated data and measures as appropriate. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the measures and requirements presented for this conservation area.</p>	NO

Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan,  
 Public Draft, Volumes 1–4, October 15, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>Chapter 4.5: Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, 4.5.6 Barriers, Page 4-200</b>		
Land uses adjacent to or within a Conservation Area shall incorporate barriers in individual project designs to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass, or dumping in a Conservation Area. Such barriers may include native landscaping, rocks/boulders, fencing, walls and/or signage.	The Proposed Project would be located within a Conservation Area. Measures to comply with this land use policy will be evaluated further in the land use section of the report.	YES
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Establishment of the MSHCP Reserve System, Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, 4.5.4 Noise, Page 4-196</b>		
Land uses adjacent to or within a Conservation Area that generate noise above 105 dBA hourly shall incorporate setbacks, berms, or walls to minimize the effects of noise on the Conservation Area resources.	The Proposed Project could generate noise above 105 dBA. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Note: No applicable policies were identified for visual resources; wilderness and recreation; agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; transportation and traffic; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; geology, mineral resources, and soils; and socioeconomics.		

## 2.4 Federal Environmental Reports

### 2.4.1 U.S. BLM Agua Fria National Monument and Bradshaw-Harquahala Draft Resource Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement

The BLM completed the Agua Fria National Monument and Bradshaw-Harquahala Draft Resource Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DRMP/DEIS) in January 6, 2006, and held a 90-day review period for this document ending on April 5, 2006. This document covers 895,900 acres of BLM-administered land. The DRMP/DEIS includes strategies for protecting and preserving the biological, cultural, recreational, geological, educational, scientific and scenic values within this planning area. The DRMP/DEIS evaluates the No-Action Alternative and four action alternatives. Within each of the alternative discussions, the DRMP/DEIS presents management actions that are applicable to each alternative. Alternative E is identified as the Preferred Alternative.

Specific policies were not identified in the DRMP/DEIS. The Preferred Alternative was reviewed to determine any key issues or management actions that would be applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives. While there is the potential for changes to the key components of the DRMP/DEIS alternatives when a final plan is adopted, the following key issues associated with the Preferred Alternative are evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.

- **Special Area Designation.** The DRMP/DEIS identifies the Harquahala Mountains as an Outstanding National Area (ONA) – Area of Critical Concern (ACEC) (96,430 acres). The Harquahala Mountains are proposed for this designation because the “area constitutes a rare, intact, mountaintop vegetation community surrounded by low desert. As the highest topographic feature in the region, the mountains contain a biologically diverse system, in stark contrast to the surrounding landscape. The mountain range is high enough that, from the summit, mountains in Mexico are visible during very

clear air conditions. Conversely, the mountain range is a dominant landscape feature for travelers in many areas of southwest Arizona, visible from major highways (such as Interstate 10 and U.S. Highway 60) as much as a hundred miles away.” The DRMP/DEIS identifies the following desired future conditions for this new designation:

- Minimize the visual intrusion of any management activity so as to retain the outstanding scenic quality and natural landscape appearance consistent with VRM Class II standards.
- Achieve long-term conservation of scenic, natural resource, and cultural values.
- Achieve and maintain unfragmented wildlife habitat, which provides adequate forage, cover, and access to water for healthy wildlife populations.
- **Cultural Resources.** Nearly the entire area of the Harquahala Special Cultural Resource Management Area (SCRMA) is included within the Harquahala Mountains ONA ACEC. The historic Harquahala Peak Smithsonian Observatory and the Harquahala Peak Pack Trail would be allocated to public use. Allocate other sites for public use and interpretive development consistent with management actions described for the Harquahala Mountains ONA ACEC.
- **Visual Resources.** Within the Harquahala Management Unit, allocate Harquahala Mountains ONA ACEC as Visual Resource Management Class II.

#### 2.4.2 Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan EIS, August 1985

The Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (RMP) area is in the Lower Gila Resource Area in southwestern Arizona. It includes portions of Maricopa, Pinal, Pima, Yuma, and La Paz Counties. The Federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has management responsibilities on approximately 2,009,232 surface acres and 1,946,485 acres of subsurface minerals. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers and a series capacitor location within the Lower Gila South Resource Management planning area.

The Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) analyzes the impacts of implementing one of five alternative land use plans or a combination of two or more alternative plans for the Lower Gila South Planning Area. Each alternative is a land use plan that would provide a framework within which future, more site-specific decisions would be made, such as directing the management intensity of various resources, developing activity plans (grazing management plans, habitat management plans, etc.), or issuing rights-of-way, leases, or permits. The goal of the Plan is to manage this activity in ways to preserve the natural environment while sustaining the demand for development. The BLM is under congressional mandate to provide for orderly use and development of the public lands and to preserve the land and its resources from destruction. It oversees the objectives and policies contained within the RMP/EIS.

While the EIS does not include specific policies regarding utility corridors, the following measures or resource information presented in the EIS apply to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project and alternatives and have been considered in the impact analysis. These measures include:

- *The Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan provides Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class management objectives pertaining to the protection and management of visual resources.* The Proposed Project would cross public lands administered by the BLM Yuma District; therefore, the Visual Resource Management objectives will be applied in the EIR/EIS.

- *The RMP/EIS identifies criteria for off-road vehicle use. Limitations on or closure of public lands to motorized off-road vehicle use will be established for specific roads, trails, or areas where problems are identified. The following criteria would be considered before restricting or closing any area to ORV use: the need to promote user enjoyment and minimize use conflicts; the need to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resource values; the need to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant degradation of wildlife habitats; and the need to promote user safety. These criteria have been considered and evaluated further in Wilderness and Recreation section of the EIR/EIS.*
- *The RMP/EIS identifies significant problem soils and severe critical erosion areas in fragile desert pavement soils in the western portion of the RMP/EIS area. When the very gravelly, loamy surface layer (two inches thick) is destroyed, these soils are subject to severe wind and water erosion. (Page 37). Any soil disturbance project on the fragile soils (desert pavement) would be evaluated using site-specific environmental assessments on a case-by-case basis (page 55). This issue has been considered further in the EIR/EIS.*

### 2.4.3 Final Amendment and Environmental Assessment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan, February 2000

This plan amends the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan through one amendment to enhance BLM management capabilities and resolve pertinent issues and conflicts. The goals of this plan are those expressed in the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plans.

The Lower Gila North and South planning units cover approximately 2 million acres of public lands in Maricopa, Yavapai, Pima, Pinal, La Paz and Yuma Counties. An additional 1.1 million acres on the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range are also included in the planning area. While this plan is an amendment to the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS), it does not supersede that document. The purpose of this plan is to further enhance the BLM management capabilities to both the North and South Lower Gila Management Plans. The Proposed Project would impact only the Lower Gila South Management Plan area. However, because this document amends the BLM responsibilities to the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS, this document should be used in conjunction with the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS to determine potential project impacts to the planning area.

The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, and a series capacitor location within the Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan areas. While the Amendment/Environmental Assessment does not include specific policies regarding utility corridors, the following measure was considered and evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

*Maintain current vehicle management guidance specified as follows: permitting cross-country vehicle travel only when specifically authorized to complete a task which requires such use, and only in areas where such use will not cause unnecessary or undue resource impacts retaining all congressionally declared wildernesses as closed to mechanical use. Motorized vehicle use would be associated with construction and maintenance of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would require the issuance of a new or revised right-of-way grant from BLM, and any motorized-vehicle use would be conducted pursuant to this grant. This policy will be evaluated further in the Wilderness and Recreation section of the report.*

#### 2.4.4 Proposed Northern and Eastern Colorado Desert Coordinated Management Plan, an amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan 1980 and Sikes Act Plan with the California Department of Fish and Game, and Final Environmental Impact Statement, July 2002

The Northern and Eastern Colorado (NECO) Planning Area comprises 5,547,665 acres of private, federal, and State land. The majority of the planning area land is public land managed by BLM, with a total of 3,823,194 acres. The planning area amounts to about five percent of California and is located in the south-east corner of the State. Specifically, beginning at the City of Needles on I-40, the NECO boundary runs south along the CDCA boundary, parallel to the Colorado River, to the Quechan Indian reservation near Yuma. (Note that the Colorado River, the border between California and Arizona, is not the boundary.) The boundary skirts the reservation to the All American Canal near the international border. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, potential alternative sub-station sites, and a fiber optic repeater/series capacitor within the NECO planning area.

The primary purpose and goal of this EIS, and the associated plans it covers, is to amend or create land use plans and specific management prescriptions for species and habitats on federal lands covered by the applicable Plans, with a focus on the recovery of the desert tortoise. Plans to be amended include:

- BLM 1980 California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan,
- BLM 1987 Yuma District Resource Management Plan for wild horse and burro management,
- Joshua Tree National Park (JTNP) General Management Plan and Backcountry and Wilderness Management Plan.

While the EIS does not include specific policies regarding utility corridors, the following measures or resource information presented in the EIS apply to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project and alternatives and have been considered in the impact analysis. These measures include:

- *Provide for constrained motorized vehicle access in a manner that balances the needs of all desert users, private landowners, and other public agencies.* Motorized vehicle use would be associated with construction and maintenance of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would require the issuance of a new or revised right-of-way grant from BLM, and any motorized-vehicle use would be conducted pursuant to this grant. This measure will be evaluated further in the Wilderness and Recreation section of the report.
- *When designating or amending areas or routes for motorized vehicle access, to the degree possible, avoid adverse impacts to desert resources.* Motorized vehicle use would be associated with construction and maintenance of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would require the issuance of a new or revised right-of-way grant from BLM, and any motorized-vehicle use would be conducted pursuant to this grant. This measure will be evaluated further in the Wilderness and Recreation section of the report.

#### 2.4.5 Kofa National Wildlife Refuge & Wilderness and New Water Mountains Wilderness Interagency Management Plan and Environmental Assessment and Record of Decision, October 1996

Managed by the USFWS, the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge contains a total of 665,400 acres, including 510,900 acres designated as wilderness. Managed by the BLM, the New Water Mountains Wilderness area covers 24,600 acres in Yuma County Arizona. The plan provides management direction with respect

to natural resources located within the planning area. The goal of the plan is to provide the long-term protection and preservation of the areas' wilderness character under a principle of non-degradation, and to manage the wilderness area for the use and enjoyment of visitors in a manner that will leave the area unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness. While the Plan, Environmental Assessment, and Record of Decision do not include specific policies for the development of utility corridors, the following measure is applicable to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project and will be addressed in the Visual Resources Section of the EIR/EIS.

*Maintain or enhance the wilderness values of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation, and special features of the planning area by: Minimizing impacts of recreational use and visual impacts of authorized developments. Minimizing visual impacts from mining scars and former vehicle routes.* The Proposed Project would result in the placement of new structures within the Refuge, which would affect views from Crystal Hill Road and Pipeline Road. The Proposed Project would also result in construction of new roads or use of existing access and spur roads, which may result in increased land scarring.

#### 2.4.6 Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument Proposed Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement, and Record of Decision, October 2003

The Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument is located in Southern California, approximately 100 miles east of Los Angeles. The National Monument has a dramatic landscape rising abruptly from near sea level in the valley to the San Jacinto Peak at 10,834 feet. The Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument covers 89,500 acres of BLM lands, 65,000 acres of U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (Forest Service) lands, 19,800 acres of Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians lands, 12,900 acres of California Department of Parks and Recreation lands, 28,900 acres of California Department of Fish and Game lands, 7,500 acres of other State of California agencies lands, and 38,500 acres of private land. The Proposed Project would include upgrading an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line north of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument Management Plan Area.

The BLM and the Forest Service jointly manage federal lands in the National Monument in consultation and cooperation with the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, other federal agencies, State agencies, and local governments to protect the National Monument's biological, cultural, recreational, geological, educational, scientific, and scenic values.

The Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement, and Record of Decision do not include specific policies for the development of utility corridors within the Management Plan Area.

## 3. Local Plans and Policies

### 3.1 La Paz County, Arizona

**La Paz County Comprehensive Plan, May 2005.** Located in Western Arizona, La Paz County contains the river communities of Parker, Ehrenberg, Cibola, Parker Strip and the inland communities of Bouse, Brenda, Harcuvar, Hope, Poston, Quartzsite, Salome, Vicksburg, and Wenden. The La Paz County Comprehensive Plan provides guidance development decisions. The Comprehensive Plan contains three elements: Land Use Element, Multimodal Transportation Element, and Environmental Element.

The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, and a series capacitor location within La Paz County. The Land Use Element of the Plan includes specific policies for the development and placement of utility corridors within the Plan area. In addition to those guidelines identified in the Land Use Element, the following policies are applicable to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

<b>La Paz County Comprehensive Plan, May 2005</b>		
<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Visual Resource Management</b>		
Policy 2.1: Determining ways to minimize the visual impact of the built environment on desert vistas and mountain views will be part of the evaluation process for proposed new development.	This policy characterizes one aspect of the County's project review process, but does not specify criteria that projects must meet or actions that projects must consider or undertake to protect visual resources and/or minimize visual impacts.	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Land Use Element, Page 23</b>		
Policy 1.6: Support the County's agricultural base by allowing only appropriate compatible land uses nearby.	In La Paz County, the Proposed Project and SCE Harquahala-West Alternative would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project and alternative would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Policy 2.3: Support and protect ranching activities by working closely with public agencies and approving only appropriate, compatible land uses. Promote fencing and cattle crossings of major public roads through range lands.	In La Paz County, the Proposed Project and SCE Harquahala-West Alternative would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project and alternative would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
Policy 4.4: Develop guidelines for dust control measures for construction and excavation activities in proximity to developed areas that will be impacted.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APMs A-2 and A-3. The Proposed Project would not include any construction and excavation activities in proximity to developed areas in this jurisdiction.	NO
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Land Use Element</b>		
Policy 5.1: Protect employment areas, commercial development, and interchange node areas from intrusion of other uses and inappropriate adjacent land uses.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact commercial areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES

Note: No applicable policies were identified for biological resources; land use; wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; transportation and traffic; public health and safety; hydrology and water resources; and geology, mineral resources, and soils.

## 3.2 Maricopa County, Arizona

**Maricopa County 2020 Comprehensive Plan, 2002.** Maricopa County has a land area of 9,226 square miles, of which 1,441 square miles (15.6 percent) are incorporated and 7,785 square miles (84.4 percent) are unincorporated. It is the fifth-largest of Arizona's 15 counties, and the 14th-largest in the United States. It is located in western and central Arizona.

The Comprehensive Plan provides a guide for decision-makers concerning growth and development. Each of the Comprehensive Plan elements contains a series of goals, objectives and policies used to define development standards, guide public investment, and guide public and private decision-making. The plan includes seven elements: Land Use, Transportation, Environmental, Economic Development, Open Space, Growth Areas, and Water Resources. While the plan does not include specific policies for the development of utility corridors, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would need to be addressed for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and goals.

<b>Maricopa County 2020 Comprehensive Plan, 2002</b>		
<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use Element</b>		
Objective L10: Promote the balance of conservation and development. Policy L10.6: Encourage the preservation of ridgelines, foothills, and mountainous land with slopes of 15% or greater.	Although the Proposed Project would cause additional obstruction of views of ridges and mountains within Maricopa County (Big Horn Mountains and Saddle Mountain), it would not physically damage slopes of 15% or greater.	NO
Objective L11: Promote an interconnected open space system. Policy L11.3: Encourage the protection of ridgelines, significant mountainous areas, wildlife habitat, native vegetation, and riparian areas.	Although the Proposed Project would cause additional obstruction of views of ridges and significant mountainous areas within Maricopa County (Big Horn Mountains and Saddle Mountain), it would not physically change the visual character or quality of these resources.	NO
<b>Environment &amp; Environmental Effects Element</b>		
Objective E2: Promote development that is compatible with the visual character and quality of the site. Policy E2.2: Encourage preservation of scenic corridors and vistas.	Although the Proposed Project would be visible from major travel corridors (I-10, Salome Highway), it would not be located within the viewshed of a designated scenic corridor or vista.	NO
<b>Open Space Element</b>		
Objective O1: Promote development that is compatible with the visual character and quality of the site. Policy O1.1: Encourage efforts to protect and improve public access to open space resources.	Access and spur roads associated with the Proposed Project may effect public access along portions of the Proposed Project route. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Objective O1: Promote development that is compatible with the visual character and quality of the site. Policy O1.2: Encourage protection of view corridors within new and established scenic corridors.	Although the Proposed Project would be visible from major travel corridors (I-10, Salome Highway), it would not be located within the viewshed of established scenic corridors.	NO
Objective O4: Protect and enhance environmentally sensitive areas, including mountains and steep slopes; rivers and significant washes; historic, cultural, and archaeological resources; view corridors; sensitive desert; and significant wildlife habitat and ecosystems. Policy O4.1: Conserve mountainous areas that contain important wildlife habitats, cultural resources, and scenic areas.	The Proposed Project would impact views of mountainous areas (Big Horn Mountains, Saddle Mountain). This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Objective O4: Protect and enhance environmentally sensitive areas, including mountains and steep slopes; rivers and significant washes; historic, cultural, and archaeological resources; view corridors; sensitive desert; and significant wildlife habitat and ecosystems. Policy O4.2: Discourage development on ridge or crestlines and on steep slopes.	Although the Proposed Project would cause additional obstruction of views of ridges and steep slopes within Maricopa County (Big Horn Mountains and Saddle Mountain), it would not cross ridges or crestlines on steep slopes in Maricopa County.	NO

**Maricopa County 2020 Comprehensive Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Objective O5: Encourage appropriate open space between communities and land uses. Policy O5.3: Protect view corridors through buffering, screening, and other development standards.	The Proposed Project may impact view corridors from established travel routes (I-10 and Salome Highway) in Maricopa County. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**LAND USE**

**Open Space Element, Open Space Policies, Page 100**

Policy O6.3: Monitor and coordinate with the State Land Department, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Forest Service regarding reclassification, exchange, disposal, and acquisition of lands identified as proposed open space under their management, to promote the cause of open space conservation.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor, allowing the corridor to be maintained as open space. Because the BLM would be issuing a new or revised right-of-way grant to SCE for the Proposed Project, but would maintain ownership of the land, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
--	---	----

**NOISE**

**Noise Element**

Noise Objective 2E2: Minimize vehicle traffic noise on sensitive land uses.	The Proposed Project would involve traffic noise. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
---	---	-----

**TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

Objective T8: Minimize and mitigate impacts of construction and operations.	The Proposed Project would comply with this policy through implementation of APM A-7, APM V-3, APM V-10, and Mitigation Measure T-7a, which would reduce transportation and traffic related impacts.	NO
---	--	----

**AIR QUALITY**

**Air Quality Element**

Policy 2E1.1: Encourage the reduction of unpaved roads within the PM10 non-attainment area. Policy 2E1.2: Encourage the reduction of unpaved shoulders within the PM10 non-attainment area.	These two policies are not applicable to the Proposed Project, which does not reach the PM10 nonattainment area.	NO
Policy 2E1.8: Encourage all construction activities to use the best available control measures, as required by Environmental Services, to control emissions.	This policy does not specifically require anything more than what is already required by MCAQD Rules.	NO

**SOCIOECONOMICS**

**Economic Development Element**

Objective ED2: Encourage employment opportunities proximate to housing.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to impact local housing markets along the Proposed Project and alternative routes as a result of construction personnel locating to the area during the construction period. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
---	---	-----

Note: No applicable policies were identified for biological resources; wilderness and recreation; agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; public health and safety; hydrology and water resources; and geology, mineral resources and soils.

**Maricopa County 2020 Tonopah/Arlington Area Plan, 2004.** This document represents the results of the area plan update process for the Tonopah/Arlington planning area and is organized to follow the guidelines found in the Eye to the Future 2020, Maricopa County Comprehensive Plan. The Tonopah/Arlington Area Plan updates the existing Tonopah Land Use Plan and gives direction for development of the

planning area. Included in the 346-square-mile Tonopah/Arlington planning area are the unincorporated communities of Tonopah, Arlington, Hassayampa, and Wintersburg, Arizona. Specific goals and policies have been added for the Tonopah/Arlington Area for the Land Use, Transportation, Environmental, and Economic Development issue areas.

While this plan is an amendment to the Maricopa County 2020 Comprehensive Plan, it does not supersede that document. The purpose of this plan is to further define the guidelines identified in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan for the Tonopah/Arlington Area. The Goals for the Maricopa County 2020 Comprehensive Plan are the same for this document.

<b>Maricopa County 2020 Tonopah/Arlington Area Plan, 2004</b>		
<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
Tonopah/Arlington Objective 1: Encourage developments that are compatible with natural environmental features and which do not lead to their destruction. Policy E1.2: Encourage land uses and development designs that are compatible with environmentally sensitive areas such as parks, open space, floodplains, hillsides, wildlife habitat, scenic areas, and unstable geologic and soil conditions.	Access and spur roads associated with the Proposed Project may effect public access along portions of the Proposed Project route. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy E1.4: Encourage the scenic quality of the Tonopah Mountains, Saddle Mountain, Flatiron Mountain, and Palo Verde Hills.	Although the Proposed Project would not be located in close proximity to Saddle Mountain or the Palo Verde Hills, the SCE Palo Verde Alternative would pass between Saddle Mountain and the Palo Verde Hills. Both would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy O1.2: Encourage protection of view corridors within new and established scenic corridors.	Although the Proposed Project would be visible from major travel corridors (I-10, Salome Highway), it would not be located within the viewshed of established scenic corridors.	NO
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>Plan Elements, Land Use Policies, Page 72</b>		
Policy L1.7: Encourage light industrial development in the vicinity of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that terminates near the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, and would be compatible with the industrial land uses in this region. Alternative termination routes would also be located near the generating station. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Plan Elements, Economic Development Policies, Page 77</b>		
Policy ED1.9: Encourage low intensity industrial development in the area designated industrial north of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that terminates near the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, and would be compatible with the industrial land uses in this region. Alternative termination routes would also be located near the generating station. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Maricopa County 2020 Tonopah/Arlington Area Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
Noise Policy E1.3: Encourage compatible land use relationships with sources of excessive noise.	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. Therefore, this policy will be evaluated in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
Policy T1.1: Maintain Level of Service C or better on all County-owned roadways and intersections.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
Tonopah/Arlington Objective 5: Support Maricopa County efforts to reduce PM10.	The Proposed Project would comply with MCAQD Rules 310/310.01. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy E5.1: Encourage the reduction of unpaved roads.	The Proposed Project includes a commitment to reduce the number of roads associated with the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for biological resources; wilderness and recreation; agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; public health and safety; hydrology and water resources; geology, mineral resources, and soils; and socioeconomics.

### 3.3 Riverside County, California

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003.** Riverside County is the fourth-largest county in the State, stretching nearly 200 miles across and comprising over 7,200 square miles of fertile river valleys, low deserts, mountains, foothills and rolling plains. Riverside County shares borders with Los Angeles, Imperial, Orange, San Diego, and San Bernardino Counties, extending from within 14 miles of the Pacific Ocean to the Colorado River. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line, and the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, improvements to the existing Devers Substation, potential alternative substation sites, and the addition of a series capacitor and new fiber optic repeater in Riverside County. The Proposed Project would need to be evaluated for consistency with the policies and regulations described in the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan.

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Chapter 3: Land Use Element; Open Space, Habitat &amp; Natural Resource Preservation, Page LU-28</b>		
LU 8.1: Provide for permanent preservation of open space lands that contain important natural resources, hazards, watercourses, and scenic and recreational values.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Chapter 3: Land Use Element; Watercourse Overlay Page LU-69</b>		
LU 29.1: Require that proposed projects on properties containing the Watercourse Overlay be reviewed for compliance with habitat, endangered species, flood control and applicable area plan-specific design standards.	The Proposed Project would not cross a Watercourse Overlay area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element, Floodplain and Riparian Area Management Page OS-12 and OS-13</b>		
OS 5.1: Substantially alter floodways or implement other channelization only as a "last resort," and limit the alteration to: a. that necessary for the protection of public health and safety only after all other options are exhausted; b. essential public service projects where no other feasible construction method or alternative project location exists; or c. projects where the primary function is improvement of fish and wildlife habitat.	The Proposed Project would not substantially alter floodways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
OS 5.2: If substantial modification to a floodway is proposed, design it to reduce adverse environmental effects to the maximum extent feasible, considering the following factors: a. stream scour; b. erosion protection and sedimentation; c. wildlife habitat and linkages; d. groundwater recharge capability; e. adjacent property; and f. design (a natural effect, examples could include soft riparian bottoms and gentle bank slopes, wide and shallow floodways, minimization of visible use of concrete, and landscaping with native plants to the maximum extent possible). A site specific hydrologic study may be required.	The Proposed Project would not involve modification of floodways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
OS 5.3: Based upon site, specific study, all development shall be set back from the floodway boundary a distance adequate to address the following issues: a. public safety; b. erosion; c. riparian or wetland buffer; d. wildlife movement corridor or linkage; and e. slopes.	The Proposed Project would not impact wildlife movement and is, therefore, consistent with this policy.	NO
OS 5.4: Consider designating floodway setbacks for greenways, trails, and recreation opportunities on a case-by-case basis.	This policy gives direction to the County as to setbacks and does not apply to the Proposed Project.	NO
OS 5.5: New development shall preserve and enhance existing native riparian habitat and prevent obstruction of natural watercourses. Incentives shall be utilized to the maximum extent possible.	The Proposed Project would not obstruct watercourses or significantly impact native riparian habitat. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
OS 5.6: Identify and, to the maximum extent possible, conserve remaining upland habitat areas adjacent to wetland and riparian areas that are critical to the feeding, hibernation, or nesting of wildlife species associated with these wetland and riparian areas.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, potentially impacting wetland and riparian areas. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
OS 5.7: Where land is prohibited from development due to its retention as natural floodways, floodplains and watercourses, incentives should be available to the owner of the land including density transfer and other mechanisms as may be adopted. These incentives will be provided for the purpose of encouraging the preservation of natural watercourses without creating undue hardship on the owner of properties following these policies.	This policy addresses an incentives program for the preservation of natural watercourses and does not apply to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element, Wetlands, Page OS-13</b>		
OS 6.1: During the development review process, ensure compliance with the Clean Water Act's Section 404 in terms of wetlands mitigation policies and policies concerning fill material in jurisdictional wetlands.	The Proposed Project would be ensured for compliance with the Clean Water Act. Potential impacts to wetlands will be discussed in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
OS 6.2: Preserve buffer zones around wetlands where feasible and biologically appropriate.	Potential buffer areas adjacent to the proposed transmission line and associated site improvements will be discussed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
OS 6.3: Consider wetlands for use as natural water treatment areas that will result in improvement of water quality.	The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element, Forest Resources, Page OS-19</b>		
OS 8.1: Cooperate with federal and State agencies to achieve the sustainable conservation of forest land as a means of providing open space and protecting natural resources and habitat lands included within the MSHCPs.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County. Review of the Proposed Project involves coordination with federal and State agencies. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element, Vegetation, Page OS-20</b>		
OS 9.1: Update the Vegetation Map for Western Riverside County in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, the Natural Diversity Data Base, the United States Forest Service, and other knowledgeable agencies. The County shall also provide these agencies with data as needed.	This policy requires coordination between Riverside County and the resources agencies in order to update the Vegetation Map for western Riverside County. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy; therefore, no further analysis is necessary.	NO
OS 9.2: Expand Vegetation mapping to include the eastern portion of the County of Riverside.	The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy; therefore, no further analysis is necessary.	NO
OS 9.3: Maintain and conserve superior examples of native trees, natural vegetation, stands of established trees, and other features for ecosystem, aesthetic, and water conservation purposes.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County. The Proposed Project would include measures to protect biological resources; therefore, it would be consistent with this policy.	NO
OS 9.4: Conserve the oak tree resources in the County.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County that may contain oak trees. The Proposed Project would incorporate measures to protect oak trees if identified along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element, Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plans, Page OS-35</b>		
OS 17.4: Require the preparation of biological reports in compliance with Riverside County Planning Department Biological Report Guidelines for development related uses that require discretionary approval to assess the impacts of such development and provide mitigation for impacts to biological resources until such time as the CVAG MSHCP and/or Western Riverside County MSHCP are adopted or should one or both MSHCP's not be adopted.	Biological surveys and reports were prepared for the Proposed Project. The results will be incorporated into the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS in compliance with County guidelines. Appropriate mitigation measures will be discussed as well. This policy does not need to be analyzed further.	NO
OS 17.5: Establish baseline ratios for mitigating the impacts of development related uses to rare, threatened and endangered species and their associated habitats to be used until such time as the CVAG MSHCP and/or Western Riverside County MSHCP are adopted or should one or both MSHCP's not be adopted.	Biological surveys and reports were prepared for the Proposed Project. The results will be incorporated into the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS in compliance with County guidelines. Appropriate mitigation measures will be discussed as well. This policy does not need to be analyzed further.	NO
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element, Environmentally Sensitive Lands, Page OS-36</b>		
OS 18.1: Preserve multi-species habitat resources in the County of Riverside through the enforcement of the provisions of applicable MSHCP's, if adopted.	The Proposed Project would comply with the provisions of the applicable MSHCP's.	NO
OS 18.2: Provide incentives to landowners that will encourage the protection of significant resources in the County beyond the preservation and/or conservation required to mitigate project impacts.	The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use Element, Project Design</b>		
LU 4.1: Require that new developments be located and designed to visually enhance, not degrade the character of the surrounding area through consideration of the following concepts: a. Compliance with the design standards of the appropriate area plan land use category. l. Mitigate noise, odor, lighting, and other impacts on surrounding properties.	The Proposed Project would result in the construction of new transmission facilities with the potential to visually degrade the surrounding area. Some project facilities (substations and series capacitors) may include night lighting with the potential to impact surrounding properties. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Land Use Compatibility</b>		
LU 6.1: Require land uses to develop in accordance with the General Plan and area plans to ensure compatibility and minimize impacts.	The Proposed Project would result in the construction of new transmission facilities with the potential to cause visual impacts. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
LU 6.4: Retain and enhance the integrity of existing residential, employment, agricultural, and open space areas by protecting them from encroachment of land uses that would result in impacts from noise, noxious fumes, glare, shadowing, and traffic.	The Proposed Project would result in the construction of new transmission facilities with the potential to cause glare. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Open Space, Habitat &amp; Natural Resource Preservation</b>		
LU 8.2: Require that development protect environmental resources by compliance with the Multipurpose Open Space Element of the General Plan and federal and State regulations such as CEQA, NEPA, the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act.	This EIS/EIR will document the Proposed Project's compliance or non-compliance with the applicable environmental statutes.	NO

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Land Use Element, Hillside Development &amp; Slope</b>		
LU 11.1: Apply the following policies to areas where development is allowed and that contain natural slopes, canyons, or other significant elevation changes, regardless of land use designation: a. Restrict development on visually significant ridgelines, canyon edges and hilltops through sensitive siting and appropriate landscaping to ensure development is visually unobtrusive.	The Proposed Project would be located on some visually significant ridgelines and canyon edges. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Scenic Corridors, Page LU-31</b>		
LU 13.1: Preserve and protect outstanding scenic vistas and visual features for the enjoyment of the traveling public.	The Proposed Project has the potential to affect outstanding visual features. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
LU 13.3: Ensure that the design and appearance of new landscaping, structures, equipment, signs, or grading within Designated and Eligible State and County scenic highway corridors are compatible with the surrounding scenic setting or environment.	The Proposed Project has the potential to affect views from Designated (SR 62) and Eligible (I-10, Dillon Road, Whitewater Canyon Road, San Timoteo Canyon Road, and Redlands Boulevard) scenic highways. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
LU 13.4: Maintain at least a 50-foot setback from the edge of the right-of-way for new development adjacent to Designated and Eligible State and County Scenic Highways.	The Proposed Project has the potential to encroach within 50 feet of Designated (SR 62) and Eligible (I-10, Dillon Road, Whitewater Canyon Road, San Timoteo Canyon Road, and Redlands Boulevard) scenic highways. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Open Space Area Plan Land Use Designations: Recreation</b>		
LU 19.4: Encourage that structures be designed to maintain the environmental character in which they are located.	The Proposed Project has the potential to be located within areas designated as Open Space/Recreation. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Open Space–Rural Land Use Designations</b>		
LU 20.1: Require that structures be designed to maintain the environmental character in which they are located.	The Proposed Project has the potential to affect the environmental character of the landscape along the route. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
LU 20.2: Require that development be designed to blend with undeveloped natural contours of the site and avoid an unvaried, unnatural, or manufactured appearance.	The Proposed Project has the potential to contrast with the natural contours and appearance of the surrounding landscape. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
LU 20.4: Ensure that development does not adversely impact the open space and rural character of the surrounding area.	The Proposed Project has the potential to adversely impact the open space and rural character of the surrounding area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Eastern Riverside County Desert Areas (Non-Area Plan) Policies</b>		
LU 30.1: Preserve the character of the Eastern Riverside County Desert Areas through application of those land use designations reflected on Figure LU-6, Eastern Riverside County Desert Areas Land Use Plan.	Portions of the Proposed Project would be located with the Eastern Riverside County Desert Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Circulation Element, Scenic Corridors</b>		
C 19.1: Preserve scenic routes that have exceptional or unique visual features in accordance with Caltrans' Scenic Highways Plan.	Portions of the Proposed Project would be located in close proximity to designated (SR 62) and eligible (I-10, Dillon Road, Whitewater Canyon Road, San Timoteo Canyon Road, and Redlands Boulevard), scenic highways within Riverside County. Portions of the Devers-Valley Alternative would be located in close proximity to designated (SR 62 and SR 243) and Eligible (I-10, SR 111, SR 74, SR 79, Gilman Springs Road, and Ramona Expressway) scenic highways within Riverside County. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Circulation Element: Major Utility Corridors</b>		
C 25.2: Locate new and relocated utilities underground when possible. All remaining utilities shall be located or screened in a manner that minimizes their visibility by the public.	The Proposed Project would be a major above-ground utility that would be visible from public roads. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Multipurpose Open Space Element: Scenic Resources</b>		
OS 21.1: Identify and conserve the skylines, view corridors, and outstanding scenic vistas within Riverside County.	The Proposed Project would affect a number of skyline views within the County. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Multipurpose Open Space Element: Scenic Corridors</b>		
OS 22.1: Design developments within designated scenic highway corridors to balance the objectives of maintaining scenic resources with accommodating compatible land uses.	The Proposed Project would affect views within eligible and designated scenic highways within Riverside County. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>Chapter 3: Land Use Element, Infrastructure, Public Facilities &amp; Service Provision, Page LU-24</b>		
LU 5.4: Ensure that development and conservation land uses do not infringe upon existing public utility corridors, including fee owned rights-of-way and permanent easements, whose true land use is that of "public facilities." This policy will ensure that the "public facilities" designation governs over what otherwise may be inferred by the large scale general plan maps.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor and would continue to be compatible with public facility and open space land use designations. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Chapter 3: Land Use Element, Land Use Compatibility, Page LU-25</b>		
LU 6.2: Direct public, educational, religious, and utility uses established to serve the surrounding community toward those areas designated for Community Development and Rural Community uses on the applicable Area Plan land use maps. These uses may be found consistent with any of the Community Development, Rural Community, or Rural foundation designations, including the Rural Village Overlay, as well as the Open Space–Rural and Agriculture designations, under the following conditions: a. The facility is compatible in scale and design with surrounding land uses, and does not generate excessive noise, traffic, light, fumes, or odors that might have a negative impact on adjacent neighborhoods. b. The location of the proposed use will not jeopardize public health, safety, and welfare, or the facility is necessary to ensure the continual public safety and welfare.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor and would continue to be compatible with public facility and open space land use designations. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Land Use Element, Open Space, Page LU-53</b>		
LU 21.2: Protect lands designated as Open Space–Mineral Resource from encroachment of incompatible land uses through buffer zones or visual screening.	The Proposed Project would traverse areas designated as Open Space–Mineral Resource, but would be compatible with this land use designation. However, consistency with this policy will be evaluated further in the land use section of the report.	YES
<b>Chapter 3: Land Use Element, Public Facility Area Plan Land Use Designation, Page LU-61</b>		
LU 25.6: Ensure that development and conservation land uses do not infringe upon existing public utility corridors, including fee owned rights-of-way and permanent easements, whose true land use is that of Public Facilities. This policy will ensure that the “public facilities” designation governs over what otherwise may be inferred by the large-scale general plan maps.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor and would continue to be compatible with public facility and open space land use designations. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
LU 25.7: Due to the scale of General Plan and Area Plan maps and the size of the County, utility easements and linear rights-of-way that are narrow in width are not depicted on General Plan and Area Plan maps. These features need to be taken into consideration in the review of applications to develop land and proposals to preserve land for conservation.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor and would continue to be compatible with public facility and open space land use designations. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element, Mineral Resources, Page OS-29</b>		
OS 14.2: Restrict incompatible land uses within the impact area of existing or potential surface mining areas.	The Proposed Project would traverse mining areas, but would be compatible with this land use. However, consistency with this policy will be evaluated further in the land use section of the report.	YES
OS 14.5: Require that new non-mining land uses adjacent to existing mining operations be designed to provide a buffer between the new development and the mining operations. The buffer distance shall be based on an evaluation of noise, aesthetics, drainage, operating conditions, biological resources, topography, lighting, traffic, operating hours, and air quality.	The Proposed Project would traverse mining areas, but would be compatible with this land use designation. However, consistency with this policy will be evaluated further in the land use section of the report.	YES
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space Element; Open Space, Parks and Recreation; Page OS-44</b>		
OS 20.2: Prevent unnecessary extension of public facilities, services, and utilities, for urban uses, into Open Space–Conservation designated areas.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that has been designated for public facility or open space use. While the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing conservation areas, portions of the right-of-way would be expanded. This policy will be further evaluated for consistency in the Wilderness and Recreation section of the report.	YES
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Land Use, Land Use Compatibility, Page LU-25</b>		
LU 6.4 Retain and enhance the integrity of existing residential, employment, agricultural, and open space areas by protecting them from encroachment of land uses that would result in impacts from noise, noxious fumes, glare, shadowing, and traffic.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use, nor would it create noise, fumes, glare, or traffic. The shadowing that could result would be minor and would not impact agricultural areas. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Land Use, Agriculture, Page LU-45</b>		
LU 16.1 Encourage retaining agriculturally designated lands where agricultural activity can be sustained at an operational scale, where it accommodates lifestyle choice, and in locations where impacts to and from potentially incompatible uses, such as residential uses, are minimized, through incentives such as tax credits.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not preclude the retention of agriculturally designated lands at an operational scale. In addition, the Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
LU 16.2 Protect agricultural uses, including those with industrial characteristics (dairies, poultry, hog farms, etc.) by discouraging inappropriate land division in the immediate proximity and allowing only uses and intensities that are compatible with agricultural uses.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
LU 16.4 Encourage conservation of productive agricultural lands. Preserve prime agricultural lands for high-value crop production.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would have the potential to impact agricultural resources. This policy will be evaluated further in the Agriculture section of the report.	YES
<b>Agricultural Resources – Page OS-17</b>		
OS 7.3 Encourage conservation of productive agricultural lands and preservation of prime agricultural lands.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would have a potential to impact agricultural resources. This policy will be evaluated further in the Agriculture section of the report.	YES
OS 7.5 Encourage the combination of Agriculture with other compatible open space uses in order to provide an economic advantage to Agriculture. Allow by right, in areas designated Agriculture, activities related to the production of food and fiber, and support uses incidental and secondary to the onsite agricultural operation.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW in which transmission line operation would be a compatible use. In addition, SCE would implement APMs L-3, L-4, and L-6, which would make the Proposed Project more compatible with agricultural land by minimizing interference with operations through selective tower placement and use of H-frame and tubular structures. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
OS 19.2: Review all proposed development for the possibility of archaeological sensitivity.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
OS 19.4: Require a Native American Statement as part of the environmental review process on development projects with identified cultural resources.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, Native American consultation, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
OS 19.5: Transmit significant development proposals to the History Division of the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District for evaluation in relation to the destruction/preservation of potential historical sites. Prior to approval of any development proposal, feasible mitigation shall be incorporated into the design of the project and its conditions of approval.	As part of the Proposed Project, SCE would implement APM C-4, which would require it to prepare a cultural resource treatment plan for NRHP-eligible cultural resources to mitigate identified impacts. Avoidance, recordation, and data recovery will be used as mitigation alternatives. SCE would also implement APM C-6, which states that if avoidance of specific cultural resources is not feasible, treatment shall be carried out as determined by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate SHPO.  Also Mitigation Measure C-1a and C-1c would be implemented as part of the Proposed Project. Mitigation Measure C-1a would require the inventory and evaluation of cultural resources in the APE. Mitigation Measure C-c would require the development and implementation of a Historic Properties Treatment Plan, which would include a research design and scope of work for evaluation of cultural resources and for data recovery or additional treatment of NRHP-eligible sites. Mitigation and treatment plans would need to be approved by State and local governments, and Native Americans. The Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
OS 19.8: Whenever existing information indicates that a site proposed for development may contain biological, paleontological, or other scientific resources, a report shall be filed stating the extent and potential significance of the resources that may exist within the proposed development and appropriate measures through which the impacts of development may be mitigated.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
OS 19.9: This policy requires that when existing information indicates that a site proposed for development may contain paleontological resources, a paleontologist shall monitor site grading activities, with the authority to halt grading to collect uncovered paleontological resources, curate any resources collected with an appropriate repository, and file a report with the Planning Department documenting any paleontological resources that are found during the course of site grading.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
OS 19.10: Transmit significant development applications subject to CEQA to the San Bernardino County Museum for review, comment, and/or preparation of recommended conditions of approval with regard to paleontological resources.	The San Bernardino County Museum was contacted during the data collection phase of the Proposed Project in order to perform records searches and gather data. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**NOISE**

**Noise Element**

Policy N.1.1: Protect noise-sensitive land uses from high levels of noise by restricting noise-producing land uses from these areas. If the noise producing land use cannot be relocated, then noise buffers such as setbacks, landscaping, or block walls shall be used.	The Proposed Project would involve new sources of noise that could affect noise-sensitive land uses. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
---	--	-----

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<p>Policy N.1.3: Consider the following uses noise-sensitive and discourage these uses in areas in excess of 65 CNEL: Schools; Hospitals; Rest Homes; Long Term Care Facilities; Mental Care Facilities; Residential Uses; Libraries; Passive Recreation Uses; and Schools.</p> <p>According to the State of California Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines, and acoustical study may be required in cases where these noise-sensitive land uses are located in an area of 60 CNEL or greater. Any land use that is exposed to levels higher than 65 CNEL will require noise attenuation measures.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be located near some noise-sensitive land uses. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.1.4: Determine if existing land uses will present noise compatibility issues with proposed project by undertaking site surveys.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve new sources of noise that could affect surrounding land uses. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.1.5: Prevent and mitigate the adverse impacts of excessive noise exposure on the residents, employees, visitors, and noise-sensitive uses of Riverside County.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve new sources of noise. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.1.8: Limit the maximum permitted noise levels that cross property lines and impact adjacent land uses, except when dealing with noise emissions from wind turbines. Please see the Wind Energy Conversion Systems section for more information.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve new sources of noise. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.3.6: Discourage projects that are incapable of successfully mitigating excessive noise.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve new sources of noise. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.12.1: Minimize the impacts of construction noise on adjacent uses within acceptable practices.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve construction activities. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.12.2: Ensure that construction activities are regulated to establish hours of operation in order to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or adverse noise impacts on surrounding areas.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve construction activities. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.12.4: Require that all construction equipment utilizes noise reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve use of construction equipment. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Policy N.15.3: Prohibit exposure of residential dwellings to perceptible ground vibration from passing trains as perceived at the ground or second floor. Perceptible motion shall be presumed to be a motion velocity of 0.01 inches/second over a range of 1 to 100 Hz.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not involve use of trains or the vibration from trains; therefore, it would not conflict with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<b>Circulation Element</b>		
<p>Policy C.3.28: Reduce transportation noise through proper roadway design and coordination of truck and vehicle routing.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve construction that could generate noise near Conservation Area Resources. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>YES</p>

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
<b>Circulation Element</b>		
Policy C 2.1: Maintain the countywide target Levels of Service.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-19 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy C 3.6: Require private developers to be primarily responsible for the improvement of streets and highways service access to developing commercial, industrial, and residential areas.	The Proposed Project would result in industrial facilities; however, the facilities contribution to long-term future traffic loads would be negligible.	NO
Policy C 3.8: Restrict heavy-duty truck through-traffic in residential and community center areas and plan land uses so that trucks do not need to traverse these areas.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. However, construction traffic would be limited to public roadways with minimal travel through residential areas. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element, Sensitive Receptor Policies</b>		
AQ 2.1: The County land use planning efforts shall ensure that sensitive receptors are separated and protected from polluting point sources to the greatest extent possible.	The Proposed Project would not have substantial ongoing air pollution activities in this jurisdiction that could affect sensitive receptors, and the potential for sensitive receptor impacts for this area are addressed in the EIR/EIS.	NO
AQ 2.2: Require site plan designs to protect people and land uses sensitive to air pollution through the use of barriers and/or distance from emissions sources when possible.	The Proposed Project would not have substantial ongoing air pollution activities in this jurisdiction that could affect sensitive receptors, and the potential for sensitive receptor impacts for this area are addressed in the EIR/EIS.	NO
AQ 2.3: Encourage the use of pollution control measures such as landscaping, vegetation and other materials, which trap particulate matter or control pollution.	The Proposed Project would not have substantial ongoing air pollution activities in this jurisdiction that could affect sensitive receptors, and the potential for sensitive receptor impacts for this area are addressed in the EIR/EIS.	NO
<b>Stationary Source Policies</b>		
AQ 4.1: Encourage the use of building materials/methods which reduce emissions.	The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with AQMD requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
AQ 4.5: Require stationary pollution sources to minimize the release of toxic pollutants through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design features;</li> <li>• Operating procedures;</li> <li>• Preventive maintenance;</li> <li>• Operator training; and</li> <li>• Emergency response planning</li> </ul>	The Proposed Project is not likely to include stationary sources in this jurisdiction.	NO
AQ 4.6: Require stationary air pollution sources to comply with applicable air district rules and control measures.		

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
AQ 4.7: To the greatest extent possible, require every project to mitigate any of its anticipated emissions which exceed allowable emissions as established by the SCAQMD, MDAQMD, SOCAB, the Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APMs A-1 through A-8 and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
AQ 4.8: Expand, as appropriate, measures contained in the County's Fugitive Dust Reduction Program for the Coachella Valley to the entire County.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403/403.1. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with these policies.	NO
AQ 4.9: Require compliance with SCAQMD Rules 403 and 403.1, and support appropriate future measures to reduce fugitive dust emanating from construction sites.		
AQ 4.10: Coordinate with the SCAQMD and MDAQMD to create a communications plan to alert those conducting grading operations in the County of first, second, and third stage smog alerts, and when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour. During these instances all grading operations should be suspended.		

HYDROLOGY & WATER RESOURCES

Water Resources/Flooding<sup>4</sup>

LU 29.1: Require that proposed projects on properties containing the Watercourse Overlay be reviewed for compliance with habitat, endangered species, flood control, and applicable area plan-specific design standards.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8,, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
OS 3.3: Minimize pollutant discharge into storm drainage systems and natural drainage and aquifers.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through implementation of Mitigation Measures P-1a, P-1c, P-1d, P-4a, and H-1a, which provide policies and procedures for hazardous substance storage, use and control.	NO
OS 5.1: Substantially alter floodways or implement other channelization only as a "last resort," and limit the alteration to: a. that necessary for the protection of public health and safety only after all other options are exhausted; b. essential public service projects where no other feasible construction method or alternative project location exists; or c. projects where the primary function is improvement of fish and wildlife habitat.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the following APMs: APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-13, APM W-14, and APM W-16, which provide procedures to avoid active drainage channels.	NO
OS 5.3: Based upon site specific study, all development shall be set back from the floodway boundary a distance adequate to address the following issues: a. public safety; b. erosion; c. riparian or wetland buffer; d. wildlife movement corridor or linkage; and e. slopes.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the following APMs: APM W-1, APM W-3, APM W-11, APM W-7, APM W-9, APM W-15, APM W-17, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide erosion control procedures.	NO

<sup>4</sup> LU29.1, Page LU-69 Chapter 3, Land Use Element, Watercourse Overlay  
 OS 3.3, Page OS-10 Chapter 5, Multipurpose Open Space Element, Water Quality  
 OS 5.1, Page OS-12 Chapter 5, Multipurpose Open Space Element, Floodplain and Riparian Area Management  
 OS 5.3, Page OS-12 Chapter 5, Multipurpose Open Space Element, Floodplain and Riparian Area Management  
 S 4.1, Page S-34 Chapter 6, Safety Element, Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement  
 S 4.2, Page S-34 Chapter 6, Safety Element, Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement  
 S 4.4, Page S-39 Chapter 6, Safety Element, Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement  
 S 4.8, Page S-39 Chapter 6, Safety Element, Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement  
 S 4.9, Page S-34 Chapter 6, Safety Element, Flood and Inundation Hazard Abatement

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
S 4.1: For new construction and proposals for substantial improvements to residential and nonresidential development within 100-year floodplains as mapped by FEMA or as determined by site specific hydrologic studies for areas not mapped by FEMA, the County shall apply a minimum level of acceptable risk; and disapprove projects that cannot mitigate the hazard to the satisfaction of the Building Official or other responsible agency.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures. Riverside County will have the opportunity to review and comment on the EIR/EIS.	NO
S 4.2: Enforce provisions of the Building Code in conjunction with the following guidelines: <b>a.</b> All residential, commercial and industrial structures shall be flood-proofed from the 100-year storm flow, and the finished floor elevation shall be constructed at such a height as to meet this requirement. Critical facilities should be constructed above grade to the satisfaction of the Building Official, based on federal, State, or other reliable hydrologic studies. <b>b.</b> Critical facilities shall not be permitted in floodplains unless the project design ensures that there are two routes for emergency egress and regress, and minimizes the potential for debris or flooding to block emergency routes, either through the construction of dikes, bridges, or large-diameter storm drains under roads used for primary access. <b>c.</b> Development using, storing, or otherwise involved with substantial quantities of onsite hazardous materials shall not be permitted, unless all standards for evaluation, anchoring, and flood-proofing have been satisfied; and hazardous materials are stored in watertight containers, not capable of floating, to the extent required by State and federal laws and regulations. <b>d.</b> Specific flood-proofing measures may require: use of paints, membranes, or mortar to reduce water seepage through walls; installation of water tight doors, bulkheads, and shutters; installation of flood water pumps in structures; and proper modification and protection of all electrical equipment, circuits, and appliances so that the risk of electrocution or fire is eliminated. However, fully enclosed areas that are below finished floors shall require openings to equalize the forces on both sides of the walls.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
S 4.4: Prohibit alteration of floodways and channelization unless alternative methods of flood control are not technically feasible or unless alternative methods are utilized to the maximum extent practicable.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the following APMs: APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-13, APM W-14, and APM W-16, which provide procedures to avoid active drainage channels.	NO
S 4.8: Allow development within the floodway fringe, if the proposed structures can be adequately flood-proofed and will not contribute to property damage or risks to public safety.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8,, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<p>S 4.9: Within the floodway fringe of a floodplain as mapped by FEMA or as determined by site specific hydrologic studies for areas not mapped by FEMA, require development to be capable of withstanding flooding and to minimize use of fill. However, some development may be compatible within flood plains and floodways, as may some other land uses. In such cases, flood proofing would not be required. Compatible uses shall not, however, obstruct flows or adversely affect upstream or downstream properties with increased velocities, erosion backwater effects, or concentrations of flows.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8,, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.</p>	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Fault Rupture Safety Element, Page S-9</b>		
<p>Policy S 2.1: Minimize fault rupture hazards through enforcement of Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act provisions and the following policies:</p> <p>a. Require geologic studies or analyses for critical structures, and lifeline, high-occupancy, schools, and high-risk structures, within 0.5 miles of all Quaternary to historic faults shown on the Earthquake Fault Studies Zones map.</p> <p>b. Require geologic trenching studies within all designated Earthquake Fault Studies Zones, unless adequate evidence, as determined and accepted by the County Engineering Geologist, is presented.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and Mitigation Measure G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.</p>	NO
<b>Seismically induced liquefaction, landslides, and slope failure Safety Element, Page S-15</b>		
<p>Policy S 2.1: Minimize fault rupture hazards through enforcement of Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act provisions and the following policies:</p> <p>a. Require geologic studies or analyses for critical structures, and lifeline, high-occupancy, schools, and high-risk structures, within 0.5 miles of all Quaternary to historic faults shown on the Earthquake Fault Studies Zones map.</p> <p>b. Require geologic trenching studies within all designated Earthquake Fault Studies Zones, unless adequate evidence, as determined and accepted by the County Engineering Geologist, is presented.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and Mitigation Measure G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.</p>	NO
<p>Policy S 2.2: Require geological and geotechnical investigations in areas with potential for earthquake-induced liquefaction, landsliding or settlement as part of the environmental and development review process, for any structure proposed for human occupancy, and any structure whose damage would cause harm.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.</p>	NO
<p>Policy S 2.3: Require that a State-licensed professional investigate the potential for liquefaction in areas designated as underlain by "Susceptible Sediments" and "Shallow Ground Water" for all general construction projects.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-3 and Mitigation Measure G-5a, which provide procedures for investigating the potential for liquefaction in suspect areas.</p>	NO

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Slope and soil instability hazards, Hillside areas Safety Element, Page S-25</b>		
Policy S 3.1: Require the following in landslide potential hazard management zones, or when deemed necessary by the California Environmental Quality Act: a. Preliminary geotechnical and geologic investigations. b. Evaluations of site stability, including any possible impact on adjacent properties, before final project design is approved. c. Consultant reports, investigations, and design recommendations required for grading permits, building permits, and subdivision applications be prepared by State-licensed professionals.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential soil instability impacts.	NO
Policy S 3.3: Before issuance of building permits, require certification regarding the stability of the site against adverse effects of rain, earthquakes, and subsidence.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures which provide procedures for preparation of professionally certified geologic/geotechnical soil investigations and reports.	NO
Policy S 3.4: Require adequate mitigation of potential impacts from erosion, slope instability, or other hazardous slope conditions, or from loss of aesthetic resources for development occurring on slope and hillside areas.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO
<b>Wind Erosion Safety Element, Page S-30</b>		
Policy S 3.11: Require studies that address the potential of this hazard on proposed development within "High" and "Very High" wind erosion hazard zones.	The Proposed Project would be constructed in High Wind Erosion Susceptibility areas. This issue would be evaluated as part of the EIR/EIS analysis. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy S 3.13: Require buildings to be designed to resist wind loads.	The Proposed Project would follow design standards for wind loads on towers. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for socioeconomics.

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, 2003 – Area Plans.** The following area plans are an extension of the County of Riverside General Plan and Vision Statement. The Goals and Policies identified above for the Riverside County 2003 Comprehensive General Plan are applicable and express the goals of the following area plans. The area plans detail the specific physical, environmental, and economic characteristics for areas within the Riverside County 2003 Comprehensive General Plan area. While the area plans do not include specific policies for the development of utility corridors, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be evaluated for consistency with both the specific area plans and the Riverside County 2003 Comprehensive General Plan policies and goals.

Using the Riverside County 2003 Comprehensive General Plan as the primary foundation, the area plans establish policies for development and conservation within the identified area. Because the Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line, and the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, improvements to the existing Devers Substation, potential alternative substation sites, and the addition of a series capacitor and new fiber optic repeater in Riverside County, these area plans identify additional policies and direction for development and conservation specifically for the following specific geographic areas:

- Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan, 2003.** The Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan contains policies that guide the physical development and land uses in this rugged unincorporated portion of Riverside County. The Reche Canyon/Badlands area is a predominantly mountainous, rural residential, and rugged natural open space region in northwestern Riverside County. The area consists of expansive rural and mountainous terrain, with low-lying habitat and agricultural valley areas in the southern portion of the planning area. It is distinguished by the immense variety of physical features found in this singular portion of the county. The land is devoted to agriculture, rural residential, commercial, mining, public facility and recreational uses. Of these, rural and hillside residential uses consume the largest territory. The rural communities of Reche Canyon and Pigeon Pass are located in the northwesterly portion of the planning area. Scattered and clustered hillside and rural residential uses are situated in the area.

Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan, 2003		
Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use, Local Land Use Policies, Page 29</b>		
<b>Equestrian Uses</b>		
RCBAP 2.1: Ensure the provision and/or preservation of equestrian trails and related facilities in the Reche Canyon/Badlands area.	The Proposed Project includes the construction of an access road that could potentially be used for recreation. Existing equestrian trails would not be removed as a result of the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>Multipurpose Open Space, Local Open Space Policies, Pages 45-48</b>		
<b>RCIP Vision/Multipurpose Open Space</b>		
RCBAP 13.1: Protect visual and biological resources in the Reche Canyon/Badlands area through adherence to General Plan policies found in the Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Multipurpose Open Space Element of the County General Plan has been reviewed and is included as part of this policy analysis.	NO
<b>Floodplains and Watercourses</b>		
RCBAP 14.1: Protect the watercourse and floodplain areas, and provide recreational opportunities and flood protection through adherence to policies in the Open Space, Habitat and Natural Resources Preservation section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and the Watershed Management section of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and potentially affect watercourses and floodplain areas. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS. In addition, compliance with the County of Riverside General Plan Elements will be evaluated.	YES
<b>Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan</b>		
RCBAP 16.1: Conserve habitat that captures the diversity of the Riverside Lowlands bioregion within the Reche Canyon/Badlands area. The Reche Canyon/Badlands region includes substantial areas of remaining natural habitat within the Riverside Lowlands, including portion of the San Jacinto River, the Badlands, Reche Canyon area, and the Mystic Lake/San Jacinto Wildlife Area.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
RCBAP 16.2: Conserve the existing habitat values in the Reche Canyon/Badlands portion of the San Jacinto River with a focus on conservation of flood plain areas supporting Traver-Domino-Willows soils. Conservation should focus on maintaining habitat for sensitive plant species and maintaining habitat for sensitive plant species and maintaining and enhancing linkage values along this portion of the San Jacinto River between the San Jacinto and Santa Ana Mountains.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County. The Proposed Project would include measures to protect biological resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
RCBAP 16.3: Conserve existing vernal pool complexes associated with the San Jacinto River flood plain, in the Mystic Lake/San Jacinto Wildlife Area. Conservation should focus on vernal pool surface area and supporting watersheds.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and potentially affect vernal pools. However, the Proposed Project would include measures to protect biological resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
RCBAP 16.4: Conserve existing, intact upland habitat blocks between Sycamore Canyon Park area, Box Springs Mountain Reserve, and San Bernardino County to the north, focusing on sage scrub, grassland, and chaparral habitat.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
RCBAP 16.5: Provide for a connection of intact habitat between San Jacinto Wildlife Area/Mystic Lake and adjacent Badlands area to the north.	Connections between these habitat areas would not be impeded by the Proposed Project.	NO
RCBAP 16.6: Provide for connection of intact habitat between the Badlands and San Bernardino National Forest to the south.	Connections between these habitat areas would not be impeded by the Proposed Project.	NO
RCBAP 16.7: Conserve high-quality sage scrub and chamise chaparral in order to protect core population of Bell's sage sparrow in Badlands area.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and potentially impact sage scrub and chamise chaparral. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
RCBAP 16.8: Conserve San Jacinto Valley crownscale, vernal barley, Davidson's saltbush, Coulter's goldfields, and spreading navarretia. Conservation should focus on the Traver–Domino–Willows soil series occurring in the San Jacinto River flood plain. Key populations of these three species are known to exist within this section of the San Jacinto River	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these plants and areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
RCBAP 16.9: Conserve vernal pool complexes supporting thread-leaved brodiaea and California Orcutt grass known to exist within the Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and potentially affect vernal pools. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
RCBAP 16.10: Conserve alluvial scrub and alkali vernal plain habitat supporting a key population of smooth tarplant, Wright's trichocoronis, and little mousetail within this section of the San Jacinto River system.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and potentially affect vernal pools. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
RCBAP 16.11: Conserve sandy-granitic soils within chaparral and coastal sage scrub habitats capable of supporting Payson's jewelflower and prostrate spineflower known to exist within the Reche Canyon/Badlands area.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and would potentially affect these soils. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
RCBAP 16.12: Conserve existing populations of the California gnatcatcher in the Reche Canyon/Badlands area.	The Proposed Project may impact gnatcatchers and their habitat. However, the Proposed Project would include measures to protect biological resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
RCBAP 16.13: Provide for and maintain a continuous habitat corridor linkage along the San Jacinto River.	The Proposed Project would not impact the habitat corridor along the San Jacinto River.	NO

Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Circulation: Scenic Highways</b>		
RCBAP 11.1: Protect the scenic highways in the Reche Canyon/Badlands area from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties through policies in the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Proposed Project would affect views within two County eligible scenic roadways (San Timoteo Canyon Road and Redlands Boulevard) within the Reche Canyon/Badlands Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Multipurpose Open Space</b>		
RCBAP 13.1: Protect visual and biological resources in the Reche Canyon/Badlands area through adherence to General Plan policies found in the Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Proposed Project would affect visual resources within the Reche Canyon/Badlands Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Land Use, Agriculture, Page 29</b>		
RCBAP 3.1: Preserve the viability of Agriculture in the region through adherence to policies found in the Agriculture Area Plan Designation section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and policies located in the Agricultural Resources section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would have a potential to impact agricultural resources. Refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
RCBAP 9.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan Circulation Element.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Water Resources/Flooding, Local Hazards Policies, Flooding, Page 49</b>		
RCBAP 17.2: Require that proposed development projects that are subject to flood hazards, surface ponding, high erosion potential or sheet flow be submitted to the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for review.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources. Riverside County will have the opportunity to review and comment on this EIR/EIS.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic/Liquefaction Local Hazard Policies, Page 50</b>		
Policy RCBAP 19.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to policies in the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for land use; wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; public health and safety; air quality; and socioeconomics.

- **Pass Area Plan, 2003.** The Pass, or more specifically the San Gorgonio Pass Area, is a distinctive geographical area between the Coachella, San Jacinto, and Moreno Valleys. The Badlands separate the Pass Area Plan from Moreno Valley to the west and the San Jacinto Valley to the south. The San Jacinto Mountains form the southern boundary and the San Bernardino Mountains generally define the north-

ern boundary. The Coachella Valley lies immediately to the east of the planning area. In relation to other area plans, the Pass is bounded by the Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan to the west, the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan and Riverside Extended Mountain Area Plan (REMAP) to the south, and the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan to the east. The Cities of Redlands and Yucaipa, which are located within the County of San Bernardino, lie to the north. The incorporated Cities of Banning, Beaumont, and Calimesa are located within the Pass, as well as the unincorporated communities of Cherry Valley, Cabazon, and Banning Bench.

Pass Area Plan, 2003		
Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Multipurpose Open Space, Local Open Space Policies, Watersheds, Floodplains, and Watercourses, Pages 49 and 51</b>		
PAP 14.1: Protect the Santa Ana, San Jacinto, and Salton Sea watersheds and surrounding habitats, and provide flood protection through adherence to the Watershed Management section of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	Watersheds would not be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
PAP 15.1: Protect viable oak woodlands through adherence to the Oak Tree Management Guidelines and Best Management Practices adopted by Riverside County.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County that may contain oak trees. Because the County's policies require the conservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
PAP 16.5: Conserve coastal sage scrub patches which support known populations of granite night lizard and granite spiny lizard.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County that may contain coastal sage scrub patches. Because the County's policies require the conservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
PAP 16.8: Maintain wetlands and wetland connections via Noble Creek to conserve wetland species and wildlife dispersal.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County that may contain wetlands. Because the County's policies require the conservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
PAP 16.9: Maintain a contiguous connection between the proposed reserves in San Bernardino County and the Badlands area.	Connections between the proposed San Bernardino County and the Badlands areas preserves would not be impeded by the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use, Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting</b>		
PAP 9.1: Adhere to the County's lighting requirements for standards that are intended to limit light leakage and spillage that may interfere with the operations of the Palomar Observatory.	It is not expected that the Proposed Project would require additional night lighting within the Pass Planning Area.	NO
<b>Circulation, Scenic Highways</b>		
PAP 12.1: Protect the scenic highways in the Pass from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties in accordance with the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Proposed Project would affect views within State (I-10) and County (San Timoteo Canyon Road) eligible scenic highways within The Pass Planning Area. The Devers-Valley Alternative would affect views from designated (SR 243) and eligible (I-10 and SR 79) scenic highways within The Pass Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

Pass Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Agricultural Preservation, Page 35</b>		
PAP 7.1: Protect farmland and agricultural resources within the Pass planning area through adherence to the Agricultural Resources section of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element and the Agriculture Land Use Designation Policies section of the General Plan Land Use Element.	The Proposed Project would have a potential to impact agricultural resources. Refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
PAP 10.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan Circulation Element.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, B-3, and B-19 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project would not include significant operational traffic; therefore, it would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Water Resources/Flooding – Cabazon, Page 32</b>		
PAP 5.3: Allow uses that can be periodically flooded in areas within the 100-year flood zone. Such uses might include agriculture, golf courses, recreational uses, utilities, surface mining operations, parking, landscaping, and compatible resource development.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8,, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
PAP 5.4: Require building pads to be raised, at minimum, to the elevation of the 100-year flood zone, for any habitable structures within the 100-year flood zone.	The Proposed Project would not place any habitable structures within the 100-year flood zone; therefore, it would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Flooding, Page 56</b>		
PAP 17.3: Require that proposed development projects that are subject to flood hazards, surface ponding, high erosion potential or sheet flow be submitted to the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for review.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources. Riverside County will have the opportunity to review and comment on this EIR/EIS.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic/Liquefaction</b>		
PAP 19.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to policies in the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No policies were identified for land use; wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; public health and safety; and air quality.

- Western Coachella Valley Area Plan, 2003.** The central location and relative extent of Western Coachella Valley extends well over 650 square miles. As the entryway to the vast desert areas of eastern Riverside County, Western Coachella Valley is surrounded by the mountainous area of the REMAP to the west and southwest, The Pass Area Plan to the west, the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan to the east, and San Bernardino County and Joshua Tree National Park to the northeast. The Western Coachella Valley Area Plan boundary encompasses eight cities: Desert Hot Springs, Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta, and Indio.

Western Coachella Valley Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Light Pollution</b>		
WCVAP 15.1: Where outdoor lighting is proposed, require the inclusion of outdoor lighting features that would minimize the effects on the nighttime sky and wildlife habitat areas.	There would be no nighttime lighting used as part of the Proposed Project, therefore, this policy is not relevant.	NO
<b>Watershed, Floodplains, and Watercourses</b>		
WCVAP 20.1: Protect the Whitewater River watershed and habitat, and provide recreational opportunities and flood protection through adherence to policies in the Open Space, Habitat and Natural Resources Preservation section of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Watershed Management section of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and potentially affect the Whitewater River watershed. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS. In addition, compliance with the County of Riverside General Plan Elements will be evaluated.	NO
<b>Habitat Conservation</b>		
WCVAP 21.1: Protect biological resources in the Western Coachella Valley through adherence to General Plan policies found in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element, as well as policies contained in the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, upon the latter's adoption.	The Proposed Project would adhere to the policies in the General Plan and the Coachella Valley MSHCP.	NO
WCVAP 21.2: Require all development activities within Fringe-toed Lizard Habitat areas be compatible with the conservation principles and provisions of the Fringe-toed Lizard Habitat Conservation Plan and the standards of the Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Proposed Project may cross Fringe-toed Lizard Habitat areas. Potential affects will be discussed in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
WCVAP 21.3: Preserve the environmentally sensitive alluvial fan areas flowing out of the canyons of the Santa Rosa Mountains.	The Proposed Project would not traverse alluvial fan areas flowing from the Santa Rosa Mountains. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use: Industrial Uses</b>		
WCVAP 12.4: Require the screening and/or landscaping of outdoor storage areas, such as contractor storage yards and similar uses.	The Proposed Project would require the establishment of a construction yard(s) within the Western Coachella Valley Plan Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use: Light Pollution</b>		
WCVAP 15.1: Where outdoor lighting is proposed, require the inclusion of outdoor lighting features that would minimize the effects on the nighttime sky and wildlife habitat areas.	Some Proposed Project facilities (substations and construction yards) may include night lighting with the potential to impact the nighttime sky and adjacent wildlife habitat areas. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
WCVAP 15.2: Adhere to the lighting requirements of the County Ordinance Regulating Light Pollution for standards that are intended to limit light leakage and spillage that may interfere with the operations of the Palomar Observatory.	Some Proposed Project facilities (substations and construction yards) may include night lighting with the potential to impact the nighttime sky and adjacent wildlife habitat areas. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**Western Coachella Valley Area Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Circulation: Scenic Highways</b>		
WCVAP 18.1: Protect the scenic highways in the Western Coachella Valley from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties in accordance with the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Proposed Project would affect views within State Designated (SR 62), State Eligible (1-10) and County Eligible (I-10, Dillon Road, and White-water Canyon Road) scenic highways within the Western Coachella Valley Planning Area. The Devers-Valley Alternative would affect views within State Designated (SR 62), State Eligible (1-10 and SR 111) and County Eligible (I-10) scenic highways within the Western Coachella Valley Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Multipurpose Open Space</b>		
WCVAP 19.1: Protect visual and biological resources in the Western Coachella Valley through adherence to General Plan policies found in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Proposed Project would affect visual resources within the Western Coachella Valley Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>NOISE</b>		
Noise Policy 4.5.4: Land uses adjacent to or within a Conservation Area that generate noise above 105 dBA hourly shall incorporate setbacks, berms, or walls to minimize the effects of noise on the Conservation Area resources.	The Proposed Project would involve construction that could generate noise near Conservation Area Resources. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
WCVAP 16.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan Circulation Element.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Wind Erosion and Blow Sand – Local Hazard Policies, Page 62</b>		
WCVAP 23.2: Require protection of soil in areas subject to wind erosion or blowsand. Mitigation measures that may be required include, but are not limited to, windbreaks, walls, fences, vegetative groundcover, rock, other stabilizing materials, and installation of an irrigation system or provision of other means of irrigation.	Wind erosion and blowsand would occur during construction only; permanent structures for the Proposed Project would not be susceptible or expected to cause unusual wind erosion.	NO
<b>Seismic/Liquefaction – Local Hazard Policies, Page 63</b>		
WCAVP 25.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to policies in the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO
<b>Slope – Local Hazard Policies, Page 63</b>		
WCAVP 26.1: Protect life and property through adherence to the Slope and Soil Instability Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element, the Environmentally Sensitive Lands section of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element, the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and the policies of the Rural Mountainous and Open Space-Rural Land Use Designations.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for land use; wilderness and recreation; agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; and socioeconomics.

- **Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan, 2003.** From this nearly 670-square-mile area plan, one looks west to the Santa Rosa Mountains, REMAP and western Riverside County, and east to the Colorado Desert. Imperial County lies to the south of this area, while the Western Coachella Valley Area Plan area (and the remainder of the Coachella Valley) and the expanse of the Colorado Desert and Joshua Tree National Park are located to the north.

**Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan, 2003**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Light Pollution, Page 35</b>		
ECVAP 4.1: Require the inclusion of outdoor lighting features that would minimize the effects on the nighttime sky and wildlife habitat areas.	Lighting would not be part of the Proposed Project or alternatives. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>Watershed/Water Supply, Page 40</b>		
ECVAP 9.1: Conserve and protect watersheds and water supply through adherence to policies contained in the Open Space, Habitat and Natural Resource Preservation and Land Use Designation Policies sections found in the General Plan Land Use Element, and the Water Resources section of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, but would not affect watersheds and water supply. Refer to the policy analysis for the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use: Light Pollution</b>		
ECVAP 4.1: Require the inclusion of outdoor lighting features that would minimize the effects on the nighttime sky and wildlife habitat areas.	The Proposed Project would not include facilities requiring night lighting within the Eastern Coachella Valley Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
ECVAP 4.2: Adhere to the County's lighting requirements for standards that are intended to limit light leakage and spillage that may interfere with the operations of the Palomar Observatory.	The Proposed Project would not include facilities requiring night lighting within the Eastern Coachella Valley Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Circulation: Scenic Highways</b>		
ECVAP 14.1: Protect the scenic highways in the Eastern Coachella Valley from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties in accordance with the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Proposed Project would affect views from County Eligible (I-10 and Dillon Road) scenic highways within the Eastern Coachella Valley Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Open Space: Habitat Conservation/CVMSHCP</b>		
ECVAP 15.1: Protect visual and biological resources in the Eastern Coachella Valley through adherence to General Plan policies found in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element, as well as policies contained in the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, upon its adoption.	The Proposed Project would affect visual resources within the Western Coachella Valley Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Open Space: Ridgelines</b>		
ECVAP 16.1: Refer to the Ridgeline policies in the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Scenic Resources policies in the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	Although the Proposed Project would affect views of visually significant ridgetops and hills within the Eastern Coachella Valley Planning Area, the Proposed Project would not cross those features.	NO

Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Agricultural Lands, Page 36</b>		
ECVAP 5.1: Retain and protect agricultural lands through adherence to the policies contained in the Agriculture section of the General Plan Land Use Element.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not conflict with this policy. Also refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
ECVAP 5.2: Refer to the General Plan Certainty System in the General Plan Administrative Element. An exception is provided allowing limited changes from the Agriculture designation to be processed and approved.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not conflict with this policy. Also refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
<b>Industrial Uses, Page 40</b>		
ECVAP 8.1: Encourage industrial uses related to Agriculture to continue and expand within this area plan.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include industrial uses related to Agriculture. This policy is not relevant to the project.	NO
ECVAP 8.2: Discourage industrial uses that may conflict with agricultural or residential land uses either directly or indirectly within the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy; however it may need to be addressed for the alternatives.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
ECVAP 11.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan Circulation Element.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, B-3, and B-19 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic/Liquefaction – Local Hazard Policies, Page 60</b>		
ECVAP 19.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO
<b>Slope – Local Hazard Policies, Page 60</b>		
ECVAP 20.1: Protect life and property through adherence to the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and the Slope and Soil Instability Hazards sections of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No policies were identified for land use; wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; and socioeconomics.

- Desert Center Area Plan, 2003.** As the name implies, the Desert Center Area Plan is located in the middle of the Colorado Desert in eastern Riverside County, far removed from urbanized areas. It lies approximately 55 miles east of the City of Coachella and 55 miles west of the City of Blythe. Joshua Tree National Park lies to the northwest, the Coachella Valley lies to the west and the Palo Verde Valley lies to the east. Because of its remote location, Desert Center is not impacted by any city. In fact, it is separated even from the nearest planning areas and therefore shares boundaries with none of them.

<b>Desert Center Area Plan, 2003</b>		
<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Wildlife Habitat</b>		
Policy DCAP 10.2: Work to limit off-road vehicle use within the Desert Center Area Plan.	This policy deals with recreational issues that could potentially affect wildlife habitat areas. The Proposed Project includes an access road that could be used by off-road vehicles. Mitigation measures to reduce or limit this type of use to help preserve habitat will be discussed in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
DCAP 10.3: Require new development to conform with Desert Tortoise Critical Habitat designation requirements.	Conformance with the Desert Tortoise Critical Habitat designation requirements will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use, Light Pollution</b>		
DCAP 5.1: When outdoor lighting is used, require the use of fixtures that would minimize effects on the nighttime sky and wildlife habitat areas, except as necessary for security reasons.	Some Proposed Project facilities (California Series Capacitor and Desert Center Construction Yard) may include night lighting with the potential to impact the nighttime sky and adjacent wildlife habitat areas. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Circulation, Scenic Highways</b>		
DCAP 9.1: Protect the scenic highways within the Desert Center Area Plan from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties through adherence to the policies found in the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Proposed Project would affect views from Interstate 10, a County Eligible scenic highway within the Desert Center Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Agricultural Preservation, Page 27</b>		
DCAP 4.1: Protect farmland and agricultural resources in Desert Center through adherence to the Agricultural Resources section of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element and the Agriculture section of the General Plan Land Use Element, as well as the provisions of the Agriculture land use designation.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not impact designated agricultural resources in the Desert Center Planning Area. Refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
DCAP 6.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan Circulation Element.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Desert Center Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic/Liquefaction – Local Hazard Policies, Page 43</b>		
DCAP 12.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO
<b>Slope – Local Hazard Policies, Page 44</b>		
DCAP 13.1: Protect life and property, and maintain the character of Desert Center, through adherence to the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and the Slope and Soil Instability Hazards sections of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for land use; wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; and socioeconomics.

- Palo Verde Valley Area Plan, 2003.** This Area Plan covers an area that stretches along Interstate 10 out of the Valley and into the seemingly endless desert to the west and winds more steeply into the Arizona desert to the east. Down river, the Palo Verde Valley planning area borders Imperial County to the south. Desert lands border the area to the north and west. This is emphasized by the fact that the Palo Verde Valley Area Plan does not share a border with any other area plan in Riverside County.

Palo Verde Valley Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Watershed, Floodplain, and Watercourses</b>		
PVVAP 11.1: Protect the Colorado River watershed and habitat, and provide recreational opportunities and flood protection through adherence to the Open Space, Habitat, and Natural Resource Preservation section of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Water Resources and Watershed Management sections of the Multipurpose Open Space Element, as well as through use of Best Management Practices.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the County, and could potentially affect the Colorado River watershed and habitat. Because the County's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS. In addition, compliance with the County of Riverside General Plan Elements will be evaluated.	YES
PVVAP 12.1: Protect biological resources in the Palo Verde Valley planning area through adherence to the Sensitive Environmental Land and Watershed Management sections of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element	The Proposed Project could impact biological resources in the Palo Verde Valley. This policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Circulation: Scenic Highways</b>		
PVVAP 10.1: Protect the scenic highways within the Palo Verde Valley planning area from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties in accordance with the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Proposed Project would affect views from Interstate 10, a County Eligible scenic highway within the Palo Verde Valley Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**Palo Verde Valley Area Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Hazards: Slope</b>		
PVVAP 16.1: Protect ridgelines and slopes that provide a significant visual resource for the Palo Verde Valley area through adherence to the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element.	The Proposed Project would not affect visually significant ridgelines or slopes in the Palo Verde Valley planning area.	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Agricultural Preservation, Page 31</b>		
PVVAP 4.1: Protect farmland and agricultural resources in Palo Verde Valley through adherence to the Agriculture sections of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space and Land Use Elements.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would have a potential to impact agricultural resources, but would not preclude the protection of farmland and agricultural resources in the Palo Verde Valley. Refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the agriculture sections of the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic/Liquefaction – Local Hazard Policies, Page 48</b>		
PVVAP 15.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO
<b>Slope – Local Hazard Policies, Page 49</b>		
PVVAP 16.2: Protect life and property through adherence to the Hillside Development and Slope policies of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Slope and Soil Instability Hazards sections of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for land use; wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; transportation and traffic; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; and socioeconomics.

**Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), 2003.** The Western Riverside County MSHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional habitat Conservation Plan focusing on conservation of species and their associated habitats in Western Riverside County. The MSHCP Area covers approximately 1.26 million acres (1,966 square miles); it includes all unincorporated county from the crest of the San Jacinto Mountains to the Orange County line, as well as the jurisdictional areas of the Cities of Temecula, Murrieta, Lake Elsinore, Canyon Lake, Norco, Corona, Riverside, Moreno Valley, Banning, Beaumont, Calimesa, Perris, Hemet, and San Jacinto.

The MSHCP serves as a Habitat Conservation Plan pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as well as a Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) under the NCCP Act of 2001. The MSHCP is used to allow the participating jurisdictions to authorize “take” of plant and wildlife species identified within the Plan Area. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game have authority to regulate the take of Threatened, Endangered, and Rare Species. The overall goal of the MSHCP is to enhance and maintain biological diversity and ecosystem processes while allowing future economic growth within the Plan Area.

Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>The Pass Area Plan, Section 3.3.10, the Pass Area Plan, Page 3-241 through 3-246</b>		
The City of Banning, City of Beaumont, and City of Calimesa sit within the Pass Panning Area Plan. The three cities combined are included within the 8,540-13,925 acre target conservation range on Additional Reserve Lands for the entire Pass Area Plan. The Pass Area Plan is divided into three Subunits which includes the Potrero/Badlands area, the Badlands/San Bernardino National Forest, and San Timoteo Creek. Descriptions of Planning Species, Biological Issues and Considerations and Criteria for each Area Plan Subunit within the Pass Area Plan are presented in this plan.	The Proposed Project would cross the three Pass Area Plan subunits, but would include measures to reduce potential impacts to the area.	NO
<b>Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan, Section 3.3.11, Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan, Page 3-262 through 3-267</b>		
The Reche Canyon/Badlands Area is comprised of existing Public/Quasi-Public Lands and Additional Reserve Lands. The City of Moreno Valley sits entirely within this area plan. This plan is divided into four subunits which include the Box Springs (East), Reche Canyon, Badlands (North), and the San Jacinto Wildlife Area/Mystic Lake.	The Proposed Project would cross Reche Canyon/Badlands, but would include measures to reduce potential impacts to the area.	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Agriculture, Page 6-56</b>		
In the event that Development is subsequently Proposed for property that has been designated as New Agricultural Lands, such Development shall not be considered by the County or appropriate City for at least a five-year period following the inclusion of such property on the Existing Agricultural Operations Database.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include the development or operation of agricultural lands. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
<b>Covered Activities/Allowable Uses Policy.</b> Active construction areas shall be watered regularly to control dust and minimize impacts to adjacent vegetation.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403/403.1. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Note: No policies were identified for visual resources; land use; wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; transportation and traffic; public health and safety; hydrology and water resources; geology, mineral, and soils; and socioeconomics.

### 3.4 San Bernardino County, California

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002.** The county lies within the Riverside–San Bernardino metro area and contains over 30 incorporated cities, towns, and communities. It extends from central southern California to the Arizona border, covering 20,160 square miles. Approximately 90 percent of the county's area is desert; the remainder consists of the San Bernardino Valley and the San Bernardino Mountains. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line, including improvements to the San Bernardino and Vista Substations in San Bernardino County. The Proposed Project would need to be evaluated for consistency with the policies and regulations described in the General Plan.

The General Plan is the fundamental policy document for the unincorporated, privately owned county lands. It is a comprehensive document that must address seven mandatory elements or issue topics. Those elements are Land Use, Housing, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, Noise and Safety. Other optional

issues that affect the county are also allowed and have been included in the Plan. With the exception of the overall General Plan goals described in the State of California Government Code (as described above), the San Bernardino County General Plan does not include specific goals identified for the County. However, the construction and operation of the Proposed Project would need to be addressed for consistency with the General Plan policies identified within each element.

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>C. Natural Resources – Biological (Page II-C-1 and II-C-2; Goal C-2 and Pages II-C1-1 through II-C1-7)</b>		
Goal C-2: Certain scarce natural resources are best managed for preservation. These include biological resources, cultural resources, air quality, groundwater supply and quality, and open space.	The Proposed Project would not preclude the preservation of natural resources. In addition, the Proposed Project would include measures to reduce potential impacts to biological resources.	NO
<p>BI-1: Because all rare, endangered, threatened, and candidate species' habitats require management for preservation, the following shall be implemented:</p> <p>a) Biotic Resources Overlay shall be applied to areas identified as habitat for special status species</p> <p>b) All land use map changes and proposals for areas within the Biotic Resources Overlay or Open Space on the Resources Overlay shall be accompanied by a report identifying biotic resources that could be affected and mitigation measures.</p> <p>c) The conditions of approval of any land use application shall incorporate identified mitigation measures.</p> <p>d) All land use map changes and proposals shall include, where feasible, mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to and enhance populations and habitats.</p>	A portion of the Proposed Project will be constructed in open space areas in the County and habitat for listed and candidate species may be affected. Because the County's policy requires preservation and protection of resources, mitigation measures are required. Thus, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.	YES
BI-2: Because listed and candidate species and their habitats exist throughout the County and may occur in areas not included in the Biotic Resource Overlay, all of the provisions of policy BI-1 may be applied elsewhere in the County.	A portion of the Proposed Project will be constructed in open space areas in the County and habitat for listed and sensitive species may be affected. Thus, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.	YES
BI-3: Because species occurrences may be adversely affected by land use approvals, provisions of Policy BI-1 may be applied in areas supporting these species if it can be shown that the species is "threatened" as that term is used in the Federal Endangered Species Act.	A portion of the Proposed Project will be constructed in open space areas in the County and habitat for listed and sensitive species may be affected. Thus, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.	YES
<p>BI-4: Because the quality of life is related to the variety and abundance of all species, commonly occurring species shall be conserved. The following policies shall be incorporated into the conditions of approval for all proposed discretionary land use proposals.</p> <p>a) Regulate land clearing</p> <p>b) Minimize grading and cut and fill</p> <p>c) Limit OHV operation</p> <p>d) Restrict encroachment of incompatible land uses</p> <p>e) Encourage infilling of vacant land</p> <p>f) Implement abatement program for tree mortality</p>	A portion of the Proposed Project will be constructed in open space areas in the County. The policy requires minimization of impacts related to grading and erosion, tree mortality, and soil and vegetation loss. Thus, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.	YES

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<p>BI-6: Because preservation and conservation of biological resources depends upon mitigation measures adopted as conditions of approval, monitoring programs shall be established as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Mitigation measures be monitored and modified</li> <li>b) Monitoring program shall be designed to address specific impacts identified in the biological resources report.</li> <li>c) Monitoring program shall be designed to determine implementation and efficacy of mitigation measures</li> <li>d) Monitoring program shall be funded by the Applicant</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would include a mitigation monitoring program that includes the referenced items and accomplishes the referenced tasks.</p>	NO
<b>Natural Resource Preservation Policies/Action</b>		
<p>OR-15: Because the County desires to protect and preserve natural habitat, areas shown on the Resources Overlay as "Policy Zones" and "Wildlife Corridors" shall be targeted for ministerial and discretionary actions, including purchase of some lands, in support of preserving the natural features and habitat present.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not traverse any Policy Zones, but could traverse some areas designated as Wildlife Corridors. However, the Proposed Project would not preclude the preservation of natural features and habitat in these areas. In addition, it would be located within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space.</p>	NO
<p>OR-16: Because unwanted entry by pedestrians, equestrians, bicycles, or motorized vehicles can harm the desirable attributes of some open space areas, the following policies shall apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Control access to open space lands.</li> <li>b) Limit roads into or across open space lands.</li> </ul>	<p>A portion of the Proposed Project will cross unincorporated areas of the County. The dirt roads that provide access to the towers also allow unwanted access into open space areas. This policy will need to be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.</p>	YES
<p>OR-18: Because preservation of natural resources cannot be accomplished only through the use of publicly owned land, the County shall apply the following policies to development and construction proposals on private lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Require that private lands which exhibit unique features shall maintain those features.</li> <li>b) Encourage donation or exchange of lands with sensitive biota resources) to non-profit organizations or responsible agencies</li> <li>c) Promote common-interest Planned Developments requiring open space and allowing transfer of development rights.</li> <li>d) Apply the Resource Conservation Land Use District in area of public/private open space which is suited for low intensity use.</li> <li>e) Direct growth away from areas containing fragile or erosion-prone soils, especially those which support natural habitats.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would include mitigation measures to reduce impacts to natural resources. Therefore, no further review of this policy is needed.</p>	NO
<p>OR-19: Because preservation of large habitat areas can be more successful as a natural resource preservation strategy than preservation of smaller, scattered areas within individual developments, the County supports the concept of "habitat banking," and shall make this type of system available to developers.</p>	<p>A portion of the Proposed Project would cross unincorporated areas of the County. Loss of habitat due to the Proposed Project may require mitigation and a "habitat bank" may be a viable option. This policy will need to be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.</p>	YES
<p>OR-20: Because preservation of threatened and endangered species requires preservation of naturally occurring ecological systems containing plants and animals not considered threatened or endangered, the County shall include in its review of all development projects the total habitat value of a site, rather than simply the presence or absence of these species.</p>	<p>The EIR/EIS will present and evaluate biological resources impacted by the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would include mitigation measures to reduce impacts to natural resources. Therefore, no further review of this policy is needed.</p>	NO

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<p>OR-21: Because successful long-term preservation of habitats can only occur where species diversity can be maintained through continued migration of animals, the County shall seek to eliminate the creation of habitat “islands,” which consist of habitat surrounded by developed areas or other impediments to animal movement. To accomplish this, the County shall seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Require that open space areas set aside within developments be contiguous to natural areas adjacent to the site.</li> <li>b) Use open space corridors to link natural areas.</li> <li>c) Re-establish important wildlife corridors that may be damaged or destroyed.</li> <li>d) Consider design, construction and maintenance techniques in the County Flood Control District system, which allow the growth of habitat and the use of the flood control system by wildlife.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would still be available for use as open space and wildlife corridors. San Bernardino County is responsible for items c and d.</p>	NO
<p>OR-22: Because preservation of natural resources can in many cases be achieved by providing sufficient distance between natural and developed areas, the County shall ensure that roads and buildings have an appropriate setback from riparian corridors, except where this requirement would endanger public safety. These setbacks shall be based on an engineering inundation analysis and on the wildlife and plant communities within the corridor, and shall consist of at least the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide setback of 50 feet from intermittent flows designated as “blue lines” on USGS maps.</li> <li>b) Provide setback of 100 feet from perennial creeks/streams designated as “blue lines” on USGS maps.</li> <li>c) Provide a corridor extending to the ridgelines defining the watercourse that is sufficient to maintain wildlife use.</li> </ul>	<p>The portion of the Proposed Project that crosses unincorporated areas of the County does not include a riparian corridor. This policy does apply to crossing of “blue-lines” on USGS quadrangle maps. The Proposed Project may cross blue-line drainages within the County. This policy will need to be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.</p>	YES
<p>OR-23: Because a regular assessment of the effectiveness of providing setbacks from natural areas is necessary to ensure that these measures are achieving the goal of protecting natural areas, the County shall regularly review minimum riparian area setbacks to determine whether the distances established serve the purpose of preserving wildlife use and natural habitats. If necessary, recommended setbacks shall be revised.</p>	<p>This policy requires the County to regularly review the success of setbacks from riparian areas. Because the Proposed Project does not cross any riparian drainages in the County, this policy likely will not be further evaluated.</p>	NO
<p>OR-24: Because preservation of rare, threatened, or endangered species depends on the preservation of habitat which supports populations of these species, the County shall implement the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Protect and conserve rare or endangered flora and fauna</li> <li>b) Allow no net loss of existing wetland areas.</li> <li>c) Require all County agencies to demonstrate that their projects meet the overall Biotic Resource and Open Space policies of the County.</li> <li>d) Seek to provide protection/management to maintain habitat values in unprotected areas.</li> <li>e) Review land use designations to ensure that planned land uses provide adequate protection for natural areas.</li> </ul>	<p>This policy includes protection and conservation of habitats that support endangered flora and fauna, allows no net loss of wetlands, requires that projects meet the overall Biotic Resource and Open Space Policies of the County, seeks to protect habitat not provided by other agencies, and provides adequate protection for natural areas. This policy will need to be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.</p>	YES

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<p>OR-25: Because the development of private lands can adversely affect the management strategies of the federal agencies which administer public lands within San Bernardino County, the County shall apply the following policies:</p> <p>a) Support the transfer of private inholdings into public ownership.</p> <p>b) Review the intensity of uses allowed on surrounding public lands.</p> <p>c) Develop private inholdings within Wilderness Study Areas in the California Desert Conservation planning area.</p>	<p>This policy supports the transfer of private land holdings into public ownership to reduce "checker-board" ownership, reviews the intensity of uses allowed on surrounding public lands, and addresses development within Wilderness Study Areas. This policy likely will not have to be further evaluated.</p>	NO
<p>OR-26: Because preservation of natural resources may require purchase of private lands, the County shall consider the use of funding for the regional open space/trails system for use in the consolidation of public landholding within the National Forest and California Desert Conservation Area where these purchases will further the implementation of the Open Space/Trails System and where no other source of funding exists to purchase or transfer development rights from these lands.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not cross the National Forest or the California Desert Conservation Area in the County. This policy likely will not have to be further evaluated.</p>	NO
<p>OR-27: Because preservation of some natural resources requires the establishment of a buffer area between the resource and developed areas, the County shall review the Land Use Designations for unincorporated areas within ten (10) miles of any State or federally designated scenic area, national monument, or similar area, to ensure that sufficiently low development densities and building controls are applied to protect the visual and natural qualities of these areas.</p>	<p>The portion of the Proposed Project within the County does not fall within 10 miles of any State or federally designated scenic area, national monument, or similar area. This policy likely will not have to be further evaluated.</p>	NO
<p>OR-28: Because preservation of natural resources is a goal of the County, the County shall support land use and landscape strategies and standards which protect wildlife habitats and important vegetation.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor that would not preclude the protection of wildlife habitats and vegetation. In addition, the Proposed Project would include measures to reduce impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>OR-29: Because the preservation of natural resources can be achieved or assisted through the establishment of proper management practices, the County shall encourage the use of good conservation practices in the management of grading, replacement of ground cover, protection of soils, natural drainage, and the protection and replacement of indigenous trees.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project has the potential to remove native plant communities and disturb soils as a result of construction activities. This policy will need to be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the document.</p>	YES
<p>OR-30: Because loss of natural resources can be prevented only when sufficient information on the resource is available, the County shall apply the following actions and practices:</p> <p>a) Develop a Master EA listing open space resources and establish a method of monitoring their protection.</p> <p>b) Permit development within canyons with riparian corridors only after a site-specific investigation is conducted.</p>	<p>This policy relates to the County developing a Master Environmental Assessment listing of open space resources and establishes a method of monitoring their protection. This EIR/EIS contains the data requested in this policy; therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>OR-37: Because the County contains open space values which are of local, regional, statewide, and national significance, the County shall apply the following policies:</p> <p>a) Seek to retain all existing lava flows as open space.</p> <p>b) Seek to retain all existing cinder cones as open space.</p> <p>c) Seek to retain all existing dry lakes and playas as open space.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not traverse any lava flows, cinder cones or dry lakes within San Bernardino County; therefore, this policy is not relevant.</p>	NO

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<p>OR-62: Because retaining drainage courses in their natural condition retains habitat, allows some recharge of groundwater basins and can result in savings related to the construction of engineered drainage facilities, the County shall apply the following policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Retain all natural drainage courses</li> <li>b) Prohibit the conversion of natural watercourses</li> <li>c) Encourage the use of natural drainage courses as boundaries between neighborhoods</li> <li>d) Allow no development in the FW District and/or Flood Plain Overlay District(s) which would alter the alignment or direction or course of any blue-line stream.</li> <li>e) Maintain the capacity of the existing natural drainage channels where feasible</li> <li>f) Encourage the use of open space and drainage easements as stream preservation tools.</li> <li>g) Require naturalistic drainage improvement where modifications are necessary.</li> <li>h) Encourage natural channel designs</li> <li>i) Do not place streams in underground structures</li> <li>j) Prohibit occupation or obstruction of natural drainage courses</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project may cross drainage courses such that this policy will be evaluated in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.</p>	YES
<p>OR-67: To protect public safety, the County shall seek to retain areas within the Prado Dam inundation area as permanent, public space. Consideration shall be given to retain this area as natural open space wherever possible.</p>	<p>This policy addresses the inundation areas within Prado Dam which are preferred permanent public space in the County. A majority of the Proposed Project would be located in an existing utility corridor ROW such that inundation areas will be discouraged.</p>	NO
<p>OR-68: To protect public safety, the County shall support the use, as permanent open space, of areas within flood hazard zones which are not suitable for development of permanent structures or mining operations.</p>	<p>Majority of the Proposed Project would be located in an existing utility corridor ROW such that areas within flood hazard zones will be discouraged.</p>	NO
<p>OR-69: Because the County seeks to maximize the use of open space lands where possible, the following policies shall apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Encourage the use of active and inactive utility easement corridors as public open space areas and trail alignments.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and trail use. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**E. Scenic Resource Policies/Actions**

<p>Policy OR-51: Because the provision of scenic areas, trails and scenic highways is an integral part of the planning process, the County shall require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Define the Scenic Corridor to extend 200 feet on either side of the designated route, measured from the outside edge of the right-of-way, trail or path. Development along scenic corridors shall be required to demonstrate through visual analysis that proposed improvements are compatible with the scenic qualities present.</li> <li>j. Control development on prominent ridgelines.</li> <li>k. Allow new regional and community infrastructure on hilltops only when no alternative sites are available.</li> <li>l. Review site planning, including architectural design, to prevent obstruction of scenic views and to blend with the surrounding landscape.</li> <li>m. Require compliance with grading and vegetation removal standards as set forth in the Scenic Routes Overlay District.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would traverse several ridges and hilltops and be visible from the following County Designated scenic highways: Barton Road, Beaumont Avenue, and San Timoteo Canyon Road. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	YES
--	--	-----

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Policy OR-53: Because preservation of scenic qualities is important to the County, development which would alter the character of visually significant resources should be prevented.	Although the Proposed Project would traverse several ridges and hilltops and be visible from several County Designated scenic highways, the Proposed Project would not significantly alter the character of the surrounding landscape.	NO
Policy OR-57: Because the preservation of scenic qualities can in many cases be achieved only through the preservation of existing landform and natural features, the County shall require the following: n. Require that hillside development be compatible with natural features and the ability to develop the site in a manner which preserves the integrity and character of the hillside environment, including but not limited to, consideration of terrain, landform, access needs, fire and erosion hazards, watershed and flood factors, tree preservation, and scenic amenities and quality.	The Proposed Project would traverse several ridges and hilltops and be visible from the following County Designated scenic highways: Barton Road, Beaumont Avenue, and San Timoteo Canyon Road. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS	YES
Policy OR-58: Because the County desires to retain the scenic character of visually important roadways throughout the County, the County shall designate the following routes as scenic highways, and apply all applicable policies to development within the Scenic Corridor [partial list]: <u>Loma Linda Planning Area:</u> • Barton Road • Beaumont Avenue • San Timoteo Canyon Road	The Proposed Project would be visible from the following County Designated scenic highways: Barton Road, Beaumont Avenue, and San Timoteo Canyon Road. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS	YES

**LAND USE**

**Section III: Public Facilities, Public Facilities; Resolution 2003-56, Page III-D3-45**

OH/LU-18: Designate and protect land for public services to serve the needs of the community for schools, parks, community facilities, open space, utilities and infrastructure.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within a designated utility corridor and would not require expansion of the corridor within San Bernardino County. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
--	--	----

**Section III: Land Use Districts, Land Use Districts; Resolution 2003-56, Page III-D3-46**

OH/LU-25: Because land use district boundaries are normally parcel specific and because detailed surveys of the drainage/ flood areas and power line and other institutional land uses are not presently available for precise delineation of these boundaries within the Planning Area, the following policies/actions shall be implemented: a. Where a detailed drainage report demonstrates that parcels or portions of parcels within the Floodway Land Use District should not be restricted by the limitations of the Floodway designation, the boundary between the Floodway and the adjacent land use district shall be interpreted to be consistent with such report. b. The boundaries of the Institutional Land Use District are intended to match the rights-of-way or easements for public utilities and interstate transportation corridors within the Planning Area.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within a designated utility corridor and would not require expansion of the corridor within San Bernardino County. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy	NO
---	---	----

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Chapter 6: Land Use/Growth Management, Location, Distribution and Intensity of Land Uses, Page II-D6-6</b>		
<p>LU-4: Because the County wants to promote industrial development in order to expand its employment and tax bases, the following policies/actions shall be implemented:</p> <p>(a) Protect land areas best suited for industrial activity by virtue of their location and other criteria from residential and other incompatible uses.</p> <p>(g) Ensure that industrial development meets locational and development standards that ensure their compatibility with adjacent uses and community character.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be constructed within a designated utility corridor and would not require expansion of the corridor within San Bernardino County. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy</p>	NO
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>Section III: Public Facilities, Public Facilities; Resolution 2003-56, Page III-D3-45</b>		
<p>OH/LU-23: Encourage the joint use of public facilities wherever possible, as in shared school/park facilities, shared utility/trail easements, and shared school/library facilities.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>Chapter 5: Open Space, Trails Policies/Actions, Page II-C5-36</b>		
<p>OR-7: Because the County desires to provide a regional trails system, and because achievement of this trail system will require the coordinated implementation of actions related to many County and private actions, subject to funding availability the County shall:</p> <p>(f) Use lands already in public ownership or proposed for public acquisition, such as rights of way for flood control channels, abandoned railroad lines and fire control roads for trails wherever possible, in preference to private property.</p> <p>(m) Use active and abandoned road, utility, and railroad rights-of-way for nonvehicular circulation in all new development when found feasible.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>General Open Space, Page II-C5-7</b>		
<p>OR-1: Because preservation of open space lands will be facilitated through the application of land use standards, the County shall implement the following actions:</p> <p>a. Utilize appropriate land use categories on the Land Use maps to provide for uses which respect open space values. Land Use districts appropriate for various types of open space preservation include: Agriculture (AG), Floodway (FW), Resource Conservation (RC), and Institutional (IN).</p> <p>b. Develop and apply development policies/standards to support retention of open space lands by: requiring large lot sizes, high percentage of open space or agricultural uses, and clustering.</p> <p>c. Utilize the Hazard and Resources Overlay Maps to identify areas suitable or required for retention as open space. Resources and issues identified on the Overlays which indicate open space as an appropriate use may include: flood, fire, geologic, aviation, noise, cultural, prime soils, biological, scenic resources, minerals, agricultural preserves, utility corridors, water supply and water recharge.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not preclude the preservation of agricultural lands as it would be located within an existing utility corridor that would be available for continued agricultural use.</p>	NO

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Natural Resources – Open Space – Managed Production of Resources, Page II-C5-90</b>		
<p>OR-43: Because preservation of agricultural lands can be achieved through the application of appropriate land use regulations, the County shall apply the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The County shall support the use of Williamson Act Preserves and Contracts to preserve agricultural lands.</li> <li>b. Designate those areas containing productive agricultural uses with a land use district permitting that use.</li> <li>c. In land use decisions, the County shall permit only those use types within agricultural areas that will contribute to the economic viability of the primary Agriculture use while not detracting from or competing with it.</li> <li>d. The County shall seek to protect the supply of water for Agriculture by restricting or excluding agricultural uses which have a high rate of water consumption in overdrafted areas.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would not introduce an incompatible land use, nor would it preclude the preservation of agricultural lands. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Natural Resources – Soils/Agriculture, Page II-C6-3</b>	<p>The Proposed Project would not preclude the preservation of agricultural lands. It would occur within an existing utility corridor where the land would continue to be available for agricultural use. The Proposed Project would most likely convert less than 0.1 acres of agricultural land, and would also improve the area by removing some existing tower structures.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>SA-2: Because agricultural uses are valuable, the County shall encourage retention of productive, commercially viable agricultural land and discourage the premature or unnecessary conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use through the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Preservation of prime and statewide important soils types, as well as areas exhibiting viable agricultural operations, as shown on the Resource Overlay Maps, will be considered as an integral portion of the Open Space Element when reviewing development proposals.</li> <li>b. Utilize the provisions of the Williamson Act to further the preservation of commercially viable agricultural open space and designate preserves on the Resource Overlay Maps.</li> <li>c. Within agricultural preserves, establish minimum parcel sizes of 10 acres for prime and 40 acres for nonprime agricultural land and encourage consolidation of undersized parcels through the use of land use districts.</li> <li>d. Support property and estate tax relief measures which assess long-term Agriculture at farm-use value.</li> <li>f. Within commercially viable agricultural areas, encourage only land uses which are compatible with Agriculture and maintain a list of compatible uses allowed within agricultural preserves.</li> <li>g. Consider the availability and financing of public services and utilities in any decision to convert an area from agricultural to non-agricultural uses. This information should be documented in special study reports.</li> <li>h. Establish necessary buffers between agricultural and/or other uses.</li> <li>j. If the need arises, encourage relocation of agricultural operations within the County rather than to areas outside the County.</li> <li>l. Designate agricultural land use districts on the Land Use Maps and agricultural preserves on the Resource Overlay Maps.</li> <li>n. Encourage expansion of Agriculture in under-utilized areas through actively promoting the establishment of agricultural lands where water is available in sufficient quantity. These lands shall be identified on the Resource Overlay Map.</li> <li>o. Encourage agricultural use of commercially productive agricultural lands; discourage city sphere of influence extensions into areas containing commercially productive agricultural lands.</li> <li>s. Attempt to incrementally purchase and land bank those properties whose owners do not wish to stay in the Preserve, such properties to be made available for Agriculture purchase or lease through various funding sources such as County funding, not-for-profit corporations and dairy interest groups.</li> <li>t. Coordinate a capital improvement policy program/plan that directs development into existing urban centers and away from Agriculture.</li> </ol>		

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<p>SA-3: Because Agriculture involves disturbance of the surface features via tilling and other mechanisms, it can also result in erosion, fugitive dust and scarring of the landscape. These consequences of unnecessary nuisance and visual impact can be reduced through the following:</p> <p>d. Utilize easements and other conveyances for development which proposes to locate proximate to agricultural operations to minimize future nuisance complaints.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would not introduce an incompatible land use. This policy would have been considered upon the development of this corridor. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>SA-4: Because agricultural activities tend to be larger in terms of acreage to remain economically viable, and the creation of parcels results in creating road networks which discourage Agriculture, larger parcels sizes are required.</p> <p>a. The minimum parcel size for agricultural districts within the Valley portions of the County should be 10 acres.</p> <p>b. The minimum parcel size for agricultural districts in the desert portions of the County should be 40 acres outside the CDCA boundaries and 160 acres within the CDCA boundaries.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not reduce the size of agricultural lands. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>Land Use/Growth Management, Page II-D6-4</b></p>		
<p>LU-1: Because it is essential to locate new development in areas where the economic strength derived from Agriculture, petroleum, rangeland or mineral resources, is not impaired and in order to ensure that the value of the other resources which exist in the County is not diminished, the following policies/actions shall be implemented:</p> <p>a. Reserve areas identified by the State as prime Agriculture soils and depicted on the "important farmland map" for extensive Agriculture uses.</p> <p>d. Support programs and policies that provide tax and economic incentives to insure long-term retention of agricultural and other resource lands.</p> <p>e. Encourage owners of agricultural land to enter into Land Conservation contracts with the County to ensure that the property remains in long-term agricultural use.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor where land would continue to be available for agricultural use. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>Valley Region, West Valley Sub-Region, Redlands Sphere of Influence, Soils/Agriculture, Page III-B2-13</b></p>		
<p>In accordance with California Government Code (66474.4[b]), the Board of Supervisors has made the finding that parcels smaller than ten (10) acres in size within Agriculture Preserves in Redlands Sphere Planning Area can sustain Agriculture uses permitted under Land Conservation Contracts, provided the Planning Agency makes the additional findings outlined in Section 86.031150 of the County Code. The maximum net housing density shall not be greater than one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) gross acres (1 du/5 ac). These provisions shall not override the minimum parcel size of any specific land use district.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not include the development of housing. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>Valley Region, East Valley Sub-Region, East Valley Corridor Planning Area, Land Use/Growth Management, Page III-B2-34</b></p>		
<p>EC/LU-4 Preserve existing viable agricultural activities as long as feasible while the area transitions to more intensive uses.</p> <p>1) In Planned Developments, encourage phasing of projects to preserve agricultural uses as long as possible.</p> <p>2) Permit continuation of Agriculture in all land use districts as an interim use.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not traverse the East Valley Corridor Planning Area as identified in the San Bernardino County General Plan. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	<p>NO</p>

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Valley Region, East Valley Sub-Region, Oak Glen Planning Area – Oak Glen – Natural Resources – Agriculture/Soils – Page III-B2-44</b>		
<p>Recognize the importance of Agriculture to the character and economy of Oak Glen by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designating those areas used primarily for Agriculture as Agriculture District on the Land Use Map.</li> <li>• Encouraging the establishment of agricultural preserves and the use of the Williamson Act Contracts.</li> <li>• Requiring that where residential development occurs in an agricultural district, the retention of orchard areas adjacent to major access roads should be encouraged. The depth of such areas and the method of maintaining them shall be determined during the subdivision review process.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not traverse the Oak Glen Planning Area as identified in the San Bernardino County General Plan. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO
<b>Valley Region, East Valley Sub-Region, Yucaipa Planning Area, Land Use/Growth Management, Page III-B2-51</b>		
<p>Promote and preserve the rural setting in designated areas of the community. This may be accomplished by identifying and maintaining specific areas for low-density residential or agricultural uses and by establishing development standards that enhance the rural character within identified areas. One method to accomplish this is to allow residential subdivisions which create parcels 2½ acres or less, only when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is adequate access.</li> <li>• They are a logical extension from existing development.</li> <li>• They are served by an adequate domestic water supplier.</li> <li>• They have adequate fire protection.</li> <li>• The development will not have a detrimental effect on the underground water basin.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would not traverse the Yucaipa Planning Area as identified in the San Bernardino County General Plan. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO
<b>Mountain Region, Soils/Agriculture, Page III-C-46</b>		
<p>Preserve the limited areas within the Lytle Creek area that can support commercial Agriculture.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not traverse the Lytle Creek area; therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
<p>Policy NO-1: Because excessive noise can interfere with sleep, speech and health, yet can be mitigated to acceptable levels through land use design requirements:</p> <p>c. When industrial, commercial or other land uses, including locally regulated noise sources, are proposed for areas containing noise-sensitive land uses, noise levels generated by the proposed use shall not exceed the performance standards of Figure II-9 within outdoor activity areas. If outdoor activity areas have not yet been determined, noise levels shall not exceed the performance standards [levels of figure shown in General Plan] at the boundary of areas planned or zoned for residential or other noise-sensitive land uses.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS</p>	YES
<p>Policy NO-2. Because County residents are exposed to vehicular noise sources in excess of acceptable levels the County shall:</p> <p>b. Limit truck traffic in residential and commercial areas to designated truck routes; limit construction, delivery and through-truck traffic to designated routes; and distribute maps of approved truck routes to County traffic officers.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve use of construction vehicles. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS</p>	YES

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<p>Policy NO-4. Because County residents are exposed to levels considered to be excessive from stationary sources such as industrial, recreational and construction activities as well as mechanical and electrical equipment, the County shall enforce the Hourly Noise Level Performance Standards for stationary and other locally regulated sources through development and implementation of a noise ordinance that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f. Require any project (new construction or additions) to meet the County Noise Ordinance standards as a condition of building permit approval.</li> <li>g. Require developers to depict on any appropriate development application review, (i.e., zone change, subdivision, site approval, site plan and building plans) any potential noise sources known at the time of submission and mitigation measures that insure these noise sources meet County Noise Ordinance Standards. Such sources include but are not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Truck pick up and loading areas.</li> <li>ii) Mechanical and electrical equipment such as air conditioning, swimming pool pumps and filters, spa pumps, etc.</li> <li>iii) Exterior work areas.</li> <li>iv) Exterior nuisances such as speaker boxes and outdoor public address systems.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS</p>	<p>YES</p>

**PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY**

**Hazardous Waste/Materials**

<p>Policy B-16: To minimize the risk of exposure to hazardous substances by the residential and immobile populations.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project has very low risk of exposure to hazardous substance by the public.</p>	<p>NO</p>
---	---	-----------

**AIR QUALITY**

**Air Quality Element – Protect Sensitive Receptor Policies**

<p>AQ-24: Because some land uses support populations that are especially sensitive to air contaminants (such as schools and hospitals), the County shall support a regional approach to regulating the location and design of land uses which are especially sensitive to air pollution as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Participate with the SCAQMD in jointly formulating appropriate standards for regulating the location and protection of sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals and the like) from excessive and hazardous emissions.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would not have substantial ongoing air pollution activities in this jurisdiction that could affect sensitive receptors, and the potential for sensitive receptor impacts for this area are addressed in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>NO</p>
--	--	-----------

**Air Quality Element – Control Dust Policies**

<p>AQ-26: Because particulate emissions exceed federal and State standards in the air basin, the County shall reduce particulate emissions from roads, parking lots, construction sites and agricultural lands as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to manage paved roads so they produce the minimum practicable level of particulates.</li> <li>b. Adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to minimize particulate emissions during road, parking lot and building construction.</li> <li>c. Adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to control particulate emissions from unpaved roads, drives, vehicle maneuvering areas and parking lots.</li> <li>d. Adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to limit dust from agricultural lands and operations, where applicable.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>
---	--	-----------

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Air Quality Element – Reduce Emissions from Building Materials/Method Policies</b>		
<p>AQ-27: Because particulate emissions are affected by the type of materials and methods utilized, the County shall reduce emissions from building materials and methods which generate excessive pollutants as follows:</p> <p>a. Adopt incentives, regulations and/or procedures to prohibit the use of building materials and methods which generate excessive pollutants.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with AQMD requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Geologic Natural Hazards, Page II-A1-2</b>		
<p>Policy GE-2: Because the risks from many geologic hazards can be successfully mitigated through a combination of engineering, construction, land use and developmental standards, the County shall:</p> <p>b. Require sites to be developed and all structures designed in accordance with recommendations contained in any required geotechnical or geologic reports, through conditioning, construction plans and field inspections.</p> <p>c. Require that all recommended mitigation measures be clearly indicated on all grading and construction plans.</p> <p>e. Require all facilities to meet appropriate geologic hazard specifications as determined by the County Geologist for discretionary and ministerial authorizations.</p>	<p>Geologic and geotechnical assessments would be required for new towers and structures, although none are planned for San Bernardino County.</p>	NO
<b>Seismic Rupture and Shaking Natural Hazards, Page II-A1-5 through II-A1-11</b>		
<p>Policy GE-6: Because the County is traversed by many major active faults resulting in a relatively high level of risk, the County shall:</p> <p>c. Require new structures and facilities to be designed and constructed to meet seismic and related design requirements of the most recent Uniform Building Code, or more stringent requirements if indicated by site investigations, except that no specified hazardous waste facility should be within 200' of an active/recently active fault.</p> <p>d. Require all new critical, essential or high occupancy facilities to be designed and operated in such a manner as to remain standing and functional during and after a disaster as determined by the Office of Building and Safety.</p>	<p>Seismic assessments and design would be required for new towers and structures, although none are planned for San Bernardino County.</p>	NO
<p>Policy GE-7: Because of the potential for displacement along faults not classified as active, the County shall reserve the right to require site-specific geotechnical analysis and mitigation for development located contiguous to potentially active faults, if deemed necessary by the County Geologist.</p>	<p>SCE would confirm with the County Geologist regarding potentially active faults near proposed facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>Policy GE-9: Because many structures with important functions and potentially severe consequences of failure do not fall under County control (i.e., dams, utility installations, transportation structures) the County shall:</p> <p>a. Continue to work with public utilities supplying critical public services to ensure that they have incorporated structural safety and other measures to be adequately protected from seismic hazards for both existing and proposed facilities.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project facilities would be designed to current seismic standards, and therefore would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<p>Policy GE-10: Because the ground in close proximity to a fault is subject to rupture during earthquake, exposing occupants and structures to high levels of risk, those areas identified by the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act (Public Resources Code, Division 2, Chapter 7.5) shall be designated on the Hazard Overlay Maps and the following standards and procedures shall apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The definitions, provisions and mapping of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act.</li> <li>c. Maintain a minimum of a 50' setback from an identified fault for all new structures. For an inferred fault area, a 150' setback shall be maintained. However, critical, essential or high occupancy structures and facilities shall not be located in Special Studies Zones unless there is no feasible alternative, as determined by staff review, in which case these facilities shall maintain a 150' setback from an identified fault (200' if the fault is inferred).</li> <li>f. Plan transportation facilities (i.e., roads, freeways, rail, rapid transit) and utility systems to cross active fault traces a minimum number of times and to be designed to accommodate fault displacement without major damage that would cause long-term and unacceptable disruption of service. Utility lines shall be equipped with such mechanisms as flexible units, valving, redundant lines or auto valves to shut off flows in the event of fault rupture.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and Mitigation Measure G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.</p>	NO
<p>Policy GE-11: Because the purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act is applicable only to fault rupture areas (in close proximity to faults) and because the entire San Bernardino–Chino Valley area is subject to severe hazard from the effects of shaking due to an earthquake, the County shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Require special studies, including dynamic analysis for all major structures (critical, essential and high occupancy land uses) within areas determined by the County Geologist to be subject to significant seismic shaking.</li> <li>b. Design and construct all structures in areas determined by the County Geologist to be subject to significant seismic shaking to withstand groundshaking forces of a minor earthquake without damage, of a moderate earthquake without structural damage, and of a major earthquake without collapse. Critical, essential, and high occupancy structures shall be designed and constructed to remain standing and functional following a major earthquake and shall be so engineered as to withstand maximum probable ground motion accelerations.</li> <li>c. Require all new construction to meet the most current and applicable lateral force requirements, except that no residual repository may be located in areas of rapid geological change.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and Mitigation Measure G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.</p>	NO
<p>GE-12: Because liquefaction can cause devastating structural damage and because there is a high potential for saturation when the groundwater level is within the upper 50 feet of alluvial material, the County shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Require that each site located within the Liquefaction Hazard Overlay, shall be evaluated by a licensed geologist prior to design.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project within San Bernardino County is outside liquefaction hazard areas. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO

**San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Landslides/Mudslides Natural Hazards, Page II-A4-2</b>		
<p>Policy WE-3: Because erosion control is an important concern of the property owner and because many widely spread areas in the County are highly susceptible to erosion, the County shall:</p> <p>a. Apply the provisions of the Revised Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance Countywide.</p> <p>b. Tailor grading, land clearance, and grazing to prevent unnatural erosion in erosion susceptible areas.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measure, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.</p>	NO
<b>Landslides/Mudslides Natural Hazards, Page II-A1-12</b>		
<p>Policy GE-15: Because large portions of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains and the Chino Hills have high landslide potential posing substantial risk to life and property, and because once landslides are recognized, many can be safely mitigated, the County shall:</p> <p>a. Require that a stability analysis be required in Landslide Hazard areas designated "Generally Susceptible" and "Mostly Susceptible" on the Hazards Overlay Maps and where required by the County Geologist.</p> <p>b. Require site development and construction in compliance with soil and geologic investigation report recommendations.</p>	<p>Landslide potential exists in hillside areas of San Timoteo Hills. San Bernardino County does not identify this area as landslide hazard.</p>	NO
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Section II, Planning Issues, D. Man-Made Resources, 4. Energy/Telecommunications, Policies/Actions, Page II-D4-4 to II-D4-5</b>		
<p>ET-3: Because the efficient production, distribution and routing of energy and telecommunications will maximize resources, the County shall:</p> <p>b. Consolidate pipeline and transmission line corridors by requiring proposed new facilities to locate in existing corridors to the maximum extent feasible. When new transmission facilities cannot be located within existing corridors, assist in investigating the feasibility of establishing corridors parallel to interstate freeways.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>ET-6: Because the use of new and innovative resources, technologies and design features in energy and telecommunications facilities can assist in maximizing resources and minimizing impacts, the County shall:</p> <p>b. Require undergrounding of new and existing transmission lines when feasible.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would use the existing aboveground utility corridors in the areas of unincorporated San Bernardino County that would be traversed.</p>	NO
<p>e. Resist any proposed powerline routes for major steel tower electrical transmission lines along existing wooden pole lines.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would involve reconductoring most of the existing lattice steel tower lines, such that this policy would not apply to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO
<p>ET 7: Because land uses adjacent to utility corridors must be compatible, the County shall approve only those secondary uses within corridors that are compatible with adjacent land uses.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor; therefore, incompatible land uses would not be introduced. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>Economic Development Element</b>		
<p>Economic Development Element Policy D-41: Implement strategies aimed at developing a balance between housing and employment opportunities for all residents.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project could have the potential to impact local housing markets along the route as a result of construction personnel locating to the area during the construction period. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.</p>	YES

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2002

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
Economic Development Element Policy D-42: Develop sufficient infrastructure and services to accommodate existing and planned residential development.	The new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities are intended to provide adequate electrical distribution to meet existing and future demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project itself would be an infrastructure Proposed Project designed to accommodate existing and planned residential development within San Bernardino County. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for cultural and paleontological resources; transportation and traffic; and hydrology and water resources.

### 3.5 City of Banning, California

**City of Banning Draft General Plan, 2005.** The City of Banning is a growing residential community in west-central Riverside County. It is located in the San Gorgonio Pass area and is well served by major transportation routes. The Interstate 10 corridor includes a significant portion of the city’s developed acreage, with vacant lands and lower density development generally located towards the northern and southern portions of the city. The city's corporate limits cover about 23.2 square miles. Its sphere of influence, county-managed lands over which the city has an advisory role, includes 8.5 square miles in non-contiguous lands located both north and south of Interstate 10. An additional 5.2 square miles have been considered in this General Plan, and are identified as the City Planning Area. The total study area includes approximately 36.9 square miles. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line within the City of Banning General Plan Area.

City of Banning Draft General Plan, 2005

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Environmental Resources, Open Space and Conservation Element, Page IV-26</b>		
Policy 3: Ridgelines shall be preserved as open space	A majority of the Proposed Project would occur in an existing utility corridor such that ridgelines may not be affected.	NO
Policy 4: The City shall preserve all watercourses and washes necessary for regional flood control, ground water recharge areas and drainage for open space and recreational purposes.	This policy establishes that the City preserves all watercourses and washes for regional flood control, open space, and recreational purposes. This policy does not relate to the Proposed Project such that no further evaluation will occur.	NO
Policy 5: The City shall preserve permanent open space edges or greenbelts that define the physical limits of the City and provide physical separation between adjoining neighborhoods.	The Proposed Project would be located on existing utility corridors where open space ridges or greenbelts may not be affected. This policy will not be addressed in the document.	NO
<b>Biological Resources Element, Page IV-53</b>		
Program 1.C: The City staff shall continue to request biological resource surveys for new development in compliance with applicable State and federal requirements.	The Proposed Project includes surveys of biological resources, and therefore would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**City of Banning Draft General Plan, 2005**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Policy 2: As part of the development review process, the City shall evaluate projects based on their impact on existing habitat and wildlife, and for the land's value as viable open space.	The Proposed Project will be evaluated with regard to its impacts on biological resources, including habitat and wildlife. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 4. Drainage channels, utility corridors and pipeline easements shall be preserved in natural open space to the extent possible.	A majority of the Proposed Project would occur in existing utility corridor ROWs, which would preserve open space. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

Policy 3: The City of Banning shall protect the peaks and ridgelines within the City, and encourage coordination with adjacent jurisdictions to protect the peaks and ridgelines within the City's area of influence, to protect the historic visual quality of the hillside areas and natural features of the Pass area.	This policy describes the City's desire to protect scenic attributes as part of the City's project review process but does not specify criteria that projects must meet or actions that projects must consider or undertake to protect visual resources and/or minimize visual impacts.	NO
---	---	----

**Public Services and Facilities, Water, Wastewater and Utilities Element, Pages VI-7 through VI-8**

Policy 10: Major utility facilities, including power and other transmission towers, cellular communication towers and other viewshed intrusions shall be designated and sited to ensure minimal environmental and viewshed impacts and environmental hazards.	The proposed infrastructure upgrades would occur in existing utility corridor ROWs.	NO
---	---	----

**WILDERNESS AND RECREATION**

**Open Space and Conservation Element, Chapter IV: Environmental Resources, Page IV-26**

Policy 6: Where practical, new development shall integrate pipeline, above- and under-ground utility corridors and other easements (including electric, cable and telephone distribution lines) into a functional open space network.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
---	---	----

**CULTURAL & PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Cultural Resources**

<p>Policy 1: The City shall exercise its responsibility to identify, document and evaluate archaeological, historical and cultural resources that may be affected by proposed development projects and other activities.</p> <p>Program 1.A: All new development proposals, except single family dwelling on existing lots of record, shall submit a records search for historic and cultural resources as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Program 1.B: Development or land use proposals which have the potential to disturb or destroy sensitive cultural resources shall be evaluated by a qualified professional and, if necessary, comprehensive Phase I studies and appropriate mitigation measures shall be incorporated into project approvals.</p>	The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy because an evaluation of cultural resources has been conducted as part of the EIR/EIS Proposed Project evaluation. The cultural resources evaluation is documented in this report.	NO
--	--	----

**NOISE**

**Noise Element**

Policy 1: The City shall protect noise-sensitive land uses, including residential neighborhoods, schools, hospitals, libraries, churches, resorts and community open space, from potentially significant sources of community noise.	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
--	---	-----

**City of Banning Draft General Plan, 2005**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
Policy 6: The City shall maintain peak hour Level of Service C or better on all local intersections, except those on Ramsey Street and at I-10 interchanges, where Level of Service D or better shall be maintained.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 8: The City shall limit truck routes in the City to Ramsey Street, Lincoln Street, Highland Springs, Sunset (between Ramsey and Lincoln), 8th Street (between Ramsey and Lincoln), Hargrave (between Ramsey and Lincoln) and Hathaway.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. The Proposed Project would utilize designated truck routes and limit use of residential roadways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO
<b>Public Services and Facilities, Water, Wastewater and Utilities Element, Pages VI-7 through VI-8</b>		
Policy 9: Utility lines on scenic roadways and major streets shall have primary consideration for undergrounding.	No designated scenic roadways exist near the proposed aboveground utility corridor upgrades.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Hazardous and Toxic Materials</b>		
Policy 3: The City shall thoroughly evaluate development proposals for lands directly adjacent to sites known to be contaminated with hazardous or toxic materials, traversed by natural gas transmission lines or fuel lines, or sites that use potentially hazardous or toxic materials.	Tower locations are within the existing right-of-way crossed by a 30" diameter gas pipeline; tower location(s) proximate to gas line should be verified prior to construction. Fuel and petroleum pipelines are south of I-10. Adjacent contaminated sites are unlikely in the rural/undeveloped area.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Water Resources loading</b>		
Policy 6: All new development shall be required to incorporate adequate flood mitigation measures, such as grading that prevents adverse drainage impacts to adjacent properties, onsite retention of runoff, and the adequate siting of structures located within flood plains.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Geologic Hazards</b>		
Policy 2: In accordance with State law, all development proposals within designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones shall be accompanied by appropriate geotechnical analysis.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and Mitigation Measure G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.	NO
Policy 3: Development in areas identified as being susceptible to slope instability shall be avoided unless adequately engineered to eliminate geotechnical hazards.	The Proposed Project would be located in low to no Slope Instability areas.	NO
Policy 5: The City shall coordinate and cooperate with public and quasi-public agencies to assure the continued functionality of major utility systems in the event of a major earthquake.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and Mitigation Measure G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.	NO

City of Banning Draft General Plan, 2005

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Economic Development Element</b>		
Economic Development Element Policy 3: Encourage and promote infill development in orderly and logical development patterns that decrease the costs, and increase the efficiency of new utilities, infrastructure, and public services.	The new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities are intended to provide adequate electrical distribution to meet existing and future demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project itself would be an infrastructure project designed to accommodate existing and planned development within the City of Banning. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO
Economic Development Element Policy 8: In order to maintain existing economic activities and attract new commercial and industrial development, the City shall assure the provision of adequate utilities, infrastructure, and other capital facilities.	The new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities are intended to provide adequate electrical distribution to meet existing and future demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project itself would be an infrastructure project designed to accommodate existing and planned development within the City of Banning. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO
<b>Housing Element</b>		
Housing Element Policy 3: Minimize the displacement impacts occurring as a result of residential demolition.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact residential areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Housing Element Policy 5: Accommodate new residential development, which is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and public services.	The new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities are intended to provide adequate electrical distribution to meet existing and future demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project itself would be an infrastructure project designed to accommodate existing and planned development within the City of Banning. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for land use; agriculture, and transportation and traffic.

### 3.6 City of Beaumont, California

**City of Beaumont General Plan, November 2000.** The City of Beaumont is located in the north-central part of Riverside County at San Gorgonio Pass between the areas influenced by the coast to the west and the Coachella Valley to the east. One of the key objectives of the City’s General Plan is to accommodate the substantial growth that is currently occurring and will continue to occur in the city. The plan includes seven elements including: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Natural Resources, Public Safety, Noise and Public Services and Facilities. The Public Services and Facilities Element identifies goals and policies directly related to the development of utility corridors. In addition to those policies, construction and operation of the Proposed Project was evaluated for consistency with other General Plan Element policies. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line within the City of Beaumont General Plan Area.

**City of Beaumont General Plan, November 2000**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Resource Management Element, Biological Resources, Page 4-4</b>		
Policy 13: The City of Beaumont will encourage the protection of existing wildlife in the conservation areas located in the southerly portion of the Planning Area.	This policy encourages the protection of existing wildlife in conservation areas located in the southerly portion of the Planning Area. Because the Proposed Project would cross the northern portion of the Planning Area, this policy will not be evaluated any further.	NO
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>Chapter 2: Community Development Element, Phased Development Policies, Page 2-3</b>		
Policy 18: The City of Beaumont will continue to oversee the development of adequate and dependable public services and facilities to support both existing and future development.	The Proposed Project would serve to provide additional electricity to the Inland Empire. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>Chapter 4: Resource Management Element, Park and Recreation Policies, Page 4-5</b>		
Policy 18: The City of Beaumont will evaluate the feasibility of expanded joint-use of the open space lands used for flood control and utility easements.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Policy 20: The City of Beaumont shall negotiate agreements with the utility companies, the Flood Control District for the establishment of recreation trails, linkages, uses, and appropriate landscaping within their respective rights-of-way.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Community Development Element , Residential Development Policies, Page 2-3</b>		
Policy 10: The City of Beaumont encourages and supports the keeping of farms and equine animals in suitable locations and upon parcels which are a minimum of one acre in size, with a maximum of two large animals per acre, and shall establish appropriate zoning provisions to accommodate animal keeping.	The Proposed Project would not include the development or operation of agricultural lands. Therefore this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>Resource Management Element, Soil Resources and Agriculture, Page 4-2</b>		
Policy 2: The City of Beaumont will support the maintenance of existing agricultural resources in the City to the extent feasible.	The Proposed Project would not preclude the maintenance of existing agricultural resources. Therefore Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources Policy Matrix, Pages 6.14 and 6.16 and General Plan Pages 6-2 and 6-3</b>		
Policy 15: The City of Beaumont will identify and preserve those sites/buildings that are important to the community for the benefit of the future generations that will reside or work in the City.	This policy is not applicable to the Proposed Project because no historic structures are present within the APE.	NO

City of Beaumont General Plan, November 2000

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
Cultural Resource Management. Should archaeological or paleontological resources be encountered during excavation and grading activities, all work would cease until appropriate salvage measures are established. Appendix K of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines shall be followed for excavation monitoring and salvage work that may be necessary. Salvage and preservation efforts will be undertaken pursuant to Appendix K requirements outlined in CEQA.	The requirements of this policy would be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
Environmental Review. The City shall continue to evaluate the environmental impacts of new development and provide mitigation measures prior to development approval, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Environmental review shall be provided for major projects, as well as those that will have the potential to adversely impact the environment. Land use and development are among the issue areas that will be addressed in the environmental analysis. In compliance with CEQA, the City shall also assign responsibilities for the verification of the implementation of mitigation measures that may be recommended as part of the environmental review process.	Portions of this policy are programmatic and are the responsibility of the agency. Portions of this policy would be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
Historic Building Code. The City will investigate the feasibility of adopting alternate building code standards for historic structures, as authorized by the State Historical Building Code. The initial step will require City staff to amend the development code to include provisions for the maintenance, rehabilitation, and preservation of historic structures. Potential candidates include those historic resources described herein.	This policy is not applicable to the Proposed Project because no historic structures are present within the APE.	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Safety Element</b>		
Safety Element Policy 24: The City of Beaumont will protect public health and welfare by eliminating existing noise problems and by preventing significant degradation of the future acoustic environment.	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source that could degrade the acoustic environment. This policy will be further evaluated in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Safety Element Policy 27: The City of Beaumont shall promote the effective enforcement of City, State and federal noise standards by all appropriate City divisions.	The Proposed Project would not affect the ability of the City of Beaumont to effectively enforce noise standards. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Resource Management Element</b>		
Resource Management Element Policy 9: The City of Beaumont will require feasible fugitive dust reduction techniques to be utilized during construction activities such as regularly watering down construction area.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APMs and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Resource Management Element, Water Resources, Policies Concerning Water Quality, Page 4-2</b>		
Resource Management Element Policy 6: The City of Beaumont will strive to promote development practices that will mitigate potential flooding.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO

City of Beaumont General Plan, November 2000

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Safety Element, Flood Control/Flooding, Page 5-4</b>		
Safety Element Policy 10: The City of Beaumont will require all new developments to mitigate potential flooding that may result from the development.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic Safety</b>		
Safety Element Policy 4: The City of Beaumont will require special soils and structural investigations for all proposed structures of large scale or involving large groups of people.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for conducting soil and structural investigations.	NO
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Community Development Element</b>		
Community Development Element Policy 7: The City of Beaumont will continue to maintain and conserve its existing residential neighborhoods.	The Proposed Project would have the potential to intrude or impact residential areas along the Proposed Project route. Therefore, compliance with this policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Community Development Element Policy 8: The City of Beaumont will continue to examine future opportunities for new residential development.	The Proposed Project would construct new and upgraded transmission line and substation facilities. The Proposed Project would not introduce any new residential development or impede the opportunities for new residential development within the City of Beaumont. All project activities would occur within an already existing SCE right-of-way. Therefore, the Proposed Project would comply with this policy.	NO

Note: No policies were identified for visual resources; public health and safety; and transportation and traffic.

### 3.7 City of Blythe, California

**City of Blythe General Plan, September 1989.** The City of Blythe comprises approximately 3.5 square miles of incorporated area, a limited portion of which is in agriculture. The city’s sphere of influence surrounds the incorporated city limits and comprises approximately 13 square miles. The General Plan Study Area extends from the Colorado River to the east, to and including the Blythe Airport to the west, and covers approximately 63 square miles within Riverside County. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, a new fiber optic repeater, and three alternative substation sites within the City of Blythe General Plan area.

In addition to the State required General Plan elements, the City of Blythe General Plan includes one optional element: Economic Development. While the General Plan does not include specific goals for the development of utility corridors, the following policies are applicable to the Proposed Project.

**City of Blythe Comprehensive General Plan, September 1989**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use Element, Open Space, Page III-23</b>		
Goal 1: To conserve, protect and manage open space areas in order to assure continued availability of environmental resources, guard against environmental hazards, provide enhanced recreational opportunities, and create and aesthetic character for the City.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the City. Because the City's policies require the conservation, protection, and management of these areas, the Proposed Project includes measures that would reduce any potential impacts.	NO
Goal 2: To preserve the aesthetic, recreational and biological resource value of the Colorado River and desert resources areas, recognizing these areas as vital long-term open space resources for the City.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the City and the Colorado River. Because the City's goal is to preserve these areas, this goal will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Open Space, Page III-24</b>		
Policy 3: Areas with particularly sensitive or important biological habitat and resources shall be protected from disturbance and development. Such areas shall be promoted by the City for protection and funding by State and federal agencies.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the City, which may contain sensitive or important biological habitat. The Proposed Project would include measures to reduce impacts to these resources.	NO
Policy 4: The City shall consult and coordinate with appropriate State and federal agencies to assure the maintenance of proper Colorado River water levels, to protect the biological and recreational resources of the river.	The Proposed Project would not affect water levels of the Colorado River, and therefore would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Policy 5: Promote the wise and conscientious use of river backwater. Sloughs and other riparian habitat areas which will enhance the water fowl habitat and sport hunting potential.	Riparian habitat areas and sloughs may be affected by the Proposed Project. As such, potential impacts to these resources will be discussed further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Chapter IV: Environmental Resources, Biological Resources Element, Biological Resources Goal No. 1, Pages IV-7 and IV-8</b>		
Policy 2. The City shall require or insist that responsible County, State and federal agencies assure the provision of ample natural and enhanced open-space setbacks from the Colorado River's edge in conjunction with any development near or adjacent to the river's edge.	As part of the EIR/EIS process, potential affects to the Colorado River will be evaluated, and measures will be identified to reduce potential impacts.	NO
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Page IV-23 and IV-24</b>		
Goal 5. Preservation of riparian and ruderal habitats as important breeding and foraging habitat for native and migratory birds and animals.	Portions of the Proposed Project may cross riparian and ruderal habitat areas; however, as part of the Proposed Project, SCE would implement APMs B-7 and B-21, which would require the avoidance of wetland and riparian areas, and other measures that would reduce potential impacts to these areas.	NO
Policy 1. The City shall actively coordinate and participate in the protection of the Colorado River and other water bodies and their shores to assure the maintenance and enhancement of these vital open space resource areas.	The EIR/EIS will identify and present mitigation measures for any potential impacts to biological resources.	NO
Policy 2. The City shall actively coordinate and participate in the protection and preservation of fish and wildlife and their habitat, including those rare and endangered species and those of economic importance.	The EIR/EIS will identify and present mitigation measures for any potential impacts to fish and wildlife and their habitat.	NO

**City of Blythe Comprehensive General Plan, September 1989**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Policy 3. The City shall restrict or prohibit, and shall encourage other jurisdictions to restrict or prohibit, development in areas of sensitive biological or scenic value.	The EIR/EIS will identify and present mitigation measures for any potential impacts to biological resources.	NO
Policy 15. The Goodman Slough open space area shall be recognized as a "Biological Reserve" and an overall planning effort for its restoration and enhancement and use shall be initiated to assure its long-term preservation.	The Proposed Project would not traverse the Goodman Slough. Therefore the Proposed Project would not conflict this policy.	NO
Policy 16. Maintain and enhance the scenic, biologic and recreation resources of the Colorado River through coordinated regulation of discharge levels, land use, and access along the river.	The Colorado River would be spanned as part of the Proposed Project. In addition, the EIR/EIS will identify and present mitigation measures for any potential impacts to the Colorado River.	NO

**LAND USE**

**Land Use Element, Chapter III: Community Development, Page III-6 & III-19**

General Policy 5. The appropriateness and compatibility of a proposed land use shall be determined in light of existing and approved land uses in the surrounding area, and shall include consideration of the intensity of the use, potential hazards, nuisances, aesthetic issues, and design.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor, but new towers will be added, upgraded, or improved. However, the Proposed Project would be constructed south of the City of Blythe and as such would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Industrial Policy 6. Development proposed in each industrial land use category shall substantially comply with the types and intensities of uses as set forth for each land use designation.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor south of the City of Blythe. As such, the Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**WILDERNESS AND RECREATION**

**Chapter III: Recreation Element, Draft Trail Policies, Page III-91**

Policy 5: Institute joint agreements and encroachment permits, where possible, with the public and private sectors (e.g., utility companies, Palo Verde Irrigation District, development companies and homeowners associations) that control easements and unused rights-of-way for the purpose of incorporating such lands into permanent trail linkages throughout the City and its sphere of influence.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
--	---	----

**AGRICULTURE**

**Agricultural Reserve, Page III-26**

1. The City shall protect agricultural lands from premature development by assuring the logical and coherent expansion of urban development in the City.	This policy is the responsibility of the City of Blythe. In addition, the Proposed Project would not enter the City Blythe.	NO
2. The City shall encourage the continuation of agricultural activity on undeveloped land as a method of assuring their ongoing use and function as rural open space areas.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not preclude the continuation of agricultural activity; therefore it would not conflict with this policy. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO
3. Every effort shall be made to properly integrate and accommodate agricultural infrastructure including irrigation and drainage canals and agricultural buildings.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not include the development or operation of agricultural infrastructure, and construction of this alternative would implement APM L-4, which would site towers so that sensitive features, including canals and agricultural buildings, would be spanned. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO

**City of Blythe Comprehensive General Plan, September 1989**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
4. To assure the financial viability of cultivation on agricultural lands, the City shall encourage the use of Williamson Act contracts and other forms of property tax relief.	This policy is the responsibility of the City of Blythe. In addition, the Proposed Project and alternatives do not include the development or operation of agricultural land, and therefore this policy is not relevant. Also the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO
5. Preservation of agricultural lands and prime soils in non-urban areas shall be fostered in order to retain the viability of the groundwater aquifer which serves the City.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not preclude the preservation of agricultural lands or prime soils. The amount of agricultural land removed for purposes of the alternative would be minor and would still allow existing agricultural operations to continue. The Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe. Therefore this alternative would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>Economic Development, Page III-118</b>		
1. Maintain the important role of Agriculture and agri-business to the local economy and assure the orderly and logical extension of urbanization into agricultural areas.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not diminish the role of agriculture or agri-business, therefore this policy is not relevant. In addition, the Proposed Project would not enter the City of Blythe.	NO
<b>Biological Resources, Page IV-7</b>		
3. Land use planning for agricultural lands shall be so designated so as to assure the maintenance of large blocks of cultivated lands, avoiding fragmented agricultural zones and thereby assuring a more productive and contiguous foraging habitat for water birds and other wildlife.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not fragment agricultural lands, and would still allow farming operations to continue. SCE would implement APMs L-4, L-5, and L-6 within the Palo Verde Valley, which would minimize any impacts to agricultural operations. These APMs would require H-frame structures with smaller footprints to be utilized, towers sites to be selected in order to span sensitive features, and towers to be aligned adjacent or parallel to field boundaries.	NO
<b>Open Space &amp; Conservation, Page IV-24</b>		
5. The City shall work closely with the Palo Verde Irrigation District and appropriate State agencies to ensure the protection and preservation of agricultural lands and shall establish compatible land uses and parcel sizes.	This policy is the responsibility of the City of Blythe; therefore it is not relevant to the Proposed Project or alternatives. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO
19. Establish land use designations and policies which discourage premature development of important agricultural lands and preserve same as important open space resources.	This policy is the responsibility of the City of Blythe; therefore it is not relevant to the Proposed Project or alternatives. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO
<b>Agricultural Resources, Page IV-29</b>		
1. Develop and implement a Land Use Plan which provides an orderly and coherent expansion of urban development and services while protecting agricultural lands from premature development.	The development of a Land Use Plan is the responsibility of the City of Blythe. However, the operation of the Proposed Project or alternatives would be approved after its consideration with respect to the City of Blythe's Land Use Plan. Therefore the Proposed Project or alternatives would be consistent with the Plan. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO

**City of Blythe Comprehensive General Plan, September 1989**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
2. Recognize the agricultural sector as an essential part of the local economy and encourage continuation of farming activities on vacant lands as a method of assuring their on-going use and function as rural open space areas.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not preclude the continuation of farming activities on vacant lands, and therefore it would be consistent with this policy. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO
3. The City shall make every effort to protect and preserve important Agriculture infrastructure including irrigation and drainage canals, crop dusting facilities, packing sheds, processing and materials handling facilities.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not preclude the protection and preservation of agriculture infrastructure; and construction of this alternative would implement APM L-4, which would site towers so that sensitive features, including canals and agricultural buildings, would be spanned. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO
4. The City shall encourage the use of Williamson Act contracts and other forms of property tax relief to help assure the continued financial viability of cultivation of agricultural lands.	This policy is the responsibility of the City of Blythe, and therefore is not relevant to the Proposed Project or alternatives. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO
5. The City shall recognize the importance and relationship between continued agricultural activity and the long-term viability of the groundwater aquifer which services the City.	The Proposed Project or alternatives would not preclude continued agricultural activity, nor would it impact the groundwater aquifer that services the City of Blythe. Therefore this policy is not relevant. In addition, the Proposed Project would be located south of the City of Blythe.	NO

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Cultural Resources Element, Page IV-8 through IV-11**

Identify, protect and preserve, where possible, the historical resources of the city	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
Require the preservation of identified cultural resources to the extent possible, prior to new development, through dedication, removal, use, transfer, reuse, or other means.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
The City shall require qualified archaeologists or paleontologists to be present during the excavation of sites which have a high potential for archaeological or paleontological resources. (City of Calimesa General Plan, Resource Management Element, p. 4-25, Section 11, paragraph 3, line 1)	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO

**TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

**Circulation Element**

Policy 10: Through traffic shall be concentrated on arterial and collector roadways, thereby providing safer and quieter traffic impacts within residential neighborhoods.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. In addition, the Proposed Project would utilize designated truck routes and limit use of residential roadways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO
--	--	----

**City of Blythe Comprehensive General Plan, September 1989**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Policy 11: Provide and maintain roadway intersection operations at Level of Service (LOS) D or better at peak traffic volumes for all segments of the City's circulation system.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 16: The City shall allow the interim use of Lovekin Boulevard as a truck route until such time as alternative truck routes are developed which will relieve Lovekin Boulevard and provide adequate service for truck traffic.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. The Proposed Project would utilize designated truck routes and limit use of residential roadways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO

**PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY**

**Hazardous and Toxic Materials Policies, Page V-18.**

1. Inventory all sites for the production, use, storage, and disposal of any hazardous materials, as well as roads and rail lines likely to be used for their transport.	Very limited use and storage of hazardous materials planned for construction or operation.	NO
3. Assure adequate environmental review of facilities for the manufacture, storage, use or disposal of hazardous and toxic materials in the City or the region.	Proposed substations are outside of Blythe limits and will store/use very minor quantities of hazardous materials. The City of Blythe will review and comment on the EIR.	NO
9. The City shall take a pro-active role in the regulation of hazardous materials management, transport, and disposal, ensuring that the City has a voice in issues affecting the region.	City of Blythe will review and comment on the EIR.	NO

**AIR QUALITY**

**Air Quality Element**

Air Quality Element Policy 2: The City shall require that all development proposals be reviewed for potential adverse effects on air quality and will require the mitigation of any potentially significant impacts.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APM and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
--	--	----

**GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS**

**Mineral Resources**

Mineral Resources Goal: Control the extraction of mineral resources in order to protect and preserve aesthetic and natural resources, assure the minimal disturbance of the environment, and to preserve important resources for timely future extraction.	No mineral resources are planned for the Proposed Project, and it would not restrict future extraction of mineral resources.	NO
--	--	----

**Seismic Safety, Page V-4**

Seismic Safety Goal: To assess seismic and geotechnical conditions that pose significant hazards to life or property, and to identify significant development constraints to assure the protection of the public health and welfare. Require site-specific geotechnical assessments, mitigation of shaking hazard for critical structures (hospitals, emergency medical facilities), liquefaction, and water table drawdown and land subsidence.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO
--	---	----

**City of Blythe Comprehensive General Plan, September 1989**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Slopes and Erosion, Page V-6</b>		
Slopes and Erosion Goal: To ensure the protection of the public health, safety and welfare from conditions of steep and unstable slopes and areas subject to wind or water erosion which pose significant hazards to life or property. Specific concern about the banks of the Colorado River, development along the toe or slopes of the Palo Verde Mesa, slopes steeper than 15 percent, and areas subject to erosion.	The Proposed Project would avoid the banks of the River, the toe of the mesa and other steep slopes. The Proposed Project would not be located in areas subject to unusual water erosion.	NO
<b>Erosion, Page V-7</b>		
Wind Erosion and Blow Sand Goal: Assure the minimal impact of wind erosion and blowing sand. All development plans shall include an erosion and fugitive dust control plan, shall include stabilization control measures to reduce or eliminate blowing dust and sand, including site watering and other soil stabilization techniques to minimize hazard/impact associated with site grading.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Housing Element</b>		
Housing Element Program 1-c: In the event that any low income housing is eliminated for any reason, require the owner of the land to relocate those residents affected.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact residential areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Housing Element Policy 2: Ensure that sufficient residential lands are available to satisfy the future needs of the City.	The Proposed Project would construct new and upgraded transmission line and substation facilities. The Proposed Project would not introduce any new residential development or impede the opportunities for new residential development within the City of Blythe. All Proposed Project activities would occur within an already existing SCE right-of-way. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy.	NO
Housing Element Policy 4: Preserve existing numbers of mobile homes and consider proposals for additional well designed parks at affordable rates.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact residential areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Housing Element Program 4-b: If a mobile home park is converted or destroyed, the owner of the land will be required to relocate residents to comparable accommodations, in accordance with applicable State law.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact residential areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Economic Development Element</b>		
Economic Development Element Policy 1: Maintain the important role of agriculture and agri-business to the local economy and assure the orderly and logical extension of urbanization into agricultural areas.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact agricultural areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES

Note: No policies were identified for visual resources, and noise.

### 3.8 City of Calimesa, California

**City of Calimesa General Plan, April 1994.** The City of Calimesa is located within the eastern portion of Southern California’s inland valley, within the Yucaipa Valley of the San Gorgonio Pass area. The San Bernardino Mountains and the Crafton Hills surround Calimesa to the north and west. The San Jacinto Mountains and the San Timoteo Badlands border the city to the east and south, respectively. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line within the City of Calimesa General Plan Area.

With the exception of the overall General Plan goals described in the State of California Government Code (as described above), the City of Calimesa General Plan does not include specific goals identified for the City. While the General Plan does not include specific goals for the development of utility corridors, the following General Plan policies are applicable to the Proposed Project:

City of Calimesa General Plan, April 1994		
Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Part II, Section 1 Land Use Element, Goals and Policies, Rural Atmosphere and Quality of Life, Page 1</b>		
1.1: Preserve the natural character and visual quality of the hillsides through sensitive site design and grading.	This policy will be evaluated further for the proposed utility corridor upgrades.	YES
<b>Part II, Section 4 Resource Management Element, Biological Resources, Pages 4-5 and 4-6</b>		
Goal 3: Conserve and protect significant standards of mature trees, native vegetation, and wildlife habitat within the planning area.	The Proposed Project has the potential to remove native plant communities and wildlife habitat as a result of construction activities such that this policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
3.1: Conserve and protect important plant communities and wildlife habitats, such as riparian areas, wetlands, oak woodlands and other significant tree stands, and rare or endangered plant/animal species by using buffers, creative site planning, revegetation and open space easements/dedications.	The Proposed Project has the potential to remove native plant communities and wildlife habitat as a result of construction activities such that this policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
3.2: Encourage the planting of native species of trees and other drought-tolerant vegetation.	Planting native species of trees and other drought-tolerant vegetation with the implementation of the proposed utility corridor upgrades will be analyzed in more detail in the EIR/EIS.	YES
3.3: In areas that may contain important plant and animal communities, require developments to prepare biological assessments identifying species types and locations and develop measures to preserve sensitive species to the maximum extent possible.	The EIR/EIS will identify the species types and location of important plant and animal communities. This policy will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
3.4: Allow new development to remove only the minimum natural vegetation and require the revegetation of graded areas with native plant species.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would not remove significant amounts of natural vegetation. The affects of the Proposed Project will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
3.5: Work with State, federal, and local agencies in the preservation of sensitive vegetation and wildlife in the City.	The Proposed Project would include measures to reduce potential impacts to sensitive vegetation and wildlife.	NO
3.6: Protect and maintain sensitive biological habitats by eliminating urban development and restricting off-road vehicle use in these areas.	The Proposed Project would include measures to reduce potential impacts to sensitive biological habitats, and would limit off-road vehicle use.	NO

City of Calimesa General Plan, April 1994

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Part II, Section 4 Resource Management Element, Open Space Areas, Page 4</b>		
Goal 7: Seek and provide a network of open space areas to preserve natural resources and to provide visual and physical relief from urban development.	Although utility corridors also provide recreational opportunities and physical relief from urban environment, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
Seek dedication and contiguous open space lands in order to provide a network throughout the City.	This policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
Encourage open space and quasi-passive recreational uses for areas identified to have hazards relating to floods, earthquake faults, landslides, etc.	This policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**Land Use Element, Rural Atmosphere and Quality of Life, Page 1-5**

Policy 1.1: Preserve the natural character and visual quality of the hillsides through sensitive site design and grading.	The Proposed Project would include the construction of a new electric transmission line along several hillsides of the City of Calimesa.	YES
---	--	-----

**Land Use Element, Preservation of Natural Resources and Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Page 1-8**

Policy 5.4: Development shall be prohibited in areas containing sensitive biological resources and habitats, cultural resources, groundwater recharge areas, prominent ridgelines, unless adequate protection and/or preservation is provided.	The Proposed Project would include the construction of a new electric transmission line along several hillsides of the City of Calimesa.	YES
--	--	-----

**Resource Management Element, Geologic Resources, Page 14-5**

Policy 2.5: Protect the City's scenic and visual resources by limiting ridgeline development and building heights.	The Proposed Project would include the construction of a new electric transmission line along several hillsides of the City of Calimesa. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
--	--	-----

**LAND USE**

**Part II, Section 1 Land Use Element, Utilities, Page 1-11**

10.3: Actively encourage and support the undergrounding of existing overhead utilities.	The Proposed Project would be placed within an existing utility corridor that currently contains overhead transmission lines.	NO
---	---	----

**WILDERNESS AND RECREATION**

**Chapter 4: Resource Management Element, Resource Management Policies, Page 4-8**

Policy 8.6: As appropriate and in conjunction with fee owners, designate washes, channels, utility corridors and transportation rights-of-way as major linkages of the open space/recreation network.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
---	---	----

**AGRICULTURE**

**Agricultural Land, Page 4-7**

6.1: Ensure the compatibility of agricultural uses with adjacent urban areas by requiring development to setback adequate distances, provide buffers such as landscaping, earthen berms, or other physical barriers.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would be located within an existing utility corridor, and therefore buffers and setbacks would have been established when the corridor was developed. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
--	---	----

City of Calimesa General Plan, April 1994

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
6.2 Encourage the use of sound agricultural practices to minimize the disturbance of the natural environment while maximizing agricultural production capabilities.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include the development or operation of agricultural lands. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO

**CULTURAL & PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Cultural Resources**

Developments in areas which have not been subject to prior cultural resource surveys shall be required to perform surveys and submit their findings to the City. When resources are identified, appropriate testing, preservation, mitigation or salvage shall be carried out prior to grading or excavation activities. The City shall use these surveys to refine its cultural resource map. The map shall be used as a guide for requiring future surveys and studies as part of proposed development or redevelopment.	As part of the Proposed Project, SCE would implement APMs C-1 through C-3 that would require that cultural resource surveys and inventories to be completed prior to construction. In addition, APMs would C-4 through C-7 would provide for the preservation and/or mitigation of identified cultural resources. Mitigation Measure C-1a would also be implemented as part of the Proposed Project, and it would require that results of the cultural resources inventory be filed with appropriate local governments.	NO
[The City] shall require qualified archaeologists or paleontologists to be present during the excavation of sites which have a high potential for archaeological or paleontological resources. Removal of fossils, Indian [sic] remains, or archaeological artifacts shall be made in compliance with State regulations. The City shall consider prohibiting development when impacts to cultural resources cannot be mitigated. It shall set up a procedure by which uncovered archaeological and paleontological resources will be removed and transferred for preservation at a local educational and scientific facility for research or display. It shall promote cultural awareness through newsletter articles, landmark identification, educational programs, field trips, and cultural events.	Portions of this policy are programmatic and are the responsibility of the agency. The remainder of the requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO

**NOISE**

**Noise Element**

Goal 1: Ensure that all land uses are protected from excessive and unwanted noise. Policy 1.5: Provide buffer areas between noise sources and other developments. Policy 1.6: Provide measures to limit construction noise in residential areas.	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source and construction noise. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Goal 2: Work towards the reduction of noise impacts from vehicular traffic and trains. Policy 2.7: Regulate the use of residential streets by trucks, trailers, and construction vehicles, to the extent possible.	The Proposed Project would involve use of construction vehicles. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**

**Circulation Element**

Goal 4: Regulate the travel of trucks on City streets. Policy 4.1: Establish a truck route system which designates truck and commercial vehicle routes and provides adequately sized and designed roadways to meet the needs of trucks and commercial vehicles.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. The Proposed Project would utilize designated truck routes and limit use of residential roadways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO
--	---	----

**City of Calimesa General Plan, April 1994**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>		
Policy 5.1: Comply with the enforcement of disclosure laws that require all users, producers, and transporters of hazardous materials and wastes to clearly identify such materials at the site, and to notify the appropriate County, State, and/or federal agencies in the event of a violation.	The Proposed Project would not store or use significant quantities of hazardous materials during construction or during operation in the City of Calimesa.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
Policy 5.1: Require all feasible fugitive dust reduction techniques to be utilized during construction activities.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APMs and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
Policy 6.1: Support the use of low polluting construction materials and coatings.	The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with AQMD requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 6.2: Actively encourage the separation of sensitive receptors, such as schools and hospitals, from sources of toxic emissions.	The Proposed Project would not have substantial ongoing air pollution activities in this jurisdiction that could affect sensitive receptors, and the potential for sensitive receptor impacts for this area are addressed in the EIR/EIS.	NO
Policy 6.3: Actively encourage the separation of sensitive receptors from potential carbon monoxide hotspots.	The Proposed Project would not create CO hotspots.	NO
Policy 7.1: Require new local commercial and industrial establishments to demonstrate that South Coast Air Quality Management District permits have been obtained.	The Proposed Project is not likely to include the need for industrial stationary source permitting in this jurisdiction.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Water Resources/Flooding, Page 5-6</b>		
Policy 3.7: Ensure that development does not divert storm water runoff onto adjacent properties, or cause alterations of natural drainage courses that cannot be adequately handled by existing drainage facilities of the flood control improvements proposed with the development.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Geological Resources - Resource Management Element, Page 4-5</b>		
Policy 2.2: Require the practice of proper soil management techniques to reduce erosion, sedimentation and other soil-related problems.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO
Policy 2.3: Require erosion control measures such as binders, revegetation, slope covers, and other practices which reduce erosion due to wind and water.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO

**City of Calimesa General Plan, April 1994**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Policy 2.4: Discourage the grading of hillside areas through compliance with the City's Hillside Development Guidelines.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO
Policy 2.6: Areas with slopes of 45 percent or greater shall be considered not buildable.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential impacts related to slopes.	NO
<b>Seismic and Geologic Hazards - Safety Element, Page 5-4</b>		
Policy 1.2: Require geological and geotechnical investigations in areas of potential seismic or geologic hazards as part of the environmental and development review process. Require mitigation of seismic or geologic hazards to the satisfaction of the responsible agencies.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO
Policy 1.5: Require liquefaction assessments studies in areas identified as having moderate to high liquefaction susceptibility.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-3 and Mitigation Measure G-5a, which provide procedures for investigating the potential for liquefaction in suspect areas.	NO
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Part II, Section 1 Land Use Element, Public Services, Page 1</b>		
Policy 12.3: Provide and maintain existing infrastructure and enhance public service levels to meet the needs of Calimesa residents.	The Proposed Project would provide a new source of electricity, which would be consistent with this policy.	NO

### 3.9 City of Cathedral City, California

**City of Cathedral City Comprehensive General Plan, 2002.** The City of Cathedral City is located in the Coachella Valley, in eastern Riverside County. It is bordered on the west by the City of Palm Springs, and on the east by the City of Rancho Mirage. The city currently includes 19.5 square miles of land, extending from the Santa Rosa Mountains on the south, to Edom Hill on the north. The General Plan addresses not only the 12,502 acres located within the city limits, but also the 3,267 acres of the city's sphere of influence. These lands are located north of Interstate 10. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers within the Cathedral City General Plan area.

The General Plan includes two documents: This General Plan and the General Plan Environmental Impact Report. In addition to the State required General Plan elements, the Cathedral City General Plan includes three optional elements: Economic Development, Public Services and Facilities, and Cultural Resources. The Public Services and Facilities Element identifies goals and policies directly related to the development of utility corridors.

City of Cathedral City Comprehensive General Plan, 2002

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Chapter IV, Environmental Resources, Biological Resources Element, Goals, Policies and Programs, Page IV-20 – IV-22</b>		
Policy 2: As part of the development review process, projects shall be evaluated for the project's impacts on existing habitat and wildlife, and for the land's value as viable open space.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the City. Because the City's policies require the preservation and protection of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy 3: Encourage and cooperate with other agencies in establishing multiple use corridors that take advantage of drainage channels and utility easements as wildlife corridors, public access and links between open space areas and the built environment.	The Proposed Project would be located within an existing utility easement, which could potentially be used as a wildlife movement corridor or other uses as described in this policy.	NO
Policy 4: Assure that sensitive habitat and wildlife areas, as well as State and federal lands, are appropriately buffered from the built environment.	The Proposed Project is linear in nature and would cross open space as well as built areas. Buffer requirements will be analyzed as part of the environmental document.	YES
Policy 5: Promote the protection of biodiversity and proactively encourage an appreciation for the natural environment and biological resources.	This policy gives direction as to the protection of biological resources in the City. The Proposed Project would not preclude the protection of biodiversity, and the EIR/EIS identifies measures to reduce potential impacts to biological resources.	NO
<b>Chapter IV, Environmental Resources, Open Space and Conservation Element, Goals, Policies and Programs, Policies, Page IV-70 – IV-73</b>		
Policy 6: The City shall retain significant areas of natural desert, watercourse and hillside habitat, including migration corridors and wildlife preserves, in order to maintain and enhance the preservation of sensitive biological resources.	The Proposed Project would not significantly impact migration corridors and would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Policy 8: Where possible, new development shall integrate existing pipeline, utility corridors and other easements into a functional open space network.	The Proposed Project would be located within an existing utility corridor and would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Policy 9: Native landscaping materials and oasis-like design features shall be incorporated into parks, golf course and other appropriate open space lands to retain and preserve the natural desert environment.	The Proposed Project may require landscaping. This policy will be further analyzed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use Element: Industrial Goals, Policies, and Programs</b>		
Policy 3: Limit business park and industrial development to those uses which complement the overall economic development goals of the community by enhancing the type and value of new jobs for the community, while assuring that the City's high environmental quality standards are not compromised. Program 3.B: Business park and industrial development proposals shall be carefully reviewed in the course of conducting the CEQA Initial Study and through subsequent analysis, as necessary, to assure that the proposed land use(s) will not contribute to the degradation of the community's air, water or other environmental resources, including the City's aesthetic values.	This policy describes a portion of the City's project review process in order to protect aesthetic values but does not specify criteria that projects must meet or actions that projects must consider or undertake to protect visual resources and/or minimize visual impacts.	NO

City of Cathedral City Comprehensive General Plan, 2002

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Community Image and Urban Design Element</b>		
<p>Policy 1: Public and private sector development shall be subject to citywide design guidelines that include the Ahwahnee Principles and are intended to protect the community's scenic viewsheds, provide community cohesion, and enhance the image of Cathedral City as a residential community.</p> <p>Program 1.C: The City shall thoroughly review all development proposals to assure compliance with community design standards.</p>	<p>This policy describes a portion of the City's project review process in order to protect scenic viewsheds and community character but does not specify criteria that projects must meet or actions that projects must consider or undertake to protect visual resources and/or minimize visual impacts.</p>	NO
<p>Policy 5: Areas of special interest, including entry points, landmarks, and scenic highway viewsheds, shall receive appropriate treatment whether part of public or private development proposals.</p>	<p>Although the Proposed Project would be visible in the viewshed of I-10 (a County Eligible Scenic Highway) as it passes through Cathedral City, it would not visually impact any City-designated areas of special visual interest within the city limits.</p>	NO
<p>Policy 12: In an effort to preserve the value of the community's night sky, outdoor lighting shall be shielded downward and limited to the minimum height, number, and intensity of fixtures needed to provide sufficient security and identification on residential, commercial, and other development.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not require any lighted facilities within Cathedral City.</p>	NO
<b>Water, Sewer &amp; Utilities Element</b>		
<p>Policy 6: Major utility facilities, such as well sites and substations, shall be designed and sited to minimize environmental and visual impacts.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would not require the construction of substation or series capacitor facilities within Cathedral City.</p>	NO
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
<p>Policy 1: The City will ensure that sites in archaeologically and historically sensitive areas are surveyed prior to development.</p> <p>Program 1.A: Develop and maintain a database of archaeological and historic resources, incorporating information from the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California–Riverside, General Land Office Survey, site surveys conducted in the planning area, and other data sources.</p> <p>Program 1.B: City staff shall require, early in the project review process, the preparation of focused cultural resource surveys in areas of known sensitivity.</p> <p>Program 1.C: The City shall adopt specific standards for the identification, preservation and maintenance of archaeological and historic sites. These standards shall include professional qualifications for persons performing site-specific surveys.</p> <p>Program 1.D: As part of the development review process, the City shall transmit development applications to the Eastern Information Center for comment.</p> <p>Program 1.E: In the event that archaeological resources are identified during construction, the City shall require that development cease, and a professional archaeologist shall be employed to examine and document the site to determine subsequent actions.</p>	<p>Portions of this policy are programmatic and are the responsibility of the agency. The remainder of the requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring</p>	NO
<p>Policy 4: Encourage public participation and appreciation of archaeological and historic resources.</p> <p>Program 4.A: Continue to coordinate and cooperate with the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians in the identification and preservation of sensitive Cahuilla Indian sites and resources, and the continued expansion of the tribal Cultural Museum.</p>	<p>Although this is a programmatic policy that is the responsibility of the agency, the Proposed Project includes coordination with the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO

**City of Cathedral City Comprehensive General Plan, 2002**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
Policy 1: Protect noise sensitive land uses, including residential neighborhoods, schools, hospitals, libraries, churches, resorts and community open space, as well as land uses proposed in the vicinity of the railway, Interstate 10, the Mid-Valley Parkway, and Da Vall Drive from high noise levels generated by existing and future noise sources.	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy 3: Private sector project proposals shall include measures that assure that noise exposures levels comply with State of California noise insulation standards as defined in Title 25 (California Noise Insulation Standards).	The Proposed Project would not involve development of noise receptors subject to noise insulation standards.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
<b>Circulation Element</b>		
Policy 3: Current and future City roadway networks shall make every effort to assure minimum operating standards that do not exceed Level-of-Service (LOS) "E" (as set forth in the General Plan Traffic Report) along roadway segments and at intersections during peak hours of traffic.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy	NO
Policy 4: Given the programmatic nature of the General Plan traffic analysis, development proposals which may generate traffic volumes or associated impacts beyond the scope of the General Plan analysis should be required to conduct project-specific traffic studies to assure that project impacts are adequately mitigated.	The Proposed Project may result in a short-term increase in traffic congestion during construction; however it would not result in increased long-term future traffic volumes.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>		
Policy 3: The City shall thoroughly evaluate development proposals for lands directly adjacent to sites known to be contaminated with hazardous or toxic materials.	The Proposed Project would be constructed in existing right-of-way with limited potential of adjacent site contamination. Individual tower locations and proximity to contaminated sites is not likely.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
Policy 3: City land use planning efforts shall ensure that sensitive receptors are separated from polluting point sources, to the greatest extent practical.	The Proposed Project would not have substantial ongoing air pollution activities in this jurisdiction that could affect sensitive receptors, and the potential for sensitive receptor impacts for this area are addressed in the EIR/EIS.	NO
Policy 4: Development proposals brought before the City shall be reviewed for their potential to adversely impact local and regional air quality and shall be required to mitigate any significant impacts.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APMs and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
Policy 8: The City shall continue to implement effective street sweeping and post-windstorm cleanup programs to reduce the cumulative impacts of blow sand and nuisance dust resulting from construction activities, natural windstorms and other sources.	This policy does not strictly apply to, or describe any specific requirements for the Proposed Project.	NO

**City of Cathedral City Comprehensive General Plan, 2002**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic Safety</b>		
Policy 1: All new development shall continue to be constructed, at a minimum, in accordance with the seismic design requirements contained in the most recently adopted edition of the Uniform Building Code/International Building Code.	Tower design follows standard building codes, and therefore would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Policy 2: In accordance with State law, all development proposals within designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones shall be accompanied by appropriate geotechnical analyses.	The Proposed Project would be located between two A-P fault zones.	NO
Policy 5: Where development is proposed in areas identified as being subject to geotechnical hazards (including, but not limited to slope instability, soil collapse, liquefaction and seismically induced settlement), the City shall require the preparation of site-specific geotechnical investigations by the Applicant prior to development. All such studies shall include mitigation measures that reduce associated hazards to insignificant levels.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential erosion and soil instability impacts.	NO
Policy 9: Coordinate with public and quasi-public agencies to assure the continued functionality of major utility systems in the event of a major earthquake.	The Proposed Project would pass between two active fault zones in Cathedral City and fault-crossing design is not applicable.	NO
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Housing Element</b>		
Policy 1: Ensure that the quality of dwelling units in existing neighborhoods is improved, conserved, rehabilitated and maintained.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact residential areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Economic Development Element</b>		
Policy 7: In order to maintain existing economic activities and attract new commercial and industrial development, the City should assure the provision of adequate utilities, infrastructure, and other capital facilities.	The new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities are intended to provide adequate electrical distribution to meet existing and future demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project itself would be an infrastructure project designed to accommodate existing and planned development within the City of Cathedral City. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for wilderness and recreation; agriculture; and hydrology and water resources.

### 3.10 City of Coachella, California

**City of Coachella General Plan, 2002.** Coachella is a California desert community, incorporated in 1946 and located southeast of the San Gorgonio Pass, east of the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa Mountains and north of the Salton Sea, at the southernmost end of the urbanized Coachella Valley. It is bordered by the City of Indio to the northwest and portions of unincorporated Riverside County to the north, south and east. The current city limits cover 21 square miles of mixed urban, agricultural, commercial, industrial and vacant land. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, and a series capacitor within the City of Coachella General Plan area.

The Coachella General Plan is a compilation of 13 elements, including the seven elements mandated by the State General Plan Guidelines, the required Air Quality element, the two elements required by Assembly Bill 939, as well as four optional elements of local significance. The four optional elements that Coachella has chosen to include are Urban Design, Agriculture, Economic Development, and Fiscal.

**City of Coachella General Plan, 1998**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Conservation Element: Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Page 134</b>		
Goal: The City shall require preservation of the habitat areas of rare, threatened and endangered wildlife and plant resources within open space areas.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the City. Because the City's policies require the preservation of these areas, this goal will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES
Objective: The City shall ensure that the habitat areas of rare, threatened and endangered wildlife and plant resources are preserved.	The EIR/EIS will identify and mitigate for any impact to threatened and endangered wildlife and plant resources.	NO
Policy: The City shall coordinate with the appropriate governmental agencies to identify and locate habitat areas of rare, threatened and endangered wildlife and plant resources.	This policy gives direction to the City to coordinate with governmental agencies for the identification of habitat areas. The Proposed Project may cross habitat areas; however measures will be identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce impacts.	NO
Policy: The City shall require that project sites and development plans be reviewed by a qualified wildlife biologist and horticulturist to identify any impacts to habitat areas of rare, threatened and endangered wildlife and plant resources and to recommend appropriate mitigation measures including the salvage and reuse of native vegetation in project landscaping.	Appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to biological resources will be discussed in the EIR/EIS, and incorporated in the mitigation monitoring program.	NO
Policy: The City shall promote wildlife refuges and preserves, including the Coachella Valley Fringe-toed Lizard Habitat Conservation Preserve, for the protection of habitat areas of threatened and endangered wildlife species.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be constructed on open space areas of the City and may impact the Coachella Valley Fringe-toed Lizard Habitat Conservation Preserve. However, as part of the Proposed Project SCE would implement APM B-34, in which it would cooperate with the Preserve and employ measures such as performing pre-construction surveys, clearing the area of CVFTLs and other sensitive species, and restoring areas with compacted soils.	NO
Policy: The City shall require appropriate mitigation measures to protect rare, threatened and endangered wildlife and plant resources including designation as Open Space.	Appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to biological resources will be identified in the EIR/EIS.	NO
<b>Open Space &amp; Parks Element: Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Page 142</b>		
Policy: The City shall identify and preserve a corridor of public open space for trails and wildlife habitat along the Whitewater River.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or wildlife habitat. In addition, potential impacts to the Whitewater River will be discussed in the EIR/EIS, and measures identified to reduce any potential impacts.	NO
<b>Open Space &amp; Parks Element: Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Page 145</b>		
Policy: The City shall identify areas of plant and wildlife habitat of rare and endangered species that may be suitable for preservation as open space.	Potential impacts to rare and endangered species will be discussed in the EIR/EIS, and mitigation measures identified to reduce impacts.	NO

City of Coachella General Plan, 1998

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use Element: Residential Development Policies</b>		
<p>Policy: The City shall develop a Hillside Conservation Ordinance which regulates development in hillside areas based on slope classification and would permit clustering of development to preserve hillside areas. Slopes below 20% would permit development in accordance with the underlying land use category. Slopes above 20% would remain essentially undeveloped allowing only appropriate recreational, circulation and utility uses such as hiking and equestrian trails, access roads, water tanks and utility lines subject to strict design guidelines.</p>	<p>Although this policy primarily addresses residential development projects, to the extent that the Proposed Project crossed slopes greater than 20% within the City of Coachella, such crossing would be an allowed use under this policy.</p>	NO
<b>Infrastructure &amp; Public Services Element Policies</b>		
<p>Objective: The City shall ensure the adequate provision of private utilities to serve the needs of the community.</p> <p>Policy: The shared use of major transmission corridors and other appropriate measures shall be encouraged as a means of preserving the aesthetic resources of the City and to lessen the visual impacts of such development. The City shall work with the appropriate agencies in developing these corridors for recreational use.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would include the construction of a new electric transmission line through the northern portion of the City of Coachella. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	YES
<b>Conservation Element Policies</b>		
<p>Objective: The City shall utilize a variety of methods to protect the visual aesthetics of the Mecca Hills and Santa Rosa Mountains.</p> <p>Policy: The City shall designate public owned portions of the Mecca Hills as Open Space on the Conservation Policy Diagram. The City shall prohibit alterations to the Mecca Hills as the most unique geologic formation in the world. Scenic views of the Mecca Hills shall be preserved through the prohibition and elimination of visual obstructions.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would pass north of I-10 and the Mecca Hills in the vicinity of the City of Coachella, and would not affect any views of the Mecca Hills from viewing opportunities within the City of Coachella.</p>	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Land Use, Page 15</b>		
<p>An Agriculture (AG) category shall be established on the Land Use Policy Diagram. The density standard for this category shall range from 0 to 1 dwelling unit/40 acres. The maximum density shall be 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres. The general residential product type shall be single family, detached homes on agricultural land of 40 acres or more. Additional uses shall be limited to those normally found as appurtenant to agricultural operations.</p>	<p>The establishment of an AG land use category is the responsibility of the City of Coachella, and therefore it is not relevant to the Proposed Project. In addition, the Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO

**City of Coachella General Plan, 1998**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<p>An Agricultural to Urban Transition Overlay shall be indicated on the Land Use Policy Diagram. The intent of this overlay area is to encourage the preservation of agricultural land to the maximum extent practical within the greater context of urban development. Urban development will be allowed at the intensity of the underlying General Plan land use category. However, the City shall develop a program of incentives including density bonuses, clustering, tax incentives and park and/or landscaping credits to achieve this objective.</p> <p>Date groves, citrus groves and vineyards are of particular interest for agricultural preservation. Also of interest are creative projects which sensitively integrate forms of active cultivation in urban areas such as community gardens. The achievement of a sense of agricultural character from major streets is desirable and may be accomplished through the choice of plant materials and characteristics of site design. Examples of plant materials would be date trees, citrus trees, grapevines and row crops. These plants would be laid out in a manner similar to a working farm.</p>	<p>The establishment of an Agricultural to Urban Transition Overlay is the responsibility of the City of Coachella, and therefore it is not relevant to the Proposed Project. In addition, the Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>Open Space Development, Page 33</b>		
<p>The Agriculture (AG) category shall be established on the Land Use Policy Diagram. The AG category shall provide for agricultural production.</p>	<p>This policy is the responsibility of the City of Coachella, and therefore it is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO
<p>The AG category shall provide for the protection and preservation of Agriculture as long as possible. The preservation of Agriculture is desirable as a major industry of Coachella. Some methods of preserving agricultural land could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density transfers to allow a greater portion of Proposed development on other sites in order to allow productive sites to remain in agricultural production</li> <li>• Use of the Williamson Act</li> <li>• Implementing a right-to-farm ordinance</li> <li>• Adopting a farmland protection program</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would not traverse lands designated as AG within the City of Coachella. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>Preservation of date palm and citrus groves will be encouraged. Where preservation is not possible, trees may be incorporated into the landscape areas or relocated to other public areas within the community.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not traverse areas identified as date palm groves in the General Plan. In addition, the Proposed Project would not preclude the preservation of date palm and citrus groves. This policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO
<p>The AG category shall allow for residential development at a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres (0.025 du/ac) as an incidental use to the primary agricultural use.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include residential development. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.</p>	NO
<b>Citywide Development, Page 36</b>		
<p>Existing agricultural uses in sphere of influence areas should be retained until conversion to urban uses are sound economic decisions.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would not constitute conversion to urban uses. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>Open Space and Parks &amp; Recreation, Page 142</b>		
<p>The City shall preserve agricultural lands surrounding the core of the City. The amount of agricultural lands to be preserved should be sufficient to maintain the rural agricultural character and to ensure a viable economic unit for continuing agricultural production.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not preclude the preservation of agricultural lands. Therefore, this policy will not be evaluated further.</p>	NO

City of Coachella General Plan, 1998

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Agriculture, Page 152</b>		
The City shall seek to retain in active cultivation the maximum amount of lands designated Agriculture (AG) on the Land Use Policy Diagram	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not traverse lands designated Agriculture (AG). Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
The City shall encourage the preservation of date groves, citrus orchards, vineyards and other crops which require substantial growth before achieving mature production rates.	The Proposed Project would not preclude the preservation of date groves, citrus orchards, vineyards, and other crops that require substantial growth before achieving mature production rates. This policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
The City shall encourage urban development to locate in areas which are not designated as Agriculture (AG) on the Land Use Policy Diagram.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include urban development, nor would it traverse lands designated as Agriculture (AG). This policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
The City shall encourage Williamson Act contracts within the areas designated for agricultural preservation.	This policy is the responsibility of the City of Coachella, and therefore it is not relevant to the Proposed Project. In addition, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not traverse lands identified as "Agricultural Retention Area" or "Agriculture to Urban Transition Area" in the Agricultural Policy Diagram in the General Plan. This policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
The City shall encourage uses which are compatible with Agriculture, including equestrian stables, date grove tours, the packing industry, refrigeration and distribution facilities and new product development.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Anticipated conflicts between a Proposed new use and existing agricultural activities shall be mitigated by the non-agricultural use.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. This Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
The City shall develop and institute a program of incentives, including density bonus and density transfer, which will allow development to occur within the Agriculture to Urban Transition Overlay while preserving or incorporating agricultural lands.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not traverse the Agriculture to Urban Transition Overlay. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
The City shall coordinate with CVWD in the review of development projects to ensure that there is no negative impact to the continued ability of the area's agricultural irrigation pipeline and tile drainage systems to serve existing Agriculture.	The Proposed Project would not traverse areas designated as agricultural lands within the City of Coachella. However, as part of the Proposed Project SCE would implement APM L-4, which would utilize the selective placement of tower structures to avoid span-sensitive features, such as irrigation pipelines, canals, and drainage systems.	NO
The City shall encourage the use of permanent physical features or barriers to separate Agriculture from other development uses, wherever possible. Such features include canals, roads, railroads, levees and topographical features.	The Proposed Project would not traverse designated agricultural resources with the City of Coachella; therefore, no barriers would be necessary. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**CULTURAL & PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Cultural Resources**

The City shall require the identification, evaluation and mitigation of adverse effects to historic, archaeological and culturally significant sites.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
---	--	----

**City of Coachella General Plan, 1998**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
The City shall require an identification of resources through a record search and survey followed by a field survey by a qualified archaeologist or historian. Cultural resources at this point are identified, described and recorded.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
The City shall require that sites which are determined to be significant shall have adverse effects mitigated. Mitigation may include extraction and preservation of artifacts, protection and preservation of artifacts on-site, on-site monitoring during grading and construction, or posting of identification on-site.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
All projects covered under CEQA will be required to request a transmittal level archaeological records search from the Eastern Information Center at the University of California, Riverside. At the discretion of the City, a records search may be required for projects not subject to CEQA provisions. The results of the records search and recommendations from EIC will determine whether further studies are warranted.	As part of the data collection for this EIR/EIS, a records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center at the University of California, Riverside of the California Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS). The record searches consisted of a review of relevant historic maps, and excavation and survey reports. Site forms for recorded sites within a 0.5-mile radius of the project route and/or within one mile of the right-of-way centerline were reviewed.	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
The City will consider the severity of noise exposure in the community planning process to prevent or minimize noise impacts to existing and proposed land uses.	The Proposed Project would cause noise exposure to surrounding land uses. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
<b>Circulation Element, Page 52</b>		
The City shall review all development proposals related to their impact on land use and circulation to ensure that the circulation system is not overburdened, and shall require improvements to adequately serve the development and adjacent properties.	The Proposed Project may result in a short-term increase in traffic congestion during construction; however it would not result in long-term future traffic loads that would overburden the circulation system.	NO
The City shall establish intersection Level of Service "D" as the minimum acceptable Level of Service.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Hazardous Waste</b>		
On any site specified as a Hazardous Waste & Substance Site, the City of Coachella is required to identify that fact prior to accepting as complete any application for a development project.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within existing utility corridor with very low potential for site contamination.	NO

City of Coachella General Plan, 1998

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element, Page 177</b>		
Land uses that are sensitive to air pollution such as schools, child care centers, hospitals, playgrounds, retirement and convalescent homes shall be identified and isolated from air pollution sources.	The Proposed Project would not have substantial ongoing air pollution activities in this jurisdiction that could affect sensitive receptors and the potential for sensitive receptor impacts for this area are addressed in the EIR/EIS.	NO
The City shall review proposed developments through the environmental and design review processes to ensure that negative impacts are mitigated.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APM and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
The City shall encourage the use of low polluting building and construction methods and materials to reduce emissions from construction activities.	The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with AQMD requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
The City shall encourage developers to limit extensive grading and cut & fill operations that generate PM10, Particulate Matter.	The Proposed Project does not propose to have extensive cut and fill operation in this jurisdiction.	NO
During site preparation, the City shall require adequate watering of construction sites, construction vehicle wheel washing and adherence to SCAQMD Rule 403 to ensure the clean-up of construction-related dirt on approach routes to the site to reduce PM10 emissions.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403.1. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
During site preparation, the City shall require that grading operations be suspended during first and second stage ozone episodes or when winds exceed 30 mph.	This policy would require actions above those generally required by SCAQMD Rule 403.1.	YES
The City shall require any construction access roads to be paved and cleaned after each work day to reduce PM10 emissions.	This policy would require actions above those generally required by SCAQMD Rule 403.1.	YES
The City shall require that any trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose dirt material offsite during site preparation activities be covered.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APM and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic Safety</b>		
The City shall discourage land uses that are considered critical from locating in areas subject to geologic hazards. No emergency or critical use facility such as a hospital, school, fire or police station, utility facility and communication facility shall be located within an active or potentially active earthquake fault zone.	No utility facilities, other than towers, are planned within fault zones.	NO
The City shall develop a comprehensive hillside safety program that involves slope stability incentives and disincentives for private property owners and provisions addressing post development stability problems.	No hillside areas to be graded in the City of Coachella.	NO
Where appropriate, the City shall require the preparation of geotechnical investigations by both a professional geotechnical engineer and a certified engineering geologist to address geotechnical hazards (i.e., erodible, expansive and collapsible soils, existing or potential landslides, areas with unsuitable percolation characteristics, large scale subsidence, non rippable bedrock areas, ground motion parameters, active or potentially active faulting, liquefaction, etc.) for new construction, multi-story addition and lateral expansion projects.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for wilderness and recreation; hydrology and water resources; and socioeconomics.

### 3.11 City of Colton, California

**City of Colton Final Preliminary General Plan.** The City of Colton encompasses 15 square miles of incorporated area, while the Planning Area, which includes the City and its sphere of influence, consists of approximately 18.4 square miles. The City of Colton is located in southwestern San Bernardino County and is surrounded by the Cities of Grand Terrace, Loma Linda, San Bernardino, Rialto, as well as unincorporated San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line within the City of Colton General Plan Area.

The General Plan includes the seven State-mandated elements including Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Noise, Open Space, Conservation, and Safety. The Open Space and Conservation elements are combined into one element, and the City has also included a Cultural Resources Preservation element. While the General Plan does not include specific goals for the development of utility corridors, the following policies are applicable to the Proposed Project.

City of Colton Final Preliminary General Plan, 1987		
Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Principles, Page 6-6</b>		
1: Preserve and protect hillside and environmentally sensitive areas designated for growth through the use of strict hillside development standards.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor, and would not require additional development outside of the corridor. Refer also to the analysis of hillside development standards under Geology, Mineral Resources and Soils below.	NO
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Plan Proposals, Page 6-7</b>		
2: Regulation shall be used to maintain open space requiring: d) The grading of soil and construction of impervious surfaces on open space lands shall be strictly regulated.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor that allows for the maintenance and improvement of structures within the corridor. However, the Proposed Project would implement several APMs, including G-10 through G-13, which would minimize the impacts of grading or reduce the amount of grading or ground disturbance.	NO
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Principles, Page 6-6</b>		
7: Outstanding scenic vistas and visual features shall be preserved and protected through the use of view easements, height limitations, and a design review board.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor, and would only involve the reconductoring of an existing transmission line. Therefore, visual contrast and visual blockage would be low. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>Land Use Element, Industrial, Principles, Page 2-24</b>		
1: Industrial uses need to be located in areas compatible with surrounding uses such as adjacent to railroads and freeways.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor, and therefore would not introduce incompatible uses. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

City of Colton Final Preliminary General Plan, 1987

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources Preservation Element, Goals &amp; Policies, Goal 1, Policies, Page 18</b>		
1a: Conserve in their entirety the largest and most unique archaeological sites.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would involve reconductoring. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact any known archaeological sites within the City of Colton. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Cultural Resources Preservation Element, Goals &amp; Policies, Goal 1, Implementation Measures, Page 18</b>		
1.4: Require adequate mitigation of impacts to archaeological resources.	The EIR/EIS would identify mitigation measures to reduce or minimize potential impacts to archaeological resources. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Cultural Resources Preservation Element, Goals &amp; Policies, Goal 2, Policies, Page 18</b>		
2f: Ensure future development is compatible with existing structures and district characteristics.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor that includes existing transmission lines. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element, Standards, Page 5-7</b>		
4: Exterior noise levels should not exceed 60 dBA at any time for such areas important to public need, and where the preservation of serenity and quietness is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose. Such areas could include parks, open spaces, amphitheaters, and other areas dedicated for activities requiring special qualities of serenity.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction noise that has the potential to exceed 60 dBA. However, implementation of APM N-1 requires compliance with local noise ordinances. In addition, the EIR/EIS would address specific mitigation measures needed to reduce noise impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
<b>Circulation Element, Goals and Policies, Safe Convenient and Efficient Transportation System, Page 5</b>		
1.3: Include transportation system management techniques, such as park-and-ride lots, traffic signal synchronization, carpool/vanpool programs, flexible work hours and the creation of Transportation management Associations as requirements of development by major employers.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APM A-7 would reduce expected construction traffic impacts through the preparation of a transportation plan and the staging of construction workers offsite and shuttling them to construction sites. The Proposed Project would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
1.8: Require major employers to prepare Transportation Management Plans with provisions for carpooling and vanpooling, flexible work hours or other techniques.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APM A-7 would reduce expected construction traffic impacts through the preparation of a transportation plan and the staging of construction workers offsite and shuttling them to construction sites. The Proposed Project would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

City of Colton Final Preliminary General Plan, 1987

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>Model Air Quality Element, Topic 2: Ground Transportation, Goal 2, 2.1 Auto Use, Page 4</b>		
2.1.1: Use incentives, regulations and Transportation Demand Management in cooperation with other jurisdictions in the South Coast Air Basin to eliminate vehicle <i>trips</i> which would otherwise be made.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APM A-7 would reduce expected construction traffic impacts through the preparation of a transportation plan and the staging of construction workers offsite and shuttling them to construction sites. The Proposed Project would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
2.1.2: Use incentives, regulations and Transportation Demand Management in cooperation with other jurisdictions in the South Coast Air Basin to eliminate vehicle <i>miles</i> traveled for auto trips which still need to be made.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APM A-7 would reduce expected construction traffic impacts through the preparation of a transportation plan and the staging of construction workers offsite and shuttling them to construction sites. The Proposed Project would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Model Air Quality Element, Topic 2: Ground Transportation, Goal 2, 2.2 Congestion Management, Page 6</b>		
2.2.1: Promote and establish modified work schedules which reduce peak period auto travel.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APM A-7 would reduce expected construction traffic impacts through the preparation of a transportation plan and the staging of construction workers offsite and shuttling them to construction sites. The Proposed Project would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Safety Element, Fire Hazards, Standards, Page 7-7</b>		
1: Define and limit the extent and intensity of development in areas of high fire hazard.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor. In addition, the Proposed Project would only consist of reconductoring within an existing transmission line corridor. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
4: Multi-story structures and high-hazard structures shall comply with fire protection standards.	The Proposed Project would consist of reconductoring an existing transmission line, within an existing utility corridor. In carrying out the reconductoring in this area of the Proposed Project, Best Management Practices would be implemented to ensure fire safety. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
9: Distances between structures shall conform to standards for safe fire protection.	The Proposed Project would consist of reconductoring an existing transmission line, and would not change the current distance between towers. Best Management Practices would be followed to ensure fire safety. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
10: All development plans shall be reviewed by local planning, fire, water, health, road, and flood control authorities.	The City of Colton will have the opportunity to review and comment on the EIR/EIS.	NO

**City of Colton Final Preliminary General Plan, 1987**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Safety Element, Emergency Preparedness, Standards, Page 7-8</b>		
4: Minimum road widths and clearances around structures shall follow the standards set in the Municipal Code.	The Proposed Project would consist of reconductoring an existing transmission line. Road widths and clearances were determined with the establishment of the corridor. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Safety Element, Plan Proposals, Fire Hazards, Page 7-11</b>		
18: Curtail use of heavy equipment during critical fire weather.	The Proposed Project would involve temporary use of heavy equipment during construction and may occasionally use heavy equipment during operation. Because the Proposed Project would not involve consistent use of heavy equipment, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Standards, Page 6-6</b>		
4: Strict enforcement of water and air quality standards shall be applied to all industrial users through business license approvals, fire inspections and code enforcement of performance standards.	The Proposed Project would be required to comply with water and air quality standards. Any impacts to water and air quality identified in the EIR/EIS would be mitigated and these measures would be incorporated in the mitigation monitoring program for the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Model Air Quality Element, Topic 5: Particulate Emissions, Goal 5, Policies and Programs, Page 12</b>		
5.1: Reduce particulate emissions from roads, parking lots, construction sites and agricultural lands.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 that requires reduction in air emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Program 5.1.1: Adopt incentives, regulations and procedures to manage paved roads so they produce the minimum practicable level of particulates.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 that requires reduction in air emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Program 5.1.2: Adopt incentives, regulations and procedures to minimize particulate emissions during road, parking lot and building construction.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 that requires reduction in air emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Program 5.1.3: Adopt incentives, regulations and procedures to control particulate emissions from unpaved roads, drives, vehicle maneuvering areas and parking lots.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 that requires reduction in air emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
5.2: Reduce emissions from buildings materials and methods which generate excessive pollutants.	The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with SCAQMD requirements to reduce air emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Program 5.2.1: Adopt incentives, regulations and procedures to prohibit the use of building materials and methods which generate excessive pollutants.	The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with SCAQMD requirements to reduce air emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

City of Colton Final Preliminary General Plan, 1987

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Principles, Page 6-6</b>		
6: Restrict development in canyons and hillsides and control the plan of development to prevent obstruction of natural runoff or water courses and to prevent unwarranted scarring of hillsides.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would not include additional development outside of this corridor within the City of Colton. However, the Proposed Project would implement several APMs, including APMs W-2, W-5, and W-6 through W-10, which would prevent obstruction of natural runoff or water-courses and scarring of hillsides. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Standards, Page 6-7</b>		
5: Hillside development standards shall be adopted requiring: a) Focused EIRs for all hillside developments exceeding ten (10) parcels in a single development or subdivision. b) New development shall occur on those sites that require the least amount of grading and vegetation removal. c) Roads shall follow the natural topography and are not to exceed a grade of 12 percent.	The Proposed Project would occur in areas with ridges and hills within an existing utility corridor. Several APMs would be implemented that would require the avoidance or minimization of soil disturbance and new access roads in areas with high erosion hazards or potential slope instability. In addition, the EIR/EIS includes analysis of the Proposed Project on any hills and ridges within the City of Colton. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Safety Element, The Policy Plan, Geologic Hazards, Standards, Page 7-6</b>		
2: Structural design shall be compatible with the local geologic hazard.	The Proposed Project would conform to all structural design provisions, including the 1997 Uniform Building Code and the California Building Code, and would utilize standard foundation and structural design measures. In addition, several APMs would be implemented that would minimize damage from local geologic hazards, such as potential earthquakes, slope instability, erosion hazards, and landslides. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Safety Element, Plan Proposals, Geologic Hazards, Page 7-9</b>		
7: Adopt the 1979 Uniform Building Code with the intent of upholding set safety standards for structures as a protective measure against geologic hazards.	The Proposed Project would conform to the 1997 Uniform Building Code, as well as the California Building Code, which is based upon the 1997 Uniform Building Code and includes more extensive structural seismic provisions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for wilderness and recreation, agriculture, and socioeconomics.

### 3.12 City of Desert Hot Springs, California

**City of Desert Hot Springs Comprehensive General Plan, 2000.** The City of Desert Hot Springs comprises an established residential community with important vacation resorts centered on the city’s unique hot water mineral springs resource. The city also provides community-scale commercial and business centers serving the city and surrounding communities. Located in the northwest portion of the Coa-

chella Valley in Riverside County, the city is a transitional area between a more intense tourist commercial base to the south and southeast and the more rural and quasi-industrial wind-farm development to the west. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers within the City of Desert Hot Springs General Plan area.

The Desert Hot Springs General Plan is organized into five major chapters: Administration, Community Development, Environmental Resources, Environmental Hazards, and Public Services and Facilities. With the exception of the overall General Plan goals described in the State of California Government Code, the City of Desert Hot Springs General Plan does not include specific goals identified for the City. However, the construction and operation of the Proposed Project would need to be addressed for consistency with the General Plan policies identified within each element. While the General Plan contains an optional Public Services and Facilities Element, this Element does not identify any specific goals or policies directly related to the development of utility corridors. Therefore, construction and operation of the Proposed Project is analyzed for consistency with all General Plan Element policies.

City of Desert Hot Springs Comprehensive General Plan, 2000		
Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Biological Resources Element, Biological Resources Goal, Policies and Programs, Pages IV-8 – IV-11</b>		
Policy 2: Support all practical efforts to maintain a broad variety of habitats, including suitable habitat for rare and endangered species occurring in the City and vicinity.	The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Program 2C: Until adoption of the Coachella Valley Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the City shall continue to require the preparation of wildlife surveys and, as necessary, Habitat Conservation Plans, for new development in compliance with Federal Section 10a(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act and Section 2081 of the State Endangered Species Act.	Compliance with the Federal and State Endangered Species Act will be discussed in the EIR/EIS.	NO
Policy 3: All development proposals on vacant lands shall be reviewed and evaluated to assure minimal impacts on existing habitat and wildlife.	The EIR/EIS includes an evaluation of the Proposed Project's impact to habitats and wildlife. No further analysis is necessary.	NO
Program 3A: City shall assure a thorough assessment of impacts to habitat and/or wildlife associated with proposed development, including requiring the preparation of detailed biological resource surveys and mitigation programs in identified sensitive areas of the City.	The EIR/EIS includes an evaluation of the Proposed Project's impact to habitats and wildlife. Pre-construction and other surveys would be conducted as part of the Proposed Project. No further analysis is necessary.	NO
Program 3B: City shall encourage developers to salvage naturally occurring desert plant materials for incorporation into project landscaping to the greatest extent possible and shall indicate utilization of these indigenous materials on project landscape plans, which provide or enhance wildlife habitat and serve to extend the local desert environment into the urban design of the City. Plans shall be submitted to the City for approval.	The EIR/EIS includes an evaluation of the Proposed Project's potential impact to desert plant materials. Pre-construction and other surveys would be conducted and sensitive plants would be avoided. No further analysis is necessary.	NO
Policy 5: Encourage and cooperate in the establishment of multiple use corridors that use drainage channels and utility easements to provide wildlife corridors and public interconnection between open space areas in the community and vicinity.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for use as wildlife corridors and public interconnections between open spaces.	NO
Policy 6: Pro-actively encourage and promote an appreciation of sensitive biological resources and the integrated local environment.	This policy gives direction to the City to encourage an appreciation of sensitive biological resources. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**City of Desert Hot Springs Comprehensive General Plan, 2000**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element: Goals, Policies and Programs, Pages IV-52 – IV-54</b>		
Goal 1: Conservation, preservation and management of open space areas and protection of environmental resources and threatened animal species, protection against environmental hazards, and provision of enhanced recreational opportunities, and scenic qualities of the City.	The Proposed Project would not conflict with this goal.	NO
Goal 2: Preservation of the City's desert atmosphere, including maintenance of natural and scenic resources.	The Proposed Project would not conflict with this goal.	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**Community Design Element Policies**

Policy 10: Lighting shall be limited to the minimum height, number and intensity of fixtures needed to provide security and identification in residential, commercial and industrial development, taking every reasonable measure to preserve the community's night skies.	The Proposed Project would include facilities within the City of Desert Hot Springs that may require night lighting (Devers Substation modifications and Palm Springs Construction Yard at Devers Substation. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy 14: Water wells, utility substations, switching and control facilities associated with it shall be screened to preserve scenic viewsheds and limit visual clutter.	The Proposed Project would include both short-term construction facilities (Palm Springs Construction Yard) and long-term operational facilities (modifications to Devers Substation) within the City of Desert Hot Springs. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy 16: All grading and development proposed within scenic highway viewsheds, including hillsides, entry and focal points, shall be regulated to minimize adverse impacts to these viewsheds.	The Proposed Project may include construction of spur roads within the viewshed of SR 62, a State Designated Scenic Highway. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**Water, Sewer & Utilities Element Policies**

Policy 10: Major utility facilities shall be sited to assure minimal impacts to the environment and the community, and minimize potential environmental hazards.	The Proposed Project would include the siting of facilities within the City of Desert Hot Springs with the potential to cause visual impacts. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
--	---	-----

**Public Buildings and Facilities Element Policies**

Policy 1: Coordinate with public utilities and special districts, utilities and other quasi-public entities to assure the least intrusive and most compatible integration of related buildings and facilities into the land use pattern of the community. Program 1B: Integrate all new maintenance areas and utility substations with surrounding land uses, and regulate in order to maintain a compatible and aesthetically pleasing community through the use of appropriate buffers, architectural design and landscape, and signage.	The Proposed Project would include the siting of facilities within the City of Desert Hot Springs with the potential to cause visual impacts. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
---	---	-----

**LAND USE**

**Community Design Element Policies – Page III-120, Chapter III: Community Design Element**

Policy 13: Overhead utility lines shall be undergrounded to the greatest extent practical through the establishment of an undergrounding program and guidelines. Overhead utility lines along scenic roadways shall have first priority for City and other funding for utility undergrounding.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would not traverse the City of Desert Hot Springs. As such, the Proposed Project would be compatible with this policy.	NO
Policy 14: Water wells, utility substations, switching and control facilities associated with it shall be screened to preserve scenic viewsheds and limit visual clutter.	The Proposed Project would not construct utility substations within the City of Desert Hot Springs and would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**City of Desert Hot Springs Comprehensive General Plan, 2000**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>IV. Open Space and Conservation Element , Page IV-53</b>		
Policy 3: With the cooperation and approval of the local utilities and service providers and County Flood Control Districts, the City shall maximize use of flood control and utility easement areas to develop a multi-use trail system to and through parks and open space areas.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
Policy 2: Development or land use proposals, which have the potential to disturb or destroy sensitive cultural resources, shall be evaluated by a qualified professional and, if necessary, appropriate mitigation measures shall be incorporated into project approvals.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
<b>Circulation Element</b>		
Policy 12: City truck routes shall be designated and limited to Palm Drive, Two Bunch Palms Trail, Indian Avenue, Little Morongo Road, Pierson Boulevard and Highway 62.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. The Proposed Project would utilize designated truck routes and limit use of residential roadways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>		
Policy 3: Require and facilitate the safe and responsible disposal of all hazardous and/or toxic wastes in compliance with existing federal, State, and county regulations	Very limited use of hazardous chemicals is planned for construction. The EIR/EIS will require chemical control and spill prevention/clean-up plans.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
Policy 6: All development proposals brought before the City will be reviewed for potential adverse effects on air quality and will be required to mitigate any significant impacts.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APMs and air quality mitigation measures.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic Safety</b>		
Policy 2: In accordance with State law, development proposals within designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones and along the Blind Canyon Fault shall be accompanied by appropriate geotechnical analysis.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and MM G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.	NO
Policy 5: The City shall cooperate and coordinate with public and quasi-public agencies to assure the continued functionality of major utility services in the event of a major earthquake.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM G-2, APM G-3, APM G-8 and MM G-7a, which provide procedures to analyze, confirm, and avoid active fault locations.	NO
Policy 8: Development in areas identified as being subject to a rock fall or landslide hazard shall be avoided.	The Proposed Project would cross areas with only moderate susceptibility to rock fall or landslide.	NO

City of Desert Hot Springs Comprehensive General Plan, 2000

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Housing Element</b>		
Policy 1B: The City shall encourage the preservation of its existing housing stock.	The Proposed Project could have the potential to intrude or impact residential areas along the Proposed Project and alternative routes. Therefore, compliance with the policy will be included in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Economic Development Element</b>		
Policy 2: Actively solicit employment and revenue generating development, including resort, commercial and industrial projects compatible and consistent with the City's General Plan.	Construction of the new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities would result in an increase in employment and construction-related spending along the route. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO
Policy 5: Assure sufficient infrastructure and capital facilities in order to maintain existing economic activities and attract new resort, commercial businesses and industries to the City.	The new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities are intended to provide adequate electrical distribution to meet existing and future demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project itself would be an infrastructure project designed to accommodate existing and planned development within the City of Desert Hot Springs. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO
Policy 9: Work to promote net annual increases in local household incomes for all socio-economic sectors of the community.	Construction of the new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities would result in an increase in employment and construction-related spending along the Proposed Project route. Any spending and employment within the City of Desert Hot Springs would result in a net annual increase in local household incomes. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for agriculture, noise, and hydrology and water resources.

### 3.13 City of Grand Terrace, California

**City of Grand Terrace General Plan, December 1988 and amendments.** The City of Grand Terrace is approximately 3.5 square miles in size and is located in San Bernardino County. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line within the City of Grand Terrace General Plan Area. In addition, the Vista Substation is located within the City of Grand Terrace. While the General Plan does not include specific goals for the development of utility corridors, the following General Plan policies are applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives.

City of Grand Terrace General Plan, December 1988 and amendments

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>V. Aesthetic, Cultural, and Recreational Resources Element, Recreational Resources, Page V-7, the last implementation policy</b>		
V. Significant open space should be protected to the degree feasible. Special consideration should be given to environmentally sensitive zones such as steep slopes and floodplains.	A portion of the Proposed Project would consist of reconducting both circuits of an existing double-circuit transmission line; thus, no open space in the City of Grand Terrace would be significantly affected.	NO
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Aesthetic, Cultural, and Recreational Resources Element, Aesthetic Resources, Page V-7 – V-8</b>		
Policy: Scenic Resources should be protected from harmful impacts and maintained as community assets.	The Proposed Project could affect scenic resources in the City of Grand Terrace. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy: Design of new development shall respect and preserve the view opportunities of existing development in the area.	The Proposed Project could affect view opportunities of existing development within the City of Grand Terrace. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>Chapter VI: The Housing Goals, Objectives, and Policies, C. Housing Condition – Ordinance No. 186 (Housing Element Amendment), Page 44</b>		
Policy 3.2.3: Prevent the encroachment of incompatible uses into established residential neighborhoods.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would not be expanded within the City of Grand Terrace. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Soils/Agricultural Resources, Page IV-2</b>		
Existing agricultural uses shall be permitted to remain at the owner's prerogative. Transition of Agriculture to more urbanized uses is expected, and is consistent with City objectives for the future.	The Proposed Project would not preclude a land owner's ability to keep existing Agriculture uses. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
Historic Resources of the community shall be inventoried and protected from harmful impacts.	The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
Policy 1.1.4: Consider noise impacts to residential neighborhoods when designating truck routes, freeway improvements, and major circulation corridors.	The Proposed Project would involve use of trucks along routes that may be near residential neighborhoods. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy 2.2.2: Minimize the impacts of construction noise on adjacent land uses by limiting the permitted hours of activity.	The Proposed Project would involve activities that create construction noise. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

City of Grand Terrace General Plan, December 1988 and amendments

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
<b>Circulation Element</b>		
Objective 4: Implementing Action 1: The City will continue to route truck traffic away from residential areas and work with regional agencies in order to mitigate potential impacts from regional traffic.	The Proposed Project would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. The Proposed Project would utilize designated truck routes and limit use of residential roadways. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>		
Policy: Unlicensed dumping of toxic or hazardous materials into the ground or water in Grand Terrace shall be prohibited.	Very limited use of hazardous chemicals is planned for construction. The EIR/EIS will require chemical control and spill prevention/clean-up plans.	NO
Policy: Storage of industrial chemicals and other potentially hazardous substances shall meet all applicable fire prevention regulations.	Proper storage and handling of hazardous materials will be required by the EIR/EIS (Hazardous Material Handling and Storage Plan).	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
Air Quality Element Objective 18: Reduce particulate emissions from roads, parking lots, and construction sites.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for visual resources; wilderness and recreation; hydrology and water resources; geology, mineral resources, and soils; and socioeconomics.

**City of Grand Terrace, Barton Road Specific Plan, 2003.** This Specific Plan area covers an approximately 1.3-mile corridor along Barton Road extending from the Riverside Freeway (I-215) on the west, to the intersection of Barton Road and Victoria Street on the east. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line within the Barton Road Specific Plan Area.

The Barton Road Specific Plan is a regulatory plan that serves as zoning for properties within the boundaries of the Plan. This Specific Plan has been prepared in compliance with the goals and policies of the city's General Plan. The Specific Plan does not identify any goals or policies directly related to the development of utility corridors and therefore, no applicable policies were identified for the Proposed Project.

### 3.14 City of Loma Linda, California

**City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004.** The City of Loma Linda is a scenic community located within sight of the San Bernardino and San Jacinto Mountains. As described in the General Plan, the City is in the heart of the Inland Empire. Loma Linda is located in San Bernardino County, approximately 60 miles east of Los Angeles. The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line within the City of Loma Linda General Plan Area.

City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Conservation and Open Space Element, Natural and Visual Open Space Resources, Implementing Policies for Visual Resources, Page 9-7</b>		
9.2.10.1a: Preserve outstanding natural features, such as the skyline of a prominent hill, rock outcroppings, and native/or historically significant trees.	Preservation of outstanding natural features, including the scenic vista, rock outcroppings, and native/historically significant trees will be further analyzed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Conservation and Open Space Element, Natural and Visual Open Space Resources, Guiding Policy and Implementing Policies for Open Space, Page 9-7</b>		
Guiding Policy 9.2.10.2: Acquire, preserve and maintain open space and its natural resources for future generations.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be placed in an existing corridor such that the preservation of open space in the City of Loma Linda will not be evaluated further in the report.	NO
9.2.10.2a: Base open space preservation and acquisition based on the evaluation of significant viewsheds and ridgelines, wildlife habitats and fragile ecosystems, significant scientifically, historically, or ecologically unique natural areas, passive recreational areas, and stream or creek environs.	The Proposed Project would be located in an existing corridor where viewsheds, ridgelines, wildlife habitats and fragile ecosystems may be affected. This policy will be evaluated in the biological resources section of the document.	YES
9.2.10.2f: The San Jacinto Fault Zone area should be preserved as open space through easement dedication during the review process of applicable new developments.	The San Jacinto Fault Zone area does not apply to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>Conservation and Open Space Element, Biological Resources, Biological Resources Policies and Implementing Policies, Page 9-15</b>		
Guiding Policy 9.4.4: Preserve habitats supporting rare and endangered species of plants and animals including wildlife corridors.	The Proposed Project will be located in an existing corridor where habitats supporting rare and endangered species may be affected. This policy will be evaluated in the biological resources section of the document.	YES
9.4.4a: Comply with federal policy of no net loss of wetlands through avoidance and clustered development. Where preservation is found to be infeasible (such as an unavoidable road crossing through habitats), require (1) on-site replacement of wetland areas, (2) changing replacement, or (3) restoration of degraded wetland areas at a minimum ratio of one acre of replacement/restoration for each acre of impacted on-site habitat, such that the value of impacted habitat is replaced.	Because no wetlands occur in the Loma Linda portion of the Proposed Project, this policy will not be evaluated any further in the document.	NO
9.4.4b: Require appropriate setbacks adjacent to natural streams to provide adequate buffer areas ensuring the protection of biological resources.	A portion of the Proposed Project would be located in an existing corridor such that protection of natural streams is not required. The Proposed Project may affect biological resources; thus, this policy will be evaluated further in the report.	YES
9.4.4c: Preserve, as feasible, the oak woodland areas within the City by requiring development to incorporate the trees into the development design.	A portion of the Proposed Project would occur in an existing utility corridor. Oak woodland areas will not likely occur in the project site. This policy will not be further analyzed in the document.	NO

**City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
9.4.4d: Through the project approval and design review process, require new development projects to protect sensitive habitat areas including, but not limited to, coastal sage scrub, and native grasslands. Ensure the preservation in place of habitat areas found to be occupied by State and federally protected species. Where preserved habitat areas occupy areas that would otherwise be granted as part of a development project, facilitate the transfer of allowable density to other, non-sensitive portions of the site.	The Proposed Project would be located in areas where State and federally protected species and sensitive habitat may exist. This policy will be further analyzed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
9.4.4e: Through development review, retain, as feasible, wildlife corridors in the Planning Area in particular, the San Timoteo Wash area.	Utility corridors often serve as wildlife corridors and offer recreational opportunities. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**Land Use Element: 2.2.3.1 Guiding Policy for the South Hills**

Policy j: Development shall maintain appropriate horizontal and vertical setbacks from "primary ridgelines," which are the ridgelines mapped as part of a comprehensive Specific Plan for the South Hills having the following characteristics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridges that have a significant difference in elevation from the valley or canyon floor, and are recognizable as ridgelines from the valley floor to the north.</li> <li>• Ridges that possess a prominent landform in the foreground, and form a major skyline in the background. In some cases where layers of ridges may be visible into the distance, the objective of defining major ridgelines is to avoid the silhouetting of development along sky lines when viewed from preserved open space areas and valley areas to the south.</li> </ul>	The Proposed Project would pass through portions of the South Hills in the City of Loma Linda. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy p: The overall scale and massing of structures shall respect the natural surroundings and unique visual resources of the area by incorporating designs which minimize bulk and mass, and minimize visual intrusion on the natural landscape.	The Proposed Project would pass through portions of the South Hills in the City of Loma Linda. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**Conservation and Open Space Element: Guiding Policy for Visual Resources**

Guiding Policy 9.2.10.1: Protect views and unique landforms.	Only a portion of the Proposed Project at San Bernardino Junction would be located in the City of Loma Linda, which would reconductor one out of two existing tower lines. Impacts to the views and unique landforms will be addressed in the document.	NO
Policy d: Limit development on ridgelines.	The Proposed Project would cross several ridges in the South Hills portion of the City of Loma Linda. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES

**General Plan Implementation Programs**

Work with Southern California Edison to improve transmission line corridors with attractive, community-serving uses and to upgrade the appearance of the transmission line corridors in conjunction with an expansion or co-use of the corridor.	The Proposed Project would include the upgrade of facilities within the existing transmission line corridor. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
--	--	-----

City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>Chapter 8: Public Services and Facilities Element, 8.10 Utilities and Cable Television, Page 8-21</b>		
8.10.6(a): Work with Southern California Edison to improve transmission line corridors with attractive, community-serving uses such as ornamental planting and recreational uses, including trails and playing fields.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Land Use, South Hills (Hillside Designation), Page 2-12</b>		
h. Development along and adjacent to Pilgrim Lane shall respect the existing rural character of the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ability of rural development along Pilgrim Lane to engage in Agriculture and commercial animal-keeping activities shall be protected.</li> </ul>	The Proposed Project and alternatives would respect the rural character of the South Hills area, and would not preclude the ability of rural development to engage in Agriculture and animal keeping activities.	NO
<b>Adaptive Reuse and Preservation with New Development, Page 3-15</b>		
c. Preserve the character of the existing citrus groves by preserving and incorporating strategically located existing trees or rows of existing trees into new development (i.e., in the form of landscaped setbacks and/or landscape treatments). Having accomplished this, the remaining grove may be removed.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not preclude the preservation of the character of the existing citrus groves. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>Agricultural Resources, Page 9-16</b>		
9.3.2: Guiding Policy The agricultural areas are considered an urban reserve. <p>a. Development in the agricultural areas will occur as a natural extension of urban expansion.</p> <p>b. Agricultural uses are allowed to remain and continue operation until the site is ready for conversion.</p>	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
4.5.5.1A: When existing information indicates that a site proposed for development may contain paleontological resources, a paleontologist shall monitor site grading activities with the authority to halt grading to collect uncovered paleontological resources, curate any resources collected with an appropriate reposition, and file a report with the City Community Development Department documenting any paleontological resources that are found during site grading.	SCE would implement APM P-1, which would require paleontological monitoring of earth-disturbing construction activities and salvage of significant specimens will occur in project areas of high sensitivity. In addition, as part of the Proposed Project SCE would implement Mitigation Measure C-1e, which would require a professional archaeologist to monitor during subsurface ground-disturbing construction activities and provide a monthly report.	NO

City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<p>4.5.5.2A. If human remains are encountered during a public or private construction activity, State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the San Bernardino County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The San Bernardino County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours.</p> <p>a. If the coroner determines that the burial is not historic, but prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted to determine the most likely descendant (MLD) for this area. The MLD may become involved with the disposition of the burial following scientific analysis.</p>	<p>The requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes and the State Health and Safety Code.</p>	NO
<p>4.5.5.2B. Avoidance is the preferred treatment for cultural resources. Where feasible, project plans shall be developed to allow avoidance of cultural resources. Where avoidance of construction impacts is possible, capping of the cultural resource site and avoidance planting (e.g., planting of prickly pear cactus) shall be employed to ensure that indirect impacts from increased public availability to the site are avoided. Where avoidance is selected, cultural resource sites shall be placed within permanent conservation easements or dedicated open space.</p>	<p>As part of the Proposed Project, SCE would implement APM C-4, which would require it to prepare and submit for approval a cultural resource treatment plan for NRHP-eligible cultural resources to mitigate identified impacts. Avoidance, recordation, and data recovery will be used as mitigation alternatives. SCE would also implement APM C-6, which states that if avoidance of specific cultural resources is not feasible, treatment shall be carried out as determined by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate SHPO. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>4.5.5.2C. If avoidance and/or preservation in place of cultural resources is not possible, the following mitigation measures shall be initiated for each impacted site:</p> <p>a. A participant-observer from the appropriate Indian Band or Tribe shall be used during archaeological testing or excavation in the project site.</p> <p>b. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the project, the project proponent shall develop a test level research design detailing how the cultural resource investigation shall be executed and providing specific research questions that shall be addressed through the excavation program. In particular, the testing program shall characterize the site constituents, horizontal and vertical extent, and, if possible, period of use. The testing program shall also address the California Register and National Register eligibility of the cultural resource and make recommendations as to the suitability of the resource for listing on either Register. The research design shall be submitted to the City Community Development Department for review and comment. For sites determined, through the Testing Program, to be ineligible for listing on either the California or National Register, execution of the Testing Program will suffice as mitigation of project impacts to this resource.</p>	<p>As part of the Proposed Project, SCE would implement Mitigation Measure C-1e, which would require that subsurface ground-disturbing construction activities be monitored by a professional archaeologist at all times, and a Native American monitor when necessary. In addition, Mitigation Measure C-3a would require SCE to conduct consultations with Native Americans and other appropriate agencies.</p> <p>Also Mitigation Measure C-1a and C-1c would be implemented as part of the Proposed Project. Mitigation Measure C-1a would require the inventory and evaluation of cultural resources in the APE. Mitigation Measure C-c would require the development and implementation of a Historic Properties Treatment Plan, which would include a research design and scope of work for evaluation of cultural resources and for data recovery or additional treatment of NRHP-eligible sites. Mitigation and treatment plans would need to be approved by State and local governments, and Native Americans.</p>	NO

City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
<p>Policy A: Achieve and maintain exterior noise levels appropriate to planned land uses throughout Loma Linda as indicted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential Single-Family: 65 dBA within rear yards. Multifamily: 65 dBA within private yard or enclosed balcony spaces. Single/Multifamily, indoor noise level: 45 dBA with windows closed.</li> <li>• Schools Classrooms: 65 dBA exterior noise environment at the classroom location. Play and sports areas: 70 dBA.</li> <li>• Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes: 60dBA exterior noise environment at the building location.</li> <li>• Commercial/Industrial: 70 dBA exterior noise environment at the building location, unless additional interior mitigation is provided.</li> </ul>	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<p>Policy B: Maintain a pattern of land uses that separates noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, churches, schools, and hospitals) from major noise sources to the extent possible, and guide noise tolerant land uses into the noisier portions of the Planning Area.</p>	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<p>Policy C: Require new developments to limit noise impacts on adjacent properties through acoustical site planning, which may include, but is not limited to the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased setbacks from noise sources from adjacent buildings;</li> <li>• Screen and control noise sources, such as parking, and loading facilities, outdoor activities and mechanical equipment;</li> <li>• Use soundproofing materials and double-glazed windows;</li> <li>• Retain fences, walls, and landscaping that serve as noise buffers;</li> <li>• Orient delivery, loading docks, and outdoor work areas away from noise-sensitive areas.</li> </ul>	The Proposed Project would involve development of a new noise source. This policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Hazardous Waste and Materials</b>		
<p>10.5.2 Guiding Policy: Minimize the negative impacts associated with the storage, use, generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials.</p> <p>Policy c: Continue a program of regular inspections and monitoring to ensure compliance with local, State, and federal regulations, in order to reduce the risks associated with the use and handling of hazardous materials and wastes.</p>	Very limited use of hazardous chemicals is planned for construction. The EIR/EIS will require chemical control and spill prevention/clean-up plans.	NO
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<b>Air Quality Element</b>		
<p>Policy d: As part of the development review process for non-residential development, require the incorporation of best available technologies to mitigate air quality impacts.</p>	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the APMs and air quality mitigation measures.	NO

City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Water Resources/Flooding – Chapter 10.0 Public Health and Safety Element, 10.3 Slope Failure Hazards – Page 10-9</b>		
10.3.2. Guiding Policy: Reduce the potential for property damage and personal injury from slope failure hazards and erosion. Implementing Policies.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
d. Require erosion-control measures in areas of steep slopes or areas with high erosion problems on all grading plans to reduce soil erosion from wind, grading and construction operations, and stormwater runoff.		
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Conservation and Open Space Element, Natural and Visual Open Space Resources, Implementing Policies for Visual Resources, Page 9-7</b>		
9.2.10.1c: Require new development to be designated to conserve soil and avoid erosion by limiting cut and fill areas and the exporting of soil from the development site.	A portion of the Proposed Project would occur in an existing utility corridor where cut and fill and exporting of soil from the development site would not be necessary. This policy will not be further analyzed in the document.	NO
<b>Geologic and Seismic Hazards - Public Health and Safety Element, Page 10-3 – 10-5</b>		
Minimize the risks of property damage and personal injury resulting from seismic and geologic hazards.	This policy is directed toward property damage and personal injury. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Work with Southern California Edison, the Southern California Gas Company, pipeline companies, and industrial companies to implement measures to safeguard the public from seismic hazards associated with high voltage transmission lines, caustic and toxic gas and fuel lines, and flammable storage facilities.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing seismic hazards.	NO
<b>Slope Failure Hazards - Public Health and Safety Element, Page 10-9 – 10-10</b>		
Limit cut and fill slopes to 3:1 (33% slope) throughout the City to maintain slope stability unless an engineering geologist can establish to the City's satisfaction that a steeper slope would not pose undue risk to people and property.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential soil instability impacts.	NO
Require geologic and soils reports as part of the development review process and/or building permit process for development in the affected areas to minimize slope failure.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential soil instability impacts.	NO
Require erosion-control measures in areas of steep slopes or areas with high erosion problems on all grading plans to reduce soil erosion from wind, grading and construction operations, and stormwater runoff.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding and minimizing potential soil instability impacts.	NO

City of Loma Linda Draft General Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS</b>		
<b>Economic Development Element</b>		
Economic Development Element Policy: New development shall incorporate such features as to ensure that it will not increase the cost of public services provided to existing development	The new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities are intended to provide adequate electrical distribution to meet existing and future demand. Therefore, the Proposed Project itself would be an infrastructure project designed to accommodate existing and planned development within the City of Loma Linda. The Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for land use and transportation and traffic.

### 3.15 City of Redlands, California

**City of Redlands General Plan, 1995.** The City of Redlands is located in San Bernardino County. Redlands is a small city of 64,000 residents that sits nestled at the foot of Southern California’s highest mountains, halfway between Los Angeles and Palm Springs. The General Plan area is bounded on the north by the Santa Ana Wash, the City of Highland, and the San Bernardino Mountains, on the east by the Crafton Hills and the City of Yucaipa, on the south by the Riverside County boundary and The Badlands, and on the west by the City of Loma Linda and the City of San Bernardino (San Bernardino International Airport). The Proposed Project would include the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line in the City of Redlands General Plan boundary.

The City of Redlands General Plan includes the seven elements mandated by the State General Plan Guidelines, as well as three optional elements of local significance: Growth Management, City Design and Preservation, Human Services, and Economic Development.

City of Redlands General Plan, 1995

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Section 4.0 Land Use Element, Southern Area Hills and Canyons (Live Oak and San Timoteo Canyons), Page 9 - 10</b>		
4.41g: Preserve natural vegetation and wildlife areas to create wildlife corridors extending throughout the Live Oak Canyon and San Timoteo Canyon areas.	This policy relates to wildlife corridors and their preservation; however, utility corridors are often used for wildlife movement as well. This policy will have to be analyzed in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS.	YES

**City of Redlands General Plan, 1995**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
4.41i: The portion of San Timoteo Creek, as defined by its floodway easements or flood control fee title, lying within the corporate boundary of the City is hereby declared to be Resource Preservation land and shall be preserved for the purposes of promoting wildlife preservation, open space recreation and water conservation. No fencing or other barriers shall be permitted in this Resource Preservation area that impede or limit access to the free crossing or use of the area by wildlife or its use for open space recreational purposes.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility corridor that could continue to be used for wildlife preservation, open space recreation, and water conservation. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**City Design and Preservation Element: Section 3.10 City Design – Guiding Policies**

Policy 3.10e: Preserve the natural appearance of steep hillsides and ridges. Conservation, safety, and fiscal reasons justify preservation, but visual satisfaction is more widely appreciated.	The Proposed Project would cross several hillsides and ridges within San Timoteo Canyon in the City of Redlands.	YES
---	--	-----

**Land Use Element: Section 4.41 Southern Area Hills and Canyons – Implementing Policies**

Policy 4.41d: Major topographic features within the San Timoteo and Live Oak Canyon areas shall be preserved, maintained and where possible, enhanced. Major ridgelines should not be modified although development on a ridgeline may be allowed where there is offsetting need demonstrated.	The Proposed Project would cross several hillsides and ridges within San Timoteo Canyon in the City of Redlands.	YES
--	--	-----

Policy 4.41e: Within the Live Oak Canyon and San Timoteo Canyon areas, the canyon walls immediately below major ridges and vegetation thereon shall be preserved and enhanced where appropriate. Slopes that are in excess of 50% shall be preserved intact except for public safety needs.	The Proposed Project would cross several hillsides and ridges within San Timoteo Canyon in the City of Redlands.	YES
---	--	-----

**LAND USE**

**Guiding Policies: Southeast Area – Section 4.42 (Southeast Area), Chapter 4: Land Use Element**

Policy 4.42t: All utilities and public facilities in the Southeast Area shall be designed and constructed to preserve and enhance the perceived natural and historic character of this area.	The Proposed Project would involve improvements to existing transmission lines within the City of Redlands, but would not involve the construction of new transmission lines or the expansion of the utility corridor. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
--	--	----

**WILDERNESS AND RECREATION**

**Guiding Policies: Trails – Section 7.11 (Trails), Chapter 7.0: Open Space and Recreation Element**

Policy 7.11f: Establish agreement with public agencies and private entities for development and maintenance of trails in rights-of-way and utility corridors.	The Proposed Project would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy.	NO
---	---	----

**AGRICULTURE**

**2.0 Growth Management Element – Implementing Policies: Growth Management**

2.0e: Encourage and promote orderly development and growth of urban areas while maintaining and encouraging the best possible use of agricultural land, protecting it against premature encroachment of non-agricultural development. Consider the costs of extending urban facilities and services in the review of urban development.	The Proposed Project would occur within an existing utility ROW and would not introduce an incompatible land use. The Proposed Project would not conflict with this policy; however it may need to be addressed for the alternatives.	NO
---	---	----

City of Redlands General Plan, 1995

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>3.10 City Design, North Redlands – Section 3.10 City Design, North Redlands</b>		
Maximize agricultural preservation. Citrus and other agricultural preservation should be retained where feasible for its aesthetic and biotic value as well as its contribution as the City's original economic base. North Redlands has extensive unsubdivided frontages along which citrus can continue to be efficiently farmed, buffering arterial streets without requiring a reduction in density.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not preclude the continued preservation of citrus and other agricultural lands. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>3.26 Government Decision-Making – Implementing Policies: Government Decision-Making</b>		
3.26a Protect residential, agricultural, and natural areas that may be eligible for designation by rezoning such areas and/or amending the zoning code to promote conservation of the existing built environment and agricultural and scenic areas.	This policy is the responsibility of the City of Redlands, and therefore is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO
<b>3.29 Agricultural and Scenic Areas – Implementing Policies: Agricultural and Scenic Areas</b>		
3.29a Encourage preservation of citrus groves and other agricultural areas that are designated as having cultural or scenic significance. Encourage retention of existing privately owned citrus groves of all sizes, especially in historic neighborhoods.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would have the potential to impact agricultural resources. This policy will be evaluated further in the Agriculture section of the report.	YES
3.29b Identify existing agricultural areas, scenic views, vistas, and streetscapes, including mountain, canyon, and valley vistas, urban view corridors, focal points and focal buildings.	The Proposed Project would comply with this policy through the preparation of this environmental document.	NO
3.29c Define and implement measures to preserve citrus groves, scenic views, vistas, and streetscapes for the community.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would have the potential to impact agricultural resources. This policy will be evaluated further in the Agriculture section of the report.	YES
<b>7.41 Agriculture, Guiding Policies: Agriculture</b>		
7.41a: Retain the maximum feasible amount of agricultural open space for its contributions to the local economy, lifestyle, air quality, habitat value and sense of Redlands' heritage.	The Proposed Project would have the potential to impact agricultural resources. This policy will be evaluated further in the Agriculture section of the report.	YES
7.41b Provide for continued operation of existing livestock/dairy farms in areas of the San Timoteo/Live Oak Canyon planning sector designated Rural Living and Very Low Density on the General Plan Diagram.	The Sam Timoteo/Live Oak Canyon planning sector is outside the Redlands sphere of influence; however the Redlands General Plan states "... this canyon and its character are important to this area of the city. Therefore, the City should act as a strong positive force in the planning for this area." The Proposed Project and alternatives would not preclude the continued operation of existing livestock/dairy farms.	NO
<b>7.41 Agriculture, Implementing Policies: Agriculture</b>		
7.41e: Encourage formation of a land trust to make the most efficient use of funds available for agricultural preservation.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include funding available for agricultural preservation. This policy is not relevant to the Proposed Project.	NO

City of Redlands General Plan, 1995

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>CULTURAL &amp; PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources, Archaeologic and Paleontologic Resources</b>		
<p><b>Guiding Policy:</b> 7.30a: Protect archaeological and paleontologic resources for their aesthetic, scientific, educational, and cultural values. <i>Additional policies on archaeological resources are found in Section 3, City Design and Preservation.</i></p> <p><b>Implementing Policies: [summarized]</b> 7.30b: Use Archaeological Resource Sensitivity Map to determine if the site contains known prehistoric or historic cultural resources. 7.30c: Require applicants to hire a consulting archaeologist to develop an archaeological resource mitigation plan; monitor the project to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented. 7.30d: Require that areas found during construction to contain significant historic or prehistoric archaeological artifacts be examined by a qualified consulting archaeologist or historian for appropriate protection and preservation. 7.30e: For projects involving federal land, or requiring federal permission or funding, ensure that applicants meet stricter criteria for archaeological resource review, prior to commencement of work. 7.30f: Work with the San Bernardino County Museum to identify and protect Redlands' significant nonrenewable paleontologic resources. <i>The Museum has prepared paleontologic sensitivity maps for some portions of San Bernardino County.</i></p>	<p>Portions of this policy are programmatic and are the responsibility of the agency. The remainder of the requirements of this policy will be satisfied by compliance with the NHPA Section 106 and CEQA processes. These may include inventory, evaluation, avoidance, mitigation, and/or monitoring.</p>	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
Policy 9.0c: Support measures to reduce noise emissions by motor vehicles, aircraft, and trains.	The Proposed Project would involve use of motor vehicles that would cause noise.	YES
Policy 9.0w: Limit hours for all construction or demolition work where site-related noise is audible beyond the site boundary.	The Proposed Project would involve construction work.	YES
Policy 9.0y: Minimize impacts of loud trucks by requiring that maximum noise levels due to single events be controlled to 50 dB in bedrooms and 55 dB in other habitable spaces.	The Proposed Project would involve use of trucks for construction.	YES
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Water Quality – Soil Contamination</b>		
Policy 8.20m: Require that applicants take soil samples prior to grading or construction in existing or past orchard or other agricultural areas which were treated historically with toxic chemicals such as DBCP. If contamination is discovered, prior to development consult with the appropriate agencies for proper clean-up measures.	Tower locations are within the existing right-of-way with limited potential for residual orchard or other agricultural chemicals in soil.	NO
<b>Section 8.0 Health and Safety Element, Guiding Policy, Page 26</b>		
8.70a: Support research on the health effects of electromagnetic fields generated by power transmission lines and other sources, and take appropriate action, if warranted, to reduce hazardous exposure.	This policy relates to the effects of electromagnetic fields generated by power transmission lines. This policy will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.	NO

**City of Redlands General Plan, 1995**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
8.70b: Insist on adequate setbacks from schools, housing, and care facilities for any additional high voltage power lines or substations to be constructed in the Planning Area.	The Proposed Project would involve improvements to existing transmission lines that are within an existing utility corridor within the City of Redlands, but would not involve the construction of new transmission lines or the expansion of the utility corridor. As such, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**AIR QUALITY**

**Health and Safety Element , 8.10 Air Quality**

Policy 8.15a: Aim for the minimum practicable particulate emissions from the construction and operation of roads and buildings.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 8.15b: Reduce particulate emissions from roads, parking lots, construction sites, mining operations and agricultural lands.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 8.15c: Reduce emissions from building materials and methods which generate excessive pollutants.	The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with AQMD requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 8.15e: Adopt incentives, regulations and procedures to minimize particulate emissions during grading, and road, parking lot, and building construction.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 8.15f: Adopt incentives, regulations and procedures to control particulate emissions from unpaved roads, drives, vehicle maneuvering areas, parking lots, and disturbed land that is not developed.	The Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 8.15h: Adopt incentives, regulations and procedures to prohibit the use of building materials and methods which generate excessive pollutants.	The Proposed Project would implement Best Management Practices and comply with AQMD requirements. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.	NO

**HYDROLOGY & WATER RESOURCES**

**Water Resources/Flooding – Section 8.0, 8.20 Water Quality**

8.20o: Design projects to minimize the possibility of wind or water erosion and, where necessary, require preparation and implementation of a soil erosion plan, including soil erosion mitigation during construction.	The Proposed Project would conform to this policy through the implementation of the following APMs: APM W-1, APM W-3, APM W-11, APM W-7, APM W-9, APM W-15, APM W-17, and Mitigation Measure H-6a which provide erosion control procedures.	NO
---	---	----

**SOCIOECONOMICS**

**Economic Development Element**

Policy 11.0j: Through cooperation and support, encourage development of a labor force with skills to meet the needs of the area's businesses and industries.	Construction of the new and upgraded electric transmission lines and substation facilities would result in and require construction employment along the project route. Employment from within the City of Redlands construction workforce could result during Proposed Project construction. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be in compliance with this policy and no further analysis will be included in the EIR/EIS.	NO
--	--	----

Note: No applicable policies were identified for transportation and traffic and geology, mineral resources, and soils.

### 3.16 Town of Quartzsite, Arizona

**Town of Quartzsite General Plan, 2003.** Quartzsite is a small desert community with a 2003 population of 3,354, situated in the mountains in western Arizona, 20 miles east of the Colorado River on I-10. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers within the City of Quartzsite General Plan area. The General Plan does not include specific goals for the development of utility corridors, and no applicable policies were identified for the Proposed Project.

## 4. Policies Specific to Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative

As stated in Section 1.2 of this appendix, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative, as compared to other alternatives proposed in the EIR/EIS, traverses some new jurisdictional areas not considered in the plans presented in the previous sections (Sections 2 and 3 of this appendix). The following plans apply to the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative, but not to the Proposed Project and the other alternatives:

- Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region
  - Land Management Plan: Part 1 Southern California National Forests Vision
  - Land Management Plan: Part 2 San Bernardino National Forest Strategy
  - Land Management Plan: Part 3 Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests
- Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan
  - Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan
  - San Jacinto Valley Area Plan
  - Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan
- City of Palm Springs General Plan
- City of San Jacinto Draft General Plan

These plans were reviewed and policies that applied to this alternative are presented herein. The policies presented in this section together with several policies identified in the Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, the City of Beaumont General Plan, and the City of Banning Draft General Plan (see Section 3) that are also applicable to the Proposed Project cover the jurisdictional areas crossed by this alternative. **An analysis of the applicable policies from the plans noted above are included below.**

### 4.1 Forest Service, Land and Resource Management Plans (Forest Plans)

The Land and Resource Management Plans (forest plans) for the southern California National Forests describe the strategic direction at the broad program-level for managing the land and its resources over the next 10 to 15 years. The forest plan includes six fundamental requirements including: forest-wide multiple-use goals and objectives; suitability and capability of national forest land for resource production; identification and recommendation for wilderness areas and wild and scenic rivers; forest-wide and forest-specific standards; management area prescriptions; and monitoring and evaluation requirements for plan implementation.

**Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 1 Southern California National Forests Vision, September 2005**

Part 1 is the vision for the southern California national forests. It describes the national forests' uniqueness on a national and regional level. It describes the Forest Service's national goals, the roles and contributions that the national forests make (their niche), the desired conditions for the various landscapes within the national forests, and finally, the evaluation/monitoring indicators that will be used to assess the progress made toward accomplishing the desired conditions.

**Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 1 Southern California National Forests Vision**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
Goal 6.2: Provide ecological conditions to sustain viable populations of native and desired non native species.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact viable populations of native and desired non native species. This policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
Goal 3.1: Provide for Public Use and Natural Resource Protection.	The goal mentions the role that the road and trail system has with regard to providing public access. No Forest Service roads or trails would be affected by the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative.	NO

**Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 1 Southern California National Forests Vision**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<p>21 - Stream Protection Measures General to ALL MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</p> <p>1. ALL APPLICABLE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPs) (USDA Forest Service, 2000a) SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED AND FOLLOWED IN ALL GROUND DISTURBING FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIONS, including in all contracts, operating plans, and work orders.</p> <p>2. Prevent or limit activities that could cause channel aggradations or disaggradations (incisions).</p> <p>3. Limit any activities on defined ground water recharge areas that may introduce contaminants to the groundwater, prevent or significantly reduce water infiltration, or that prevent groundwater from reaching wells.</p> <p>4. Limit any chemical applications in or near RCAs and use containment methods that minimize risk of entry to surface and ground water.</p> <p>5. Limit disturbance on incised slopes, meadows, streams, and rehabilitate damage caused by the activity to restore or improve riparian areas.</p> <p>6. When stabilizing damaged streams, preferentially use methods that emphasize natural stream restoration designs and vegetative stabilization. Use native vegetation for stream restorations whenever possible (USDA Forest Service, 2001).</p> <p>7. Existing uses, activities, or occupancy within RCA's should be evaluated for risks or impacts and mitigated during special use renewal or re-issuance. If mitigation measures are not effective, reassess with the option to modify or eliminate the use, activity or occupancy when impacts are unacceptable.</p> <p>8. Living native woody riparian vegetation should not be cut or removed, except during road, trail or facility maintenance and where riparian management objectives can be met.</p> <p>9. Maintain vegetation where practicable to provide adequate shade to meet riparian objectives (based on the potential of the site).</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.</p>	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<p>Goal 4.1a - Administer Minerals and Energy Resource Development while protecting ecosystem health.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not impact development of energy and mineral resources.</p>	NO
<p>Note: No policies were identified for visual resources; land use; wilderness; cultural and paleontological resources; agriculture; noise; public health and safety; air quality; and socioeconomics.</p>		

**Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 2 San Bernardino National Forest Strategy, September 2005**

Part 2 is the strategy, which describes the objectives (36 CFR 219.11 (b)) that the Forest Service intends to implement in order to move the national forests toward the vision described in Part 1. Part 2 identifies suitable uses through land use zones (36 CFR 219.11(c)) that show allowable uses and opportunities by zone, including existing and recommended wilderness and other special area designations (36 CFR 219.17). Part 2 also presents a prospectus that describes past program performance, program priorities and objectives, and a discussion of performance risks, recent trends, and expectations regarding the

levels of experiences, goods, and services supplied by the national forests. The national forests have been subdivided into geographic areas called 'Places.' The theme and desired condition and the multiple-use management focus for each Place are described in Part 2.

**Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 2 San Bernardino National Forest Strategy**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
WL 2 – Management of Species of Concern Goal. Maintain and improve habitat for fish, wildlife, and plants, including those with the following designations: game species, harvest species, management indicator species, and watch list species.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact habitat for fish, wildlife, and plants, therefore, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
The San Bernardino National Forest Land Management Plan provides Scenery Management System Scenic Integrity Objectives pertaining to the protection and management of visual resources.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would cross San Bernardino National Forest Lands, and will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>Forest-specific Design Criteria, Page 150, Appendix A- Special Designation Overlays</b>		
SBNF S7- Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail - Protect scenic values in accordance with adopted scenic integrity objectives. Protect foreground views from the footpath, as well as designated viewpoints. Where practicable avoid establishing unconflicting land uses within the viewshed of the trail (Arrowhead, Big Bear, Big Bear Back Country, Cajon, Garner Valley, Idyllwild, Lytle Creek, Mojave Front Country, San Geronio, Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument, and Silverwood Places).	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not traverse the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail within the SBNF. As such, this alternative would not conflict with SBNF policies regarding this trail.	NO
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element</b>		
Optimize encumbered National Forest System land and efficiently administer special-use authorizations (SUAs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require SUAs to maximize opportunities to co-locate facilities and minimize encumbrance of National Forest System land</li> <li>• All special-uses comply with law, regulation, and policy. Upon termination restore areas to a specified condition. Administer existing SUAs in threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive species habitats to ensure they avoid or minimize impacts to threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive species and their habitats.</li> <li>• Where overhead transmission lines occur work with utility companies or authorization holders to install high-visibility or avoidance devices and raptor guards on poles and other structures potentially used as perching sites.</li> <li>• Develop operation and maintenance plans for special-use authorizations within threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive species habitats.</li> <li>• Cell and communication sites, as well as other utilities should conform to Scenic Integrity Objectives by siting color and shape of structures without complete dependence on vegetation; site installations should also be sufficiently hardened to survive wild-land fire burn-over and continue operations without removal of surrounding vegetation or structural protection.</li> </ul>	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be constructed within an existing utility corridor. SCE would be required to obtain a SUA from the USDA Forest Service for this alternative; as such, the alternative would comply with the requirements of the SUA. There would be no conflict with this policy.	NO

Note: No policies were identified for land use; agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; public health and safety; noise; transportation and traffic; air quality; hydrology and water resources; geology, mineral resources and soils; and socioeconomics.

## Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 3 Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests, September 2005

Part 3 is the design criteria, and includes the laws, the standards (36 CFR 219.11 (c) and 219.13 through 219.27) and a reference to other applicable guidance that the Forest Service uses during project planning and implementation. Standards are mandatory requirements that come into play as site-specific activities are planned for implementation, and are designed to be consistent with achieving the objectives and desired conditions. The standards act as thresholds or constraints for management activities or practices to ensure the protection of resources.

### Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 3 Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
Plan Standard S12: When implementing new projects in areas that provide for threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species, use design criteria and conservation practices (see Appendix H) so that discretionary uses and facilities promote the conservation and recovery of these species and their habitats. Accept short-term impacts where long-term effects would provide a net benefit for the species and its habitat where needed to achieve multiple-use objectives	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact areas that provide threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species. This policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES
Plan Standard S13: Manage Critical Biological land use zones so that activities and discretionary uses are either neutral or beneficial for the species and habitats for which the area was established. Accept short-term adverse impacts to threatened, endangered, and proposed species if such impacts will be compensated by the accrual of long-term benefits to habitat for threatened, endangered, and candidate species.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not be located within a Critical Biological land use zone, and it would be located in an existing utility corridor (SCE Devers-Valley No. 1 500 kV). Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative.	NO
Plan Standard S18: Protect known active and inactive raptor nest areas. Extent of protection will be based on proposed management activities, human activities existing at the onset of nesting initiation, species, topography, vegetative cover, and other factors. When appropriate, a no-disturbance buffer around active nest sites will be required from nest-site selection to fledging.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact raptor nest areas; therefore, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES
Plan Standard S19: Protect all spotted owl territories identified in the Statewide California Department of Fish and Game database (numbered owl sites) and new sites that meet the State criteria by maintaining or enhancing habitat conditions over the long-term to the greatest extent practicable while protecting life and property. Use management guidelines in the species conservation strategy (or subsequent species guidance document; see Appendix H) to further evaluate protection needs for projects, uses and activities.	Spotted owl territories are not listed as occurring within this area traversed by the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative. Therefore, no impacts to spotted owl territories are anticipated, and this policy is not relevant.	NO
Plan Standard S22: Except where it may adversely affect threatened and endangered species, linear structures such as fences, major highways, utility corridors, bridge upgrades or replacements, and canals will be designed and built to allow for fish and wildlife movement.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact fish and wildlife movement; therefore, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES

Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region: Land Management Plan: Part 3 Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
Plan Standard S25: Conduct road and trail maintenance activities during the season of year that would have the least impact on threatened, endangered, and proposed wildlife species in occupied habitats, except as provided by site-specific consultation.	No roads or trails are expected to be constructed through the SBNF as part of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative. However, if roads are built or existing roads are utilized for maintenance activities, the frequency of inspection and maintenance of access roads would depend on various conditions including weather effects. It is assumed that all access roadway maintenance associated with the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would preserve sensitive plant and animal species and habitats.	NO
Plan Standard S30: Avoid activities that result in removal, crushing, burying, burning, or mowing of host plants within critical and occupied habitat for threatened, endangered, and proposed butterfly species; unless guided differently by a species-specific consultation.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not traverse any critical or occupied habitat for butterfly species; therefore, this policy is not relevant.	NO
Plan Standard S31: Design new facilities or expansion of existing facilities to direct public use away from occupied habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact occupied habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species. This policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES

Note: No applicable policies were identified for visual resources, land use; wilderness and recreation; agriculture, cultural and paleontological resources; noise; transportation and traffic; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; geology, mineral resources, and soils; and socioeconomics.

## 4.2 Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan

The following area plans are not stand-alone documents, but rather an extension of the County of Riverside General Plan and Vision Statement. The County of Riverside Vision Statement details the physical, environmental, and economic characteristics that the County aspires to achieve by the year 2020. Using the Vision Statement as the primary foundation, the County of Riverside General Plan establishes policies for development and conservation within the entire unincorporated County territory. With the General Plan policies as a foundation, the area plans identify additional policies and direction for development and conservation specifically for the Lakeview/Nuevo Area, San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, and Harvest Valley/Winchester Area.

### Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan, 2003

This planning area is surrounded by four area plans that constitute a major portion of western Riverside County. Starting to the south and moving clockwise, we find the adjacent Harvest Valley/Winchester, Mead Valley, Reche Canyon/Badlands and San Jacinto Valley Area Plans. The City of Perris borders this area plan on the west and the City of San Jacinto borders this area plan on the east, while Lake Perris is located immediately to the north.

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use, Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting, Page 30</b>		
LNAP 7.1: Adhere to the lighting requirements specified in County Ordinance No. 655 that are intended to limit light leakage and spillage that may interfere with the operations of the Palomar Observatory.	It is not expected that the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would require additional night lighting within the Lakeview/Nuevo Planning Area.	NO
<b>Circulation, Scenic Highways, Page 41</b>		
LNAP 10.1: Protect the scenic highways in the Lakeview/Nuevo planning area from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of views of the Bernasconi Hills, the San Jacinto River, the Mystic Lake Corridor, and the San Jacinto Wildlife Area in accordance with the Scenic Highways section of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would affect views from Ramona Expressway, a county-eligible scenic highway within the Lakeview/Nuevo Planning Area.	YES
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
LNAP 8.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the General Plan Circulation Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not include significant operational traffic, and therefore it would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
LNAP 14.1: Protect life and property from the hazards of flood events through adherence to the Flood and Inundation section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
LNAP 14.2: Adhere to the flood proofing, flood protection requirements, and Flood Management Review requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 458 Regulating Flood Hazard Areas.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
LNAP 14.3: Require that proposed development projects that are subject to flood hazards, surface ponding, high erosion potential or sheet flow be submitted to the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for review.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources. Riverside County will have the opportunity to review and comment on this EIR/EIS.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic, Page 48</b>		
LNAP 16.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding, and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan, 2003**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
Slope, Page 49		
LNAP 17.2: Protect life and property through adherence to the Hillside Development and Slope policies of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Slope and Soil Instability Hazards policies of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding, and minimizing potential soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for biological resources; land use; wilderness and recreation; agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; public health and safety; air quality and socioeconomics.

**San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, 2003**

The San Jacinto Valley planning area is surrounded by the following Riverside County area plans: Southwest Area Plan, and the plans for the Harvest Valley/Winchester, Lakeview/Nuevo, Reche Canyon/Badlands, The Pass, and the large territory of the Riverside Extended Mountain Area Plan (REMAP). The incorporated Cities of Hemet and San Jacinto, as well as the Community of Valle Vista/East Hemet are located within the San Jacinto Valley planning area. In addition, the San Jacinto River traverses the northern half of the planning area from northwest to southeast, and provides significant habitat, flood and dam inundation constraints, scenic resources, and agricultural opportunities.

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, 2003**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
San Jacinto River, Page 22		
SJVAP 3.1: Protect the multipurpose open space attributes of the San Jacinto River Corridor through adherence to policies in the Flood and Inundation Hazards section of the Safety Element, the Floodplain and Riparian Area Management and Environmentally Sensitive Lands sections of the Multipurpose Open Space Element, and the Open Space, Habitat and Natural Resource Preservation section of the General Plan Land Use Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have a potential to impact open space attributes of the San Jacinto River Corridor. Refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
SJVAP 3.3: Minimize the disruption of sensitive vegetation and species, as called out in the Floodplain and Riparian Area Management and Environmentally Sensitive Lands sections of the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would minimize the disruption of sensitive vegetation and species through the implementation of various APMs, including APM B-1, which would require the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features, and APMs B-8 and B-12 that would survey and site towers so as to avoid sensitive features. Refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO
Proposed MSHCP, Page 46		
SJVAP 15.1: Protect sensitive biological resources in the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan through adherence to policies found in the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have a potential to impact sensitive biological resources in the area. Refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the referenced General Plan elements.	NO

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
SJVAP 15.2: Conserve Willow-Domino-Travers soils supporting plants such as spreading navarretia (core population), San Jacinto Valley crownscale (core population), Parish's brittlescale, Coulter's goldfields, vernal barley and Davidson's saltbush (core population).	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of Willow-Domino-Travers soils. In addition, SCE would implement various APMs that would assist in the preservation of this soil and the associated species. These APMs include APM B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO
SJVAP 15.3: Conserve clay soils intermixed with or near vernal pools occurring in the upper reaches of the San Jacinto River supporting California Orcutt grass and core populations of thread-leaved brodiaea.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of clay soils and vernal pools. In addition, SCE would implement various APMs that would assist in the preservation of clay soils, vernal pools, and the associated vegetation species. These APMs include APM B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO
SJVAP 15.4: Conserve alkaline soils associated with the upper San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek to support known populations of smooth tarplant and little mouse-tail.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of alkaline soils in the upper San Jacinto River. (This alternative is not near the Bautista Creek.) In addition, SCE would implement various APMs that would assist in the preservation of this soil and the associated vegetation species. These APMs include APM B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO
SJVAP 15.5: Conserve clay soils in grasslands and open sage scrub supporting populations of small-flowered morning glory.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of clay soils. In addition, small-flowered morning glory does not have a potential to grow in the project area. Therefore, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
SJVAP 15.6: Conserve alluvial fan sage scrub and chaparral supporting slender-horned spineflower and Parry's spineflower, known to occur in the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of alluvial fan sage scrub and chaparral. In addition, SCE would implement various APMs that would assist in the preservation of this soil and the associated vegetation species. These APMs include APM B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO
SJVAP 15.7: Conserve existing known populations of least Bell's vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher in the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, including locations at the San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek. Maintain existing breeding habitat for these species at the San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of populations of least Bell's vireo and southwestern willow flycatcher, and the species' habitat. SCE would implement APM B-21, which prohibits the clearing or disturbance of riparian habitat, or the restoration of this habitat. In addition, APM B-38 would be implemented, which would require complete avoidance of least Bell's vireo habitat by relocating towers and roads.	NO

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
SJVAP 15.8: Conserve wetland habitats along the San Jacinto River including existing vernal pools and associated watersheds. Maintain watershed processes that enhance water quality and contribute to the hydrologic regime.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of wetland habitats. SCE would implement APM B-7, which would prohibit any activities from occurring in wetland areas. The alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
SJVAP 15.9: Maintain and enhance linkage value of the upper San Jacinto River including locations at the San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek for wildlife movement and live-in habitat.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative is not expected to impact any specific linkages or wildlife movement corridors because no specific linkages are present along the route of this alternative. The alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
SJVAP 15.10: Conserve intact upland habitat block, consisting of grasslands, open sage scrub, rangelands and chaparral, in the southern Badlands, Lakeview Mountains and Mica Butte for the benefit of raptors, burrowing owl, orange-throated whiptail and other MSHCP species.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of intact upland habitat block. SCE would implement APMs B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO
SJVAP 15.11: Conserve large patches of undisturbed high-quality scrub and chamise chaparral to support known populations of Bell's sage sparrow.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of scrub and chamise chaparral. SCE would implement APMs B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO
SJVAP 15.12: Conserve sufficient upland habitat in the southern Badlands, Lakeview Mountains, and Mica Butte to support known locations of gnatcatcher.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of sufficient upland habitat to support gnatcatcher. In addition, SCE would implement APM B-37, which would require pre-construction surveys, and the avoidance of suitable gnatcatcher habitat through structure relocation. If avoidance is not feasible, SCE would restore damaged habitat or participate in a land set-aside program.	NO
SJVAP 15.13: Conserve open grasslands and sparse shrublands that support populations of Stephens kangaroo rat, with a focus on suitable habitat in the southern Badlands.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of grasslands and shrublands. SCE would implement APMs B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO
SJVAP 15.14: Conserve stream courses and adjacent coastal sage scrub, grasslands and chaparral supporting southwestern arroyo toad and mountain yellow-legged frog with a focus on suitable breeding, foraging, and/or aestivating habitats along upper San Jacinto River and Bautista Canyon.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of stream courses and adjacent habitats. SCE would implement APMs B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting. APMs B-7 and B-21 would also require the avoidance of wetland and riparian areas.	NO
SJVAP 15.15: Conserve existing habitat values of the upper San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek for the benefit of the San Bernardino kangaroo rat.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the conservation of habitat values of the upper San Jacinto River. (This alternative is not near the Bautista Creek.) SCE would implement APMs B-1, B-8, and B-12, which would require surveys, and the avoidance of direct disturbance of highly sensitive features through selective tower siting.	NO

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, 2003**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>San Jacinto River, Page 23</b>		
SJVAPP 3.8: Discourage utility lines within the River corridor. If approved, lines shall be placed underground where feasible and shall be located in a manner to harmonize with the natural environment and amenity of the River.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would cross the San Jacinto River in the San Jacinto Valley Planning Area, and would be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.	YES
<b>Land Use, Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting, Page 32</b>		
SJVAP 9.1: Adhere to the County's lighting requirements for standards that are intended to limit light leakage and spillage that may interfere with the operations of the Palomar Observatory.	It is not expected that the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would require additional night lighting within the San Jacinto Valley Planning Area.	NO
<b>Circulation, Scenic Highways, Page 37</b>		
SJVAP 12.1: Protect the scenic highways in the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties in accordance with the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would affect views from Ramona Expressway, Gilman Springs Road, and SR 79, all county-eligible scenic highways within the San Jacinto Valley Planning Area. Therefore, this policy will be further evaluated.	YES
<b>Open Space, Ridgelines, Page 45</b>		
SJVAP 14.1: Refer to the Hillside Development and Slope policies in the General Plan Land Use Element and the Scenic Resources policies in the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Element.	Discussions of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative are presented in the referenced sections.	NO
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>San Jacinto River, Page 22</b>		
SJVAP 3.8: Discourage utility lines within the River corridor. If approved, lines shall be placed underground where feasible and shall be located in a manner to harmonize with the natural environment and amenity of the River.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would occur within an existing utility corridor where utilities are compatible land uses. In addition, SCE would implement APM B-W-5, which would require towers to be located to avoid drainage channels.	NO
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>San Jacinto River Policy Area, Page 23</b>		
SJVAP 3.9: Allow existing agricultural uses within the policy area to continue by right. Transition into conservation uses will occur only by acquisition of property from willing owners.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the continuation of existing agricultural uses within the San Jacinto River area. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>Land Use , Agricultural Lands, Page 31</b>		
SJVAP 7.1: Maintain particular attention to the Foundation Component designation and Certainty System procedures/findings with respect to the agricultural designations in the lower San Jacinto Valley. Reference the Agriculture section of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Agricultural Resources section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not be located in the lower San Jacinto Valley. Therefore, this policy is not relevant to the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
SJVAP 10.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the General Plan Circulation Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>San Jacinto River, Page 22</b>		
SJVAP 3.2: Require development adjacent to the River to be set back from the top of bluffs or slopes, where applicable, an appropriate distance as determined by the County Geologist in order to protect the natural and recreational values of the River and to avoid public responsibility for property damage from soil erosion or future floods.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would cross the San Jacinto River; however it would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
<b>Flooding and Dam Inundation, Page 49</b>		
SJVAP 16.1: Adhere to the flood proofing, flood protection requirements, and Flood Management Review requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 458 Regulating Flood Hazard Areas.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources. Riverside County will have the opportunity to review and comment on this EIR/EIS.	NO
SJVAP 16.2: Require that proposed development projects that are subject to flood hazards, surface ponding, high erosion potential or sheet flow be submitted to the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for review.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
SJVAP 16.4: Protect life and property from the hazards of flood events through adherence to the Flood and Inundation Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element and the Floodplain Management section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
SJVAP 19.3: Proposed development applications affecting areas of steep slope or soil instability shall provide for the retention of existing trees and other flora, which in new development serve to stabilize steep slopes, retain moisture, prevent erosion and enhance the natural scenic beauty. Where necessary, apply immediate planting in order to stabilize cut and fill slopes.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM-1, APM-3, APM-5, APM-7, APM-9, APM-11, APM-13, APM-15, and APM-17, which provide procedures to prevent erosion and stabilize steep slopes.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>		
<b>Wildland Fire Hazard, Page 50</b>		
SJVAP 17.1: Protect life and property from wildfire hazards through adherence to the Fire Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not have a potential to create wildfire hazards. Also refer to determinations under the County of Riverside General Plan for consistency with the Fire Hazards section of the referenced General Plan element.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic, page 50</b>		
SJVAP 18.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related incidents through adherence to the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding, and minimizing earthquake-induced soil instability impacts.	NO
<b>Slope, page 50</b>		
SJVAP 19.1: Protect life and property through adherence to policies in the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Slope and Soil Instability Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding, and minimizing potential soil instability impacts.	NO

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: San Jacinto Valley Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
SJVAP 19.3: Proposed development applications affecting areas of steep slope or soil instability shall provide for the retention of existing trees and other flora, which in new development serve to stabilize steep slopes, retain moisture, prevent erosion and enhance the natural scenic beauty. Where necessary, apply immediate planting in order to stabilize cut and fill slopes.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures, which provide procedures for evaluating, avoiding, and minimizing potential soil instability impacts.	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for wilderness and recreation; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; air quality and socioeconomics.

Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, 2003

The Harvest Valley/Winchester planning area is contiguous with five other planning areas, which together constitute a major portion of the vast development potential in western Riverside County. Starting to the south and moving clockwise, we find the adjacent Southwest Area Plan, and the Sun City/Menifee, Mead Valley, Lakeview/Nuevo, and San Jacinto Valley Area Plans. The planning area encompasses only unincorporated territory, but the Cities of Perris and Hemet frame this sprawling 32,000-acre valley on the west and east, respectively. The massive Diamond Valley Lake dominates the southeastern portion of the Harvest Valley/Winchester area.

Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, 2003

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
HVWAP 19.3: Conserve existing populations of the California gnatcatcher and Bell's sage sparrow in the Harvest Valley/Winchester planning area, including locations in the North Domenigoni Hills. Conservation should focus on coastal sage scrub and grassland patches in addition to riparian habitats associated with upper Warm Springs Creek.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact existing populations of California gnatcatcher and Bell's sage sparrow. This policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES
HVWAP 19.7: Conserve and maintain vernal pool complexes and hydrology that supports Riverside fairy shrimp and other rare, threatened and endangered species known to exist within the Harvest Valley/Winchester planning area to promote genetic diversity through wildlife movement.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to vernal pool complexes and hydrology in the Harvest Valley/Winchester area. This policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Land Use, Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting, Page 42</b>		
Policy HVWAP 9.1: Adhere to the lighting requirements specified in County Ordinance No. 655 that are intended to limit light leakage and spillage that may interfere with the operations of the Palomar Observatory.	Some project facilities (substation and construction yards) may include night lighting with the potential to impact the nighttime sky within the Harvest Valley/Winchester planning area. This policy will be evaluated further in the visual resources section of the report.	YES
<b>Circulation, Scenic Highways, Page 49</b>		
Policy HVWAP 14.1: Protect the scenic highways in the Harvest Valley/Winchester planning area from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties in accordance with the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, and Circulation Elements.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would affect views from SR 74, a State-eligible scenic highway and Menifee Road, a county-eligible scenic highway within the Harvest Valley/Winchester Planning Area. This policy will be evaluated further in the visual resources section of the report.	YES

**Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan: Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan, 2003**

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
HVWAP 11.2: Maintain the County's roadway Level of Service standards as described in the Level of Service section of the General Plan Circulation Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
HVWAP 20.1: Protect life and property from the hazards of potential dam failures and flood events through adherence to the Flood and Inundation section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
HVWAP 20.2: Adhere to the flood proofing and flood protection requirements of Riverside County Ordinance No. 458.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
HVWAP 20.3: Require that proposed development projects that are subject to flood hazards, surface ponding, high erosion potential, or sheet flow be submitted to the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District for review.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of all APMs and Mitigation Measures associated with Hydrology and Water Resources.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic, Page 64</b>		
HVWAP 22.1: Protect life and property from seismic-related events through adherence to the Seismic Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would cross areas with moderate liquefaction potential and does not cross active faults (within this plan area).	NO
<b>Slope, Page 65</b>		
HVWAP 23.2: Protect life and property through adherence to the Slope and Soil Instability Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would cross minor areas of steep slopes and slopes considered susceptible to earthquake induced failure (within this plan area).	NO

Note: No applicable policies were identified for land use; wilderness and recreation; agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; noise; public health and safety; air quality; and socioeconomics.

### 4.3 City of Palm Springs, California

**City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993.** The City of Palm Springs consists of approximately 82 square miles of incorporated area including 48 square miles of the San Jacinto and the Santa Rosa Mountains and 34 square miles of desert floor. The General Plan addresses incorporated city boundaries, and an area adjacent to Palm Hills and to the northern city limit boundary in the vicinity of Interstate 10. The Proposed Project would include both the upgrading of an existing SCE 230 kV transmission line and the development of a new 500 kV line including towers within the Palm Springs General Plan area. In addition, the Devers Substation is located within the City of Palm Springs General Plan area. The City of

Palm Springs General Plan provides long-term goals and policies which direct the development of the community. The City of Palm Springs General Plan includes the seven elements mandated by the State General Plan Guidelines, as well as three optional elements of local significance. The three optional elements that Palm Springs has chosen to include are Community Design, Parks & Recreation, and Economic Development.

**City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Scenic, Recreational &amp; Natural Resources, Pages II-3 – II-23</b>		
Objective 5.1: The maintenance of appropriate natural areas in their undeveloped state.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the maintenance of natural areas in their undeveloped state.	NO
<b>Watersheds/Water Resources</b>		
Policy 5.3.3: Encourage the reservation and maintenance of natural floodplain areas and the provision of development standards which will ensure the percolation of water runoff for the replenishment of the natural water table, proper drainage and the prevention of flood damage, and the preservation of plant and animal habitats.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative could impact floodplain areas. This policy will be discussed in the environmental document.	YES
<b>Hillsides</b>		
Objective 5.4: Recognition of City's mountains and hillsides as critical open space resources for the City, conserving their aesthetic, recreational and biological resources value.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not traverse any mountains or hillsides within the City of Palm Springs. This policy is not relevant to the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative.	NO
<b>Biological Resources</b>		
Objective 5.5a: The health, vigor and productivity of plant and animal life and aesthetic values within the City, and the surrounding area, through appropriate management techniques.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not decrease the productivity of plant and animal life in the portion that traverses the City of Palm Springs. However, SCE would implement APMs B-1, B-8, B-12 and B-13, which would require the completion of surveys to identify sensitive features, provide for the avoidance of highly sensitive features, and provide for the siting of towers to avoid sensitive plants/plant communities, or other features.	NO
Objective 5.5b: A native plant and animal life heritage for the benefit of all, including future generations.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would affect the plant and animal life heritage in the portion that traverses the City of Palm Springs. However, SCE would implement APMs B-1, B-8, B-12 and B-13, which would require the completion of surveys to identify sensitive features, provide for the avoidance of any highly sensitive features, and provide for the siting of towers to avoid sensitive plants/plant communities, or other features.	NO

City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<p>Policy 5.5.2: Encourage the purchase and management by appropriate agencies of unique or sensitive habitat occurring within the City, including those of the bighorn sheep. Continue to assist in the preservation of the Coachella Valley Fringe-toed Lizard, the Desert Slender Salamander and the Flat-tailed Lizard through continued participation on the Fringe-toed Lizard Habitat Conservation Plan.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not include the purchase of any sensitive habitat within the City of Palm Springs. However, SCE would implement APMs B-26, B-33, B-34, and B-36, which would minimize impacts to the Coachella Valley Fringe-toed Lizard through conduct surveys to identify lizards, avoidance of its habitat, and restoration of affected lizard habitat. The CVMSHCP, which has incorporated the Fringe-toed Lizard Habitat Conservation Plan, was considered during evaluation of this alternative. Therefore, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>Policy 5.5.3: Undeveloped areas which are inhabited by important animal and plant populations should be preserved through land use designations which are appropriately sensitive to such populations. Habitat fragmentation should be minimized; where fragmentation occurs, corridors or linkages shall be provided to allow for animal dispersal across barriers. Development projects shall be encouraged to provide cluster development with dedication of open space. Terrain which overlooks sensitive wildlife habitat areas, particularly that of the Big Horn Sheep, should be kept clear of any human habitation or activities. Support the Big Horn Sheep Refuge managed by the University of California, Riverside, and the California Department of Fish and Game to better understand the environmental needs of this species.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the preservation of undeveloped areas, nor would it traverse areas inhabited by important animal or plant populations, including Big Horn Sheep. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not fragment land within the City of Palm Springs. The alternative would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<p>Policy 5.5.4: Encourage the preservation of ecologically important areas where surrounding wildlife and plant life are dependent on water. Watering holes, where appropriate, shall be maintained and supplemented with a permanent water supply, as such supply is available due to proximate development, to take care of the needs of the animals during the dry summer season when the natural water supply may disappear. Except on the advice of a qualified biologist, grading shall not be allowed nor shall any structure be built within 100 yards of naturally occurring surface water that has been shown to persist for five or more months in any single year. A detailed hydrological study of any project that drills a well or utilizes any other natural water resource at any elevation higher than 600 feet above sea level shall be required.</p>	<p>A portion of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be constructed on open space areas within the City of Palm Springs. Because the City's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS. In addition, water sources potentially affected by the Proposed Project will be discussed in the environmental document.</p>	YES
<p>Policy 5.5.5: Provide for the protection of significant ecosystems from fire hazards, both natural and human, where the fire would be detrimental to the ecosystem.</p>	<p>The ecosystem that the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative traverses within the City of Palm Springs includes the Whitewater River, which consists of a broad sandy and cobbled desert wash that is mostly devoid of native vegetation and that periodic high flows scour the vegetation allowing for invasion of non-native weedy plant species. The remainder of the area with the City is dominated by disturbed creosote bush scrub. These ecosystems are not significant ecosystems.</p>	NO

**City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
Policy 5.5.6: To the greatest extent possible, developers will be encouraged to salvage naturally occurring desert plant materials for incorporation into project landscaping. Developers will be encouraged to utilize native plant species to provide native habitat for birds and small mammals and to allow extension of the desert environment into urban design in the City.	SCE would implement APMs B-10 and B-11, which would require SCE to buy native plants from the landowner that would otherwise be destroyed and would require that vegetation in certain areas be cleared using hand tools. In addition, the project would not plant vegetation, except during the restoration of disturbed areas. As part of restoration efforts, SCE would implement Mitigation Measure B-1a, which would require restoration of disturbed areas, and would utilize a CPUC/BLM approved seed mix that most likely would consist of native plant species. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 5.5.7: Native trees or plants should not be removed if such removal has a significant negative impact on soil retention, soil erosion and sediment control measures, scenic routes, flood and surface water runoff, and wildlife habitats. A native tree or plant may be removed if it interferes with the reasonable improvement of a site or the planned improvement of a street or access, if it is a hazard to pedestrian or vehicular travel, if it interferes with or is causing extensive damage to public services or facilities, or if it will sustain damage due to its location to an existing or proposed structure.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative may require the removal of native vegetation. This potential impact will be discussed in the EIR/EIS.	YES
Policy 5.5.8: Plant species native to the immediate region shall be used in all landscaping located in or adjacent to natural open space areas. Exotic plant species, such as fountain grass, Tamarisk, the Mexican Fan Palm and exotic cactus species, shall be prohibited within 100 feet of undisturbed areas.	A portion of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be constructed on open space areas of the City of Palm Springs. Because the City's policies require the preservation of these areas, this policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the EIR/EIS. In addition, the potential need for landscaping will be addressed.	YES
Policy 5.5.9: A biological survey may be required of any project within the planning area prior to the making of an environmental assessment.	Biological surveys were completed for the in the area of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative. The results of these surveys will be discussed as part of the EIR/EIS, as well as any required mitigation measures. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 5.5.10: Human entry into Arenas Canyon shall not be facilitated, and no grading within the canyon proper shall be performed nor shall any grading near the canyon mouth during late spring or summer.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not traverse Arenas Canyon; therefore, this policy is not relevant.	NO

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**Land Use, Page I-19**

3.1.7: Ensure that development does not overwhelm natural features, especially the washes and the views of mountains.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would affect some views of mountains in the vicinity of Palm Springs.	YES
---	---	-----

**Hillsides, Page II-6**

5.4.1: In order to preserve the scenic beauty, to protect the mountains from damaging erosion and to protect the desert floor from flooding, the frontal slopes of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains which face the desert floor shall be preserved as open space areas. The slopes of individual landmark peaks should be preserved as open space areas. Development shall be subject to approval of a development plan on a case-by-case basis which addresses aesthetic issues such as screening and landscaping.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not affect the slopes of the San Jacinto Mountains within the City of Palm Springs.	NO
---	---	----

City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
5.4.4: In addition to other policies set forth in the General Plan, hillside development shall satisfy the following performance criteria:	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not be located on any hillsides within the City of Palm Springs.	NO
<b>Community Design, Page II-37</b>		
5.11.4: All local electrical, telephone and other utility lines shall be located underground. If the soil conditions do not permit the installation of underground utilities, then they shall be located in utility walls or development shall be diverted to other areas where these standards can be satisfied. Electrical transmission lines of 35 kV or greater shall be underground as technology permits.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be placed in an existing utility corridor, and therefore would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>Community Design, Lighting, Page II-43</b>		
5.20.1: Outdoor lighting fixtures, used for flood lighting, general illumination or advertisement, shall be fully shielded and properly focused to minimize glare and spill light into the night sky and onto adjacent properties.	Components of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative requiring night lighting would be visible from the City and would include Devers Substation and the Palm Springs Construction Yard. However, Mitigation Measures V-1b and V-6c would help ensure that the alternative would not cause nighttime lighting impacts.	NO
5.20.2: Illumination levels should be appropriate to the activity level or the size of an area.	Components of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative requiring night lighting would be visible from the City and would include Devers Substation and the Palm Springs Construction Yard. However, Mitigation Measures V-1b and V-6c would help ensure that the alternative would not cause nighttime lighting impacts.	NO
<b>Community Design, Interface of Differing Land Uses, Page II-44</b>		
5.21.1: Parcels developed for commercial or industrial uses shall incorporate buffers with abutting residential parcels which adequately protect the residential parcels from the impacts of noise, light, visibility of and from commercial vehicular traffic and risks to property. Such buffers should be a minimum width of 20 feet and shall incorporate decorative walls and landscaping including trees, and be adequately secured.	Mitigation Measure V-6b would help to lessen any visual impact from ancillary facilities associated with the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative. Therefore, this alternative would not conflict with this policy	NO
5.21.2: On-site lighting for all land uses shall be unobtrusive and constructed or located so that only the intended area is illuminated, offsite glare is minimized and adequate safety is provided.	Components of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative requiring night lighting would be visible from the City and would include Devers Substation and the Palm Springs Construction Yard. However, Mitigation Measures V-1b and V-6c would help ensure that the alternative would not cause nighttime lighting impacts.	NO
<b>Scenic Corridors, Page II-52</b>		
5.24.1: The preservation of scenic vistas should be an integral factor in all land development decisions.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not impact views from scenic vistas within the City of Palm Springs.	NO
5.24.8: Electric and communications lines shall be placed underground, and electrical substations and telephone switching facilities shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts to scenic roadway corridors.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be placed within an existing utility corridor and would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>Public Utilities, Compatibility of Infrastructure with Land Uses, Page IV-30</b>		
8.2.6: The shared use of major transmission corridors and other appropriate measures shall be encouraged as a means of preserving the aesthetic resources of the City and to lessen the visual impacts of such development.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be placed within an existing utility corridor and would not conflict with this policy.	NO

**City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Analyzed Further</b>
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>I. Community Development, Business/Industrial Land Uses, Page I-73</b>		
<p>Policy 3.30.3: Wind Energy Conversion Systems (WECS) may be permitted in areas designated as Business/Industrial where such areas are also located in the Wind Energy Overlay. Provide for industrial areas which combine alternative energy development and industrial uses in those areas which are suitable for both. Alternative energy development shall be the principal land use, and the allowed industrial uses shall be serviced directly, and primarily, by alternative energy for electrical needs. Industrial uses shall not occupy more than 15% of the area of any property; multiple properties may be combined as a single entity for such purposes under a Planned Development District. Such accessory industrial usage may be allowed only upon the provision of adequate infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that traverses WECS. It would be compatible with existing land uses in this area and would not require the expansion of a utility corridor adjacent to the City of Palm Springs. As such, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>IV. Infrastructure and Community Services, Parks and Recreation, Page IV-51</b>		
<p>Policy 10.3.5: Recommend that the Riverside County Flood Control District, the Coachella Valley Water District, and the various other utility districts design their facilities and easements to allow for recreation and park use.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not conflict with this policy.</p>	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Noise Element</b>		
<p>Objective 6.20: Low noise levels in the community as part of a broad approach to environmental quality control                      Policy 6.20.1: Protect noise sensitive land uses such as residences, hospitals and convalescent homes from acceptable noise levels from both existing and future noise sources. Sensitive land uses shall not be located where noise levels are excessive unless adequate attenuation can be achieved.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would involve development of a new noise source. Therefore, this policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	YES
<p>Objective 6.21: Minimized impact of traffic-generated noise on residential and other noise-sensitive land uses                      Policy 6.21.2: Require adequate project design or sound barriers to reduce the level of traffic-generated noise on residential and other noise-sensitive land uses to acceptable levels.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would create traffic generated noise. Therefore, this policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	YES
<p>Objective 6.24: Minimized impacts of construction noise on adjacent uses                      Policy 6.24.1: Require that construction activities which may impact adjacent residential units be limited to 7 am to 7 pm during weekdays and Saturdays, except under special circumstances approved by the City, and prohibited on Sundays and holidays.                      Policy 6.24.2: Require that construction activities incorporate feasible and practical techniques which minimize the noise impacts on adjacent uses.</p>	<p>The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would create construction noise. Therefore, this policy will be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS.</p>	YES

City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
<b>Circulation Element</b>		
Objective 7.2: Improved levels of service and safety over current traffic operations with a priority to improve local traffic patterns	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative may result in a short-term increase in traffic congestion during construction; however, it would not result in long-term future traffic loads that would require traffic mitigation improvements.	NO
Policy 7.2.1: Provide and maintain level of Service D for the City's circulation network, using average weekday conditions during the peak month of March as a base.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would result in temporary construction traffic. However, implementation of APMs A-7, V-3, and V-10 and Mitigation Measure T-7a would reduce expected construction traffic impacts. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not include significant operational traffic. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
Policy 7.2.4: Require traffic mitigation improvements and other measures of development projects to mitigate the traffic impacts of the project.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative may result in a short-term increase in traffic congestion during construction; however, it would not result in long-term future traffic loads that would require traffic mitigation improvements.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Water Resources/Flooding, Page III-3; III-6</b>		
Policy 6.1.1: No Structure shall be constructed or substantially improved and no land shall be graded in the areas designated as Watercourse or Conservation except on approval of a plan which provides that the proposed development will not result in any increase in flood levels during the occurrence of the 100-year flood discharge.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
Policy 6.1.5: Require that all new development incorporate sufficient measures to mitigate flood hazards, including the design of on-site drainage systems to link with city-wide storm drainage, gradation of the site so that runoff does not impact adjacent properties or structures on the site, and elevation of the structures above any flooding elevation. New development shall abide by the current federal Environmental Protection Agency regulations for stormwater discharge.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-4, APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-7, APM W-8, APM W-12, APM W-13, APM W-14, APM W-15, APM W-16, and Mitigation Measure H-6a, which provide runoff and flood control and prevention procedures.	NO
Policy 6.1.9: Development located adjacent to natural channels shall be set back from such channels based on runoff flow and terrain.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of the following APMs: APM W-5, APM W-6, APM W-8, APM W-13, APM W-14, and APM W-16, which provide procedures to avoid active drainage channels.	NO
<b>GEOLOGY, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND SOILS</b>		
<b>Seismic Safety, Critical Facilities, Seismic Safety, Page III-22</b>		
Policy 6.7.1: Require that earthquake survival and efficient post-disaster functioning be a primary concern in the siting, design and construction standards for essential facilities. Critical or essential facilities include major public utilities.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures that provide procedures for evaluating and mitigating earthquake related hazards.	NO

City of Palm Springs General Plan, March 1993

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
Policy 6.7.2: Require that proposed Critical facilities come under careful standards of seismic review prior to any approvals, and application of the most current professional standards for seismic design.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of several APMs and Mitigation Measures that provide procedures for evaluating and mitigating earthquake related hazards.	NO
<b>Strong Ground Shaking, Seismic Safety, Page III-23</b>		
Policy 6.9.1: Adopt and maintain high standards for seismic performance of buildings through prompt and careful enforcement of the best available standards for seismic design. All new Critical Structures shall be designed to withstand a maximum credible peak horizontal ground acceleration of 1.06g.	The proposed Devers Substation improvements are near fault(s) and in a seismically active area. However, no structures other than towers would be located within the City of Palm Springs.	NO
Note: No applicable policies were identified for agriculture; cultural and paleontological resources; public health and safety; air quality; and socioeconomics.		

#### 4.4 City of San Jacinto Draft General Plan, 2000

San Jacinto is located in western Riverside County about 80 miles east of Los Angeles, 25 miles north of Temecula, and 90 miles north of San Diego. Regional access is provided by the Ramona Expressway and State Routes 74 and 79. The current San Jacinto General Plan was originally adopted in 1985, and portions have since been amended to reflect changes in the community. In 2000, the City Council updated the Plan to address changing economic, environmental, social, legal, and other conditions.

The San Jacinto General Plan addresses these seven areas: Land Use, Community Services and Facilities, Circulation, Resource Management, Public Safety, Noise, and Housing. Relevant sections of the General Plan were reviewed to identify policies that are applicable to the Proposed Project. The table below lists the policies that apply to the Proposed Project and those policies that will be carried forward in the EIR/EIS.

City of San Jacinto Draft General Plan

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
Policy 1.3: Conserve and protect important plant communities and wildlife habitats, such as riparian areas, wetlands, vernal pools, oak woodlands and other significant tree stands, and rare and endangered species.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would have the potential to impact important plant communities and wildlife habitats. This policy will be evaluated further in the biological resources section of the report.	YES
<b>WILDERNESS AND RECREATION</b>		
<b>Open Space and Conservation Element, Environmental Resources, Page IV-26</b>		
Policy 6: Where practical, new development shall integrate pipeline, above- and unformation utility corridors and other easements (including electric, cable and telephone distribution lines) into a functional open space network.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be constructed within an existing utility corridor that would continue to be available for open space and/or recreational development. Therefore, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not conflict with this policy.	NO

City of San Jacinto Draft General Plan

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
<b>Land Use , Resource Preservation, Page LU-12</b>		
Policy 6.9: Protect valuable agricultural resources and encourage the continuation of agricultural activities.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the protection of agricultural resources. This alternative would traverse the City of San Jacinto for only a short distance (0.1 miles), and most likely would not create any ground disturbance in this area. Therefore, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>Resource Management , Agricultural Resources, Page RM-9</b>		
Policy 5.1: Encourage continuous agricultural operations	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the protection of agricultural resources. This alternative would traverse the City of San Jacinto for only a short distance (0.1 miles), and most likely would not create any ground disturbance in this area. Therefore, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not conflict with this policy.	NO
Policy 5.3: Protect agricultural lands from premature conversion to urban uses.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not convert agricultural lands to urban uses; therefore, it would not conflict with this policy.	NO
<b>Resource Management , Agricultural Resources, Implementation Program, Page Appendix RM-9</b>		
RM-22: During the development of new projects, encourage the provision and maintenance of setbacks and buffers, such as roadways, topographic features, and open space, to prevent incompatibilities between agricultural and nonagricultural land uses. A number of factors shall be used to determine the appropriate buffer, including type of agricultural use, topography, and pesticide and machinery use, among others. (Agricultural Compatibility)	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would not preclude the use of agricultural land for agricultural operations. In addition, this alternative would be located within an existing utility corridor, which would have developed these setbacks and buffers, if necessary, when it was established. SCE would also implement APM L-4, which would minimize the interference caused to agricultural operations and potentially reduce footprint of tower structures. The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>NOISE</b>		
Policy 1.1: Use the City's adopted noise/land use compatibility standards as a guide for future planning and development decisions.	The portion of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative route traveling through the City of San Jacinto would not be located near any sensitive receptors according to the City of San Jacinto General Plan Noise Element.	NO
Policy 1.3: When necessary, require buffer areas between noise sources and sensitive receptors.	The portion of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative route traveling through the City of San Jacinto would not be located near any sensitive receptors according to the City of San Jacinto General Plan Noise Element.	NO
Policy 1.5: Discourage development that will create unmitigated nuisances associated with noise.	The portion of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative route traveling through the City of San Jacinto would not be located near any sensitive receptors according to the City of San Jacinto General Plan Noise Element.	NO

City of San Jacinto Draft General Plan

Applicable Policies	Determination	Analyzed Further
Policy 2.3: Control truck traffic routing to reduce transportation-related noise impacts to sensitive land uses.	The portion of the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative route traveling through the City of San Jacinto would not be located near any sensitive receptors according to the City of San Jacinto General Plan Noise Element.	NO
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC</b>		
Policy 1.1: Provide a balanced circulation system that ensures the safe and efficient movement of people and goods throughout the City.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy by complying with the requirements of the encroachment permit (or similar authorization) required to be obtained from the applicable jurisdictional agency.	NO
Policy 1.5: Establish a truck route system that ensures the efficient movement of goods through the City, while minimizing noise and safety hazards within the community.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would result in temporary heavy-duty truck trips during its construction phase. This alternative would utilize designated truck routes and limit use of residential roadways. Therefore, the Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would be consistent with this policy and no further analysis is necessary.	NO
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>Public Safety Element, Page Appendix PS-4</b>		
PS11: Hazardous Materials: Minimize public health risks and environmental risks from the use, transport, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials by Cooperating with the County of Riverside Environmental Health Department to implement the following programs described in the Public Safety Element: Hazardous Waste Minimization, Waste Generator Permit, and Hazardous Materials Handlers.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would complete the construction and operation using standard practices for control of hazardous materials, such as handling and storage of chemicals during construction, and Hazardous Waste Business Plans for the use of hazardous materials/waste at the Substation.	NO
<b>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER RESOURCES</b>		
Policy 1.6: Discourage grading of hillside areas and on slopes greater than 25 percent.	The Devers-Valley No. 2 Alternative would conform to this policy through the implementation of APM W-9 and APM W-17, which would minimize cut and fill slopes.	NO

Note: No policies were identified for visual resources; land use; cultural and paleontological resources; air quality; geology, mineral resources, and soils; and socioeconomics.

## 5. Other Reference Documents

This section includes a brief description of other reference documents used in preparing the EIR/EIS.

### 5.1 Joshua Tree National Park Final General Management Plan Amendment Environmental Impact Statement, Backcountry and Wilderness Management Plan, October 1994

This plan is the National Park Service's general management plan for the Joshua Tree National Park. Its intent is to minimize disturbance to resources and increase visitor activities and services. Management of developed land and wilderness would be enhanced through implementation plans that decrease threats

to wilderness by removing incompatible uses and development. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the backcountry management plan and ecosystem plans, which reflect the added 234,000 acres of backcountry land within the park boundary and the designation of the area from a national monument to national park land. While the Proposed Project and alternatives would not enter the Joshua Tree National Park, the proposed new 500 kV line including a series capacitor would be located directly south of the Park. No measures applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives were identified in this EIS.

## 5.2 Yuma Proving Ground Final Range Wide EIS

This Final Range Wide EIS presents the impacts associated with the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of mission diversification and changes to land use for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). Situated in southwestern Arizona, the Yuma Proving Ground installation is a desert test and evaluation center with premier facilities for testing military material. The YPG is located west and south of the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new 500 kV line including towers, potential alternative substation sites, and a series capacitor north of the Cibola Region of the YPG area. No measures applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives were identified in the EIS.

## 5.3 California Recreational Trails Plan, 2002

The California Recreational Trails Plan identifies trail-related goals and general action guidelines designed to reach those goals for the more than 3,000 miles of trails managed by the California State Parks. These goals and action guidelines direct the actions of the Department's Statewide Trails Office regarding trail programs both within the State Park System and in its wider, statewide and national roles.

Pedestrian and off-road vehicle trails located within Joshua Tree National Park are included as part of the California Recreational Trails Plan and are subject to the regulations contained within. While the Proposed Project would not enter the Joshua Tree National Park, the proposed new 500 kV line including a series capacitor would be located directly south of the Park. However, no measures applicable to the Proposed Project and alternatives were identified in this plan.

## 5.4 Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan, Riverside Extended Mountain (REMAP) Area Plan, 2003

The Riverside Extended Mountain (REMAP) Area Plan is not a stand-alone document, but rather an extension of the County of Riverside General Plan and Vision Statement. The County of Riverside Vision Statement details the physical, environmental, and economic characteristics that the County aspires to achieve by the year 2020. Using the Vision Statement as the primary foundation, the County of Riverside General Plan establishes policies for development and conservation within the entire unincorporated County territory. With the General Plan policies as a foundation, the area plan identifies additional policies and direction for development and conservation.

The Riverside Extended Mountain Area Plan (REMAP) area is surrounded by five area plans that constitute a major portion of western Riverside County and the Coachella Valley. Starting to the southwest and moving clockwise, we find the adjacent Southwest Area Plan, and the plans for the San Jacinto Valley, The Pass, Western Coachella Valley, and Eastern Coachella Valley. Moreover, REMAP shares its extensive southern boundary with San Diego County. While the Proposed Project would go near the area covered by this plan, it would not cross over lands covered by the REMAP Area Plan. Therefore, no applicable policies were identified.

## 5.5 City of Indio, California

**City of Indio General Plan 2020, November 1994.** The City of Indio is located in Riverside County California, approximately 120 miles east of Los Angeles and 15 miles east of Palm Springs. The Planning Area for the General Plan contains the existing city limits, the city's current sphere of influence, and additional unincorporated lands that have a direct impact and link to the city. The total Planning Area covers approximately 41.5 square miles. Of this area, 20.0 square miles are currently within the city limits. Although the Proposed Project would not traverse the City of Indio boundary, the goals and policies of the City were reviewed to identify any issues of concern. No significant issues were identified.