D.13 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

CEQA requires that an EIR be prepared when a Lead Agency determines that it can be fairly argued, based on substantial evidence, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Sections 21080[d], 21082.2[d]). Based upon this requirement and in consultation with appropriate State agencies with jurisdiction over resources affected by the Proposed Project, SCE determined that an EIR for the Proposed Project should be prepared. In making this determination, SCE initially determined the Proposed Project could result in significant impacts to the following environmental issues:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Public Services and Utilities
- Visual Resources
- Land Use
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic

These eleven issue areas were noted as being the areas of key environmental concern in the Proposed Project's Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA), and are discussed in detail in Section D (Environmental Analysis) of this Draft EIR.

In addition to addressing potentially significant environmental effects, CEQA requires that an EIR briefly explain the reasons why certain effects associated with a Proposed Project have been determined not to be significant, and thus not discussed in detail in the EIR (CEQA Section 21100[c]). Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines (the Initial Study checklist) contains a list of environmental resources and issues to be evaluated when a Lead Agency conducts preliminary environmental review of a project. In conducting the preliminary environmental review of the Proposed Project, SCE determined that the Proposed Project would have no impacts to the following resources and issues:

- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing

Brief descriptions of these resources and issues, and the reasons why the Proposed Project would not have significant impacts related to these resources or issues, are provided below.

D.13.1 Mineral Resources

D.13.1.1 Setting

The California Geological Survey classifies lands according to the presence or absence of significant sand, gravel, or stone deposits that are suitable as sources of aggregate. These areas, called Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) are defined as follows (DOC, 2006):

- **SRZ**: Scientific Resources Zone containing unique or rare occurrences of rocks, minerals, or fossils that are of outstanding scientific significance.
- **MRZ-1**: Mineral Resource Zone where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present or likely to be present.
- **MRZ-2**: Mineral Resource Zone where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or there is a high likelihood for their presence and development should be controlled.

- **MRZ-3**: Mineral Resource Zone where the significance of mineral deposits cannot be determined from the available data.
- **MRZ-4:** Mineral Resource Zone where there is insufficient data to assign any other MRZ designation.

The El Casco System Project study area includes the Cities of Redlands and Yucaipa within San Bernardino County and the Cities of Calimesa, Beaumont, and Banning within Riverside County. In addition, the Proposed Project traverses portions of unincorporated Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Both Riverside and San Bernardino Counties contain areas where sand, gravel, and rock products are mined.

No areas within 0.5 mile of the Proposed Project route or facilities contain an MRZ-1 zone (SCE, 2007a). However, the area traversed by the Proposed Project route has a Mineral Resource Zone designation of MRZ-3 (Riverside County, 2006). In addition, the entire route located within the Cities of Redlands and Yucaipa within San Bernardino County is designated MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 (San Bernardino County, 2007). Aggregate, which is composed of deposits of sand and gravel, is the primary mineral resource that is actively developed in the area; however, the closest active production site is located east of the Project site in the eastern portion of the City of Banning.

According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), no oil, gas, or geothermal resources are located within the Proposed Project area (DOGGR, 2007).

D.13.1.2 Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

As described above, the Proposed Project is located within both MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 zones, but is not located within an MRZ-1 zone as defined by the California Department of Conservation. According to the designations described above, the Proposed Project would be located in an area where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or there is a high likelihood for their presence and development should be controlled.

The Proposed Project consists of construction of the new El Casco Substation, upgrades to the Zanja and Banning Substations, installation of telecommunications equipment at SCE's Mill Creek Communications Site, upgrades to a total of 15.4 miles of existing 115 kV subtransmission line and associated structures, and installation of fiber optic cables within existing conduits in public streets and on existing SCE structures between the Cities of Redlands and Banning. The El Casco Substation would be constructed within the Norton Younglove Reserve in close proximity to SCE's existing Devers-San Bernardino No. 2 220 kV transmission line right-of-way (ROW) in unincorporated Riverside County. The rebuilding of the 115 kV switchracks within Zanja and Banning Substations would occur within existing SCE substations located in the Cities of Yucaipa and Banning, respectively. Upgrades to the existing 115 kV subtransmission line would occur within existing SCE ROWs in the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, and unincorporated Riverside County. Telecommunications improvements would occur at the new El Casco Substation and within the Mill Creek Communications Site in a private in-holding in the San Bernardino National Forest (SBNF) within San Bernardino County.

Therefore, as all Proposed Project components would occur within SCE-controlled land, public streets, and a private in-holding within the SBNF, Project activities would not be located in an area containing or mined for rare or unique rocks or minerals, or where there is an indication that significant mineral deposits are present. The Proposed Project would not permanently preclude from access or change the availability of any mineral resources. The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a

known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. Furthermore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. As stated above, the Proposed Project is not located in an area designated by any applicable General Plan as containing locally important mineral resources. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

D.13.1.3 Environmental Impacts of Alternatives

CPUC's Northerly Route Alternative Option 3. As shown in Figure C-1, CPUC Northerly Route Alternative - Option 3, the main difference between the CPUC's Northerly Route Alternative Option 3 (also referred to as the Route Alternative Option 3) and the Proposed Project is the routing of the 115 kV subtransmission line. This routing of the 115 kV subtransmission line would result in a slight change to the land impacted by the Route Alternative Option 3 as compared to the Proposed Project. While the Route Alternative Option 3 El Casco to Banning Subtransmission Line - Segment 2 (Grey Line shown on Figures C-1 and C-3) would be located directly adjacent to an existing mining operation, the subtransmission line would be located entirely within existing SCE ROW and City of Banning utility ROWs Furthermore, all other Route Alternative Option 3 subtransmission line components would occur within existing SCE-controlled ROW. Therefore, Route Alternative 3 activities would not be located in an area containing or mined for rare or unique rocks or minerals, or where there is an indication that significant mineral deposits are present. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

Partial Underground Alternative. This alternative would contain the same elements as the proposed El Casco System Project (see Section B, Project Description), except for an approximately one-mile portion of the alignment through the Sun Lakes community beginning just east of Highland Springs Avenue and ending just east of S. Riviera Avenue and west of S. Highland Home Road. The Partial Underground Alternative would place this segment of 115 kV subtransmission line underground. As the underground segment and all subtransmission line components would occur within existing SCE-controlled ROW, Partial Underground Route activities would not be located in an area containing or mined for rare or unique rocks or minerals, or where there is an indication that significant mineral deposits are present. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

No Project Alternative. If the Proposed Project or an alternative to the Proposed Project would not be constructed, SCE would implement temporary operating procedures within the Vista and Devers Systems, which could include contracting local generation, temporarily transferring Vista and Devers Systems substations to adjacent 115 kV systems, and/or implementing rolling blackouts. The No Project Alternative would require the construction of two 12 kV distribution lines (each approximately 9 miles in length) at Maraschino Substation. As the location of these ROWs is unknown, it is possible that these new 12 kV lines could be located within designated Riverside County MRZs. Therefore, the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in impacts to mineral resources.

D.13.2 Population and Housing

D.13.2.1 Setting

This section presents comprehensive baseline population, housing, and employment data. Regional and local demographic data is provided from the Year 2000 U.S. Census. The El Casco System Project study area includes the Cities of Redlands and Yucaipa within San Bernardino County and the Cities of Calimesa, Banning, and Beaumont within Riverside County. Part of the Proposed Project route travels though unincorporated San Bernardino and Riverside Counties; however, demographic data for

unincorporated areas is unavailable. Table D.13-1 identifies the year 2000 Census population, housing, and employment statistics for the Project area.

Table D.13-1. Year 2000 US Census Demographic Characteristics

Location	2000 Population	2000 Housing	2000 Employment
San Bernardino County	1,709,434	601,369 12.1% Vacancy Rate (72,775 Units)	661,272 11.3% in Construction Trades (74,519)
City of Redlands	63,591	24,790 4.8 % Vacancy Rate (1,197 Units)	29,942 7.0 % in Construction Trades (2,097)
City of Yucaipa	41,207	16,112 5.7 % Vacancy Rate (919 Units)	18,483 10.0 % in Construction Trades (1,853)
Riverside County	1,545,387	584,674 13.4% Vacancy Rate (78,456 Units)	602,856 11.8% in Construction Trades (70,974)
City of Calimesa	7,139	3,248 8.2 % Vacancy Rate (266 Units)	3,079 8.5 % in Construction Trades (263)
City of Banning	23,562	9,761 8.6 % Vacancy Rate (838 Units)	7,507 10.9 % in Construction Trades (818)
City of Beaumont	11,384	4,258 8.9 % Vacancy Rate (377 Units)	4,394 13.4 % in Construction Trades (590)

D.13.2.2 Environmental Impacts of Proposed Project

As discussed in Section B, Project Description, a total of 331 construction personnel would be required for construction of the Project (see Tables B-2, B-3, B-5, B-7, B-9, B-10, B-11, B-12, and B-13; Construction Personnel and Equipment Summary tables for each Project component). However, because Project construction would be divided into two phases, and construction of multiple portions of the Project could be accomplished by the same crew at different times, the actual number of construction personnel required is expected to be fewer than 331. It is assumed that required construction personnel would come from within Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The maximum number of workers required for the Proposed Project (331) would account for only 0.23 percent of the total construction workforce within Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Therefore, construction personnel are not expected to relocate to the area and generate a permanent increase to population levels or result in a decrease in available housing. No construction impacts related to existing or future population growth would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

Upon completion, the Proposed Project would be unmanned, requiring only periodic maintenance and would therefore not require additional employees for operation. Furthermore, the Proposed Project does not involve the construction of any new residential housing units. No residential properties exist within the Proposed Project ROW and no housing or persons would be displaced by the Project. The Proposed Project is required to properly serve new development in the area with electrical service, but is not considered a catalyst for housing development because it is an upgrade to a system that is already overloaded. As such, implementation of the Proposed Project would not generate a direct increase in the permanent population of the area or cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections, nor would it require the relocation of existing housing or persons. No impacts related to an increase in population or the displacement of existing housing or persons would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

D.13.2.3 Environmental Impacts of Alternatives

CPUC's Northerly Route Alternative Option 3. As shown in Figure C-1, CPUC Northerly Route Alternative - Option 3, the main difference between the CPUC's Northerly Route Alternative Option 3 (also referred to as the Route Alternative Option 3) and the Proposed Project is the routing of the 115 kV subtransmission line. As the subtransmission line and all components of Route Alternative Option 3 would be located entirely within existing SCE ROW and City of Banning utility ROWs, no housing units, businesses, or persons would be relocated as a result. Furthermore, it is assumed that the routing of the 115 kV subtransmission line associated with Route Alternative Option 3 would result in a similar required construction workforce as the Proposed Project. The number of workers required (331) would account for only 0.23 percent of the total construction workforce within Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Therefore, construction personnel are not expected to relocate to the area and generate a permanent increase to population levels or result in a decrease in available housing. No construction impacts related to existing or future population growth impacts would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. No impacts to population or housing would occur with Route Alternative Option 3.

Partial Underground Alternative. This alternative would contain the same elements as the proposed El Casco System Project (see Section B, Project Description), except for an approximately one-mile portion of the alignment through the Sun Lakes community beginning just east of Highland Springs Avenue and ending just east of S. Riviera Avenue and west of S. Highland Home Road. The Partial Underground Alternative would place this segment of 115 kV subtransmission line underground. As the underground segment and all subtransmission line components would occur within existing SCE controlled ROW, no housing units, businesses, or persons would be relocated as a result. As shown in Table C-2, Construction Personnel and Equipment Summary for Underground Construction, an additional 50 construction workers would be required. The number of workers required for the Partial Underground Alternative (381) would only account for 0.26 percent of the total construction workforce within Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Therefore, construction personnel are not expected to relocate to the area and generate a permanent increase to population levels or result in a decrease in available housing. No impacts to population or housing would occur with the Partial Underground Alternative.

No Project Alternative. If the Proposed Project or an alternative to the Proposed Project would not be constructed, SCE would implement temporary operating procedures within the Vista and Devers Systems, which could include contracting local generation, temporarily transferring Vista and Devers Systems substations to adjacent 115 kV systems, and/or implementing rolling blackouts. The No Project Alternative would require construction of two 12 kV distribution lines (each approximately 9 miles in length) at Maraschino Substation as well as the construction of a third 28 MVA transformer at Maraschino Substation and switchrack rebuilds at Banning and Zanja Substations. These construction activities would generate short-term temporary construction worker requirements. However, based on the total construction workforce within Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, no construction personnel would be expected to relocate to the area and generate a permanent increase to population levels or result in a decrease in available housing as a result of these construction activities. However, as the location of the required new two 12 kV line ROWs is unknown, it is possible that these new 12 kV lines could require the relocation of structures and persons. Therefore, the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in impacts to population and housing.