

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

PROJECT INFORMATION	
1. Project Title:	Valley-Rainbow 500 kV Interconnect Project
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:	California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
3. Contact Person and Phone Number:	Beth Shipley (415) 703-1729
4. Project Location:	The Project area is in northern San Diego County and southwestern Riverside County.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	San Diego Gas & Electric Company 101 Ash Street San Diego, CA 92101
6. General Plan Designation:	Various
7. Zoning:	Various
8. Description of Project: (Describe the entire action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the Project, and any secondary, support, or offsite features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)	<p>The Valley-Rainbow Interconnect Project will provide an interconnection between SDG&E's existing 230-kilovolt (kV) transmission system at the proposed Rainbow Substation on Rainbow Heights Road near the unincorporated community of Rainbow in San Diego County, and Southern California Edison's (SCE) existing 500 kV transmission system, at the Valley Substation on Menifee Road in the unincorporated community of Romoland in Riverside County.</p> <p>The six major elements of the Project are described as follows: (1) Construction and operation of a new single-circuit 500 kV transmission line; (2) Construction and operation of a new SDG&E 500/230/69 kV substation; (3) Modifications to SCE's existing Valley Substation; (4) Installation of a second 230 kV circuit on the existing Talega-Escondido 230 kV transmission structures and modifying the existing substations at Talega and Escondido; (5) Rebuild of a 7.7-mile section of the existing 69 kV transmission circuit on new 69 kV wood and steel pole structures adjacent to the existing 230 kV line within the existing Talega-Escondido right-of-way; and (6) Addition of a 230 kV Static Synchronous Compensator (STATCOM) at the existing Mission Substation. Shunt capacitors would be added at the Miguel and Sycamore Canyon substations (230 kV).</p>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

PROJECT INFORMATION	
9.	<p>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the Project's surroundings.)</p> <p>Various, including but not limited to vacant undeveloped lands, agriculture, large lot residential, commercial, recreation and biological preserve.</p>
10:	<p>Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)</p> <p>In addition to CPUC approval and implementation of the Project, <i>Table 1</i> provides anticipated agency approvals, discretionary actions, or permits will be required to implement the Valley-Rainbow 500 kV Interconnect.</p>
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:	
<p>The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.</p>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation
<input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	
DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)	
<p>I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>I find that although the proposed Project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the Project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

TABLE 1. PERMIT, APPROVALS AND CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

Permit, Approval or Consultation	Action Requiring Permit or Consultation	Authorizing Agency		
		Federal	State	Local
ROW permits on public lands Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) fo 1976 (PL 94-579) 43 USC 1761-1771 43 CFR 2800	Construction and operation on public lands administered by the BLM.	BLM		
Easement to cross Department of Defense Lands	Construction and operation on land under DOD management	Camp Pendleton – Marine Corps		
Easement to cross Indian Lands 25 CFR 169	Construction and operation on land under BIA management	BIA; concurrence of the Tribal Council		
Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity	Compliance with California Environmental Quality Act		CPUC	
106 Consultation National Historic Preservation Act of 1996, (16 USC 470) (36 CFR Part 800)	Construction and operation on land with sensitive cultural resources	BLM, Camp Pendleton, BIA	California SHPO Concurrence	
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq)	Construction and operation within endangered species habitat	BLM, BIA, and Camp Pendleton consultation with USFWS		

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

TABLE 1. PERMIT, APPROVALS AND CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS

Permit, Approval or Consultation	Action Requiring Permit or Consultation	Authorizing Agency		
		Federal	State	Local
404 Permit – Clean Water Act 33 USC 1344	Placement of dredge or fill materials in waters of the U.S.	Corps of Engineers; EPA and USFWS Concurrence	CDFG Concurrence	
Section 401 Certification – Clean Water Act; Pollution Prevention Plan 33 USC 1344	General construction	EPA Authorization on Tribal Lands	Regional Water Quality Control Board	
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) – Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan 33 USC 1342	General construction		Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Permit to Construct	General construction causing air emissions		South Coast Air Quality Management District and San Diego Air Pollution Control District	
1601 and 1603 Permit – Stream Course Alteration	Alteration of the natural state of any stream		CDFG	
Highway Crossing Permit	Construction and operation within, under, or over federal highway ROW	Meet Criteria set by FHWA on Federal Aid Highways	Caltrans	
Encroachment Permit	Construction and operation within, under, or over state highway ROW		Caltrans	Riverside County, San Diego County, Cities

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

PROJECT INFORMATION

I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or is "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects :

1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and 2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to an earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project. The earlier EIR adequately analyzes the proposed Project, so NO ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT OR NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Signature

Date

Beth Shipley
Printed Name

Title

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

EXPLANATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

EXPLANATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM:

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant
9. This checklist has been adapted from the form in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended effective January 1, 2001 and the additional provisions of the CPUC's Rule 17.1 for implementing CEQA.

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES <i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion of Environmental Impacts				
1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES				
<i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>				
Discussion of Environmental Impacts	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES <i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion of Environmental Impacts					
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	□	☒	□	□	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	□	☒	□	□	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	□	☒	□	□	
iv) Landslides?	□	☒	□	□	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☒	□	□	□	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	□	☒	□	□	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	□	☒	□	□	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	□	□	□	☒	
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	□	☒	□	□	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	□	☒	□	□	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	□	☒	□	□	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	□	□	☒	□	

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES <i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion of Environmental Impacts					
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:					
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES <i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>			Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion of Environmental Impacts		Potentially Significant Impact			
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. NOISE – Would the project result in:					
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES <i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion of Environmental Impacts					
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:					
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. PUBLIC SERVICES					
a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. RECREATION					
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:					
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES <i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion of Environmental Impacts					
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:					
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider/s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES <i>Refer to Attachment A for a discussion of environmental impacts</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion of Environmental Impacts				
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ATTACHMENT A

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The following provides a discussion of the environmental impacts that are anticipated to occur as a result of constructing and operating the proposed Valley-Rainbow 500 kV Interconnect Project. This section provides a brief explanation for the answers provided in the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist. All of the issues which were determined to have a "potentially significant impact" will be analyzed in the EIR. No determinations have yet been made as to the significance of these potential impacts; such determinations will be made in the EIR after the issues are considered thoroughly. The EIR will present existing conditions, impacts, and mitigation, as appropriate for these issues. The remaining issues generally will not be addressed in the EIR, except as noted otherwise. The issues which were determined to be "less than significant with mitigation incorporated" have mitigation measures (Project protocols) incorporated into the Project to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Project protocols provided by SDG&E as part of the proposed Project are included in *Attachment B* to the Initial Study. These mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring Program to be developed for the Project. All of the issues determined to be "less than significant" or "no impact" are discussed briefly below.

1. AESTHETICS

a) **Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

Potentially significant impact. Implementation of the proposed 500 kV Interconnect transmission line as well as the new 500/230/69 kV Substation would affect visual quality as well as sensitive viewers. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to visual resources.

b) **Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 1a.

c) **Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 1a.

- d) **Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Depending upon construction techniques and hours, new sources of light and glare may be present during Project construction. However, due to the short-term nature of construction, any light or glare effects are anticipated to be less than significant. During operation, low wattage lights with a downward focus would be installed around the new Rainbow Substation. However, the lights would only be used during night time service calls and therefore the use of these lights would be a less than significant impact. Potential glare from the poles and conductors (lines) is anticipated to be less than significant with the use of dulled metal finish on poles and non-specular conductors.

2. AGRICULTURE

- a) **Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

Less than significant impact. Placement of transmission towers or poles would occur in some areas of prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance and Williamson Act contracts. However, due to the limited footprint and ground disturbance of the towers or poles and tower, their placement would result in a less than significant impact to prime, unique or farmland of statewide importance.

- b) **Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

Less than significant impact. See response 2a.

- c) **Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?**

Potentially significant impact. Implementation of the proposed Project may conflict with agricultural operations within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to agricultural operations.

3. AIR QUALITY

- a) **Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

Potentially significant impact. The construction of the proposed Project would result in short-term emissions of criteria pollutants (for which the United States Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has established ambient air quality standards) thereby contributing to violations of State or Federal air quality standards. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses impacts to air quality.

- b) **Would the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 3a.

- c) **Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 3a.

- d) **Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 3a.

- e) **Would the Project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

Less than Significant Impact. Construction of the substation may produce odors; however, perception of the odor would be short-term in nature and not considered a significant impact. Operation of the substation will not produce noticeable odors.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- a) **Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Potentially significant impact. Construction and operation of the proposed Project could result in impacts to plant and animal life including but not limited to endangered, threatened or rare species and/or their habitats. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to biological resources, including impacts to locally designated species and natural communities, wetland habitat and wildlife corridors.

- b) **Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 4a.

- c) **Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 4a.

- d) **Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 4a.

- e) **Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 4a.

- f) **Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

Potentially significant impact. Project impacts will be evaluated in the context of ongoing large-scale regional conservation planning efforts in Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and the County of San Diego's northern segment to Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP).

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) **Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?**

Potentially significant impact. The Project passes near known archaeological sites. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to archaeological resources.

- b) **Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 5a.

- c) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Several alluvial and sedimentary deposits, ranging from late Pleistocene to late Pliocene in origin, underlie valley floors in the Project area. These formations exhibit a moderate to high potential for the occurrence of significant fossil resources. Due to the limited area to be disturbed by construction activities, the potential for impacting important paleontological resources is considered low. However, because impact significance cannot be determined prior to excavation, a qualified paleontologist will be consulted during final design studies to define the areas where fossils would most likely be found, and to develop, if needed, a program for monitoring excavation in those areas. Geologic formations which are sedimentary in origin have the potential to contain paleontological resources. If fossils are discovered during construction activities, the fossils will then be deposited in a scientific institution with paleontological collections. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce potential paleontological impacts to below a level of significance.

- d) **Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 5a.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a) **Would the Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:**

- i. **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State**

Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?**
- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
- iv. Landslides?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. The Project would be located in an area that would expose structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. However, Project elements would be located away from traces of active faults and designed to withstand strong shaking and seismic-related ground failure.

As part of the final engineering design for the Project and prior to construction, soils and geologic conditions will be mapped and analyzed for the study area. Locales with geologic conditions prone to hazards such as slope instability or faults or erosion will be identified and appropriate measures will be incorporated into final Project design. Construction methods and facility design will be tailored to route requirements. Project facilities will adhere to all California Uniform Building Code, SDG&E's General Conditions and Standard Specifications and CPUC's General Order for seismic standards. As a result, Project impacts related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, subsidence of the land and expansive soils are expected to be less than significant.

- b) Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 8a.

- c) **Would the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in, on or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. The Project would be located in areas that have unstable soil that could potentially result in on or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. However, Project elements would be located away from these areas and designed to withstand unstable geologic or soil conditions. See response 6a.

- d) **Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks of life or property?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. The Project would be located in areas that have expansive soil. However, Project elements would be located away from these areas to minimize or eliminate the potential risk and designed to withstand expansive soil conditions. See response 6a.

- e) **Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

No impact. The Project will not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a) **Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. The Project does not involve the use of hazardous materials beyond petroleum products and other similar products used for construction and construction vehicles. Project protocols will be in place to ensure the lawful and proper storage and use of these materials. All transport,

handling, use, and disposal of substances such as petroleum products, solvents, and paints related to construction, operation, and maintenance of the substation shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials.

The only hazardous material that would be used in operation of the substation is transformer oil. Aboveground, concrete containment basins would be constructed around the transformers, designed to contain 100 percent of the oil in the event of a spill. Transformer oil would not be stored onsite, but at SDG&E's central maintenance facility in San Diego. Used oil and oil saturated materials generated from maintenance and operation activities would be transported to SDG&E's central maintenance facility for disposal. All use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes would be in compliance with state Title 22 and federal Title 40 requirements, including the oil spill control and countermeasure plan (SCCP) required by Title 40 CFR Section 112.7. No extraordinary risk of accidental explosion or the release of hazardous substances is anticipated with development and implementation of the proposed substation.

- b) *Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?***

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. No extraordinary risk of accidental explosion or the release of hazardous substance is anticipated to result during the construction or operational phase of the proposed Project. Please refer to response 7a.

- c) *Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. See response 7a and 7b.

- d) **Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Less than significant impact. No hazardous material sites are recorded in the Project area that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Proper siting of the Project components would avoid, eliminate or reduce potential impacts of hazardous materials to a level of less than significant.

- e) **For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?**

Potentially significant Impact. There are no public airports within two miles of the Project. However, the French Valley Airport is approximately three miles from the Project and therefore could result in a safety hazard. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to air travel.

- f) **For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?**

Potentially significant Impact. There are several private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project. See response 7e.

- g) **Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Less than significant impact. The Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h) ***Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. During construction, there is a risk of wildfire from construction equipment; however, Project protocols would prevent or minimize this risk. During Project operation, there is a risk of flashovers or that a conducting object could come into close contact with the transmission line, a live line or conductor falling to the ground igniting a wildfire. However, it is anticipated that regular trimming of trees and other regular maintenance of the right-of-way, transmission structures and lines would reduce this potential risk to a less than significant level.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a) ***Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

Potentially significant impact. During construction grading, there is the potential for some short-term erosion to occur and discharge of pollutants, especially during wet weather seasons. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to water quality.

- b) ***Would the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of a local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

Less than significant impact. Short-term water provision would be required during project construction for dust suppression and possibly for landscaping and restoration activities. Short-term water provision may come from nearby wells or by water trucks. Short-term water needs during construction would not substantially affect groundwater supplies, the production rate of existing wells, or regional water supply.

Operation of the Project would not require the use of water. The additional impervious area developed by the Project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge.

- c) **Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite?**

Potentially significant impact. Construction of the substations, transmission towers or poles and access roads would alter existing drainage patterns, runoff characteristics and storm water volume and therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses project impacts to surface water drainage and erosion.

- d) **Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite?**

Less than significant impact. Construction of the substations, transmission towers or poles and access roads would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner which would result in flooding. Because most of the Project area would remain unpaved, rainfall would either infiltrate or sheet flow to unpaved areas.

- e) **Would the Project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. The Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage system. Substation design will include storm water control systems.

f) **Would the Project otherwise degrade water quality?**

Less than significant impact. No other degradation of water quality would result from Project implementation.

g) **Would the Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

No impact. No housing is proposed by the Project.

h) **Would the Project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

Less than significant impact. The Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No structures would impede or redirect flood flows as a result of the proposed Project's implementation.

i) **Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

Less than significant impact. See response 8h.

j) **Would the Project be susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

No impact. Hydrologic and topographic conditions of the Project site and surrounding area do not lend themselves to these conditions. The proposed Project is not near any water body that would potentially be effected by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. It is not anticipated that the proposed Project would be susceptible to any of the above stated natural phenomena.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING**a) Would the Project physically divide an established community?**

Potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Project may impact established communities including existing residential, school, business and recreational uses. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses any instances of potential disruption of existing as well as planned land uses.

b) 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?

Potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Project may conflict with general plan and zoning designations. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses whether or not the proposed Project is (in)consistent with any elements of adopted community plans, policies or goals.

c) Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Potentially significant impact. Implementation of the Project may conflict with adopted environmental plans. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to adopted environmental plans or policies.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES**a) Would the Project 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?**

No Impact. No known mineral resources are known for the Project site.

- b) **Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

No Impact. See response 10a.

11. NOISE

- a) **Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Potentially significant impact. Construction and operation activities have the potential to increase noise levels for adjoining areas. Exposing people to noise levels that exceed local noise ordinances would be a significant impact. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to noise.

- b) **Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 11a.

- c) **Would the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 11a.

- d) **Would the Project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 11a.

- e) **For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 11a.

- f) **For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?**

Potentially significant impact. See response 11a.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a) **Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

Potentially significant impact. The EIR will address Project growth inducement effects.

- b) **Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. The Project will result in the displacement of one residence. This impact is considered significant and will be addressed in the EIR under land use. This impact however would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing.

- c) **Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated . See response 12b.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) **Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:**

i. **Fire protection?**

Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. See response 7h.

ii. **Police protection?**

No impact. The Project will not provide additional long-term employment opportunities. No residences are proposed as part of the proposed Project, and therefore, the proposed Project would not generate additional population or generate new demand for police protection.

iii. **Schools?**

No impact. As discussed under response 13a-ii, the proposed Project would not generate population growth; therefore, no new demand would be placed on schools.

iv. **Parks?**

No Impact. The proposed substation would be an unmanned facility and no population increase would result with Project implementation. There would be no increase in the demand for parks or other recreational facilities.

v. **Other public facilities?**

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed under response 13a-ii, the proposed Project would not generate population growth; therefore, no new

demand would be placed on public facilities. Heavy trucks used during construction and maintenance of Project facilities may result in a minimal increase in the need for roadway maintenance.

14. RECREATION

- a) ***Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

No Impact. No population would be generated by the proposed Project. Therefore, no demand for recreational facilities would occur.

- b) ***Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

No impact. No recreational facilities are included or would be required as part of the proposed Project.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- a) ***Would the Project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Potentially significant impact. Construction traffic for the proposed Project would not create a substantial impact on traffic volumes. However, construction may temporarily affect traffic patterns and result in temporary traffic congestion and associated traffic hazards. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses traffic and circulation, specifically impacts to the following:

- Closing access to any individual property; hazards/barriers for pedestrians or bicycles

- Closing a road and not providing an alternative route
- Routing construction vehicles (heavy trucks) along residential streets; construction crew parking

b) Would the Project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?

Less than Significant Impact. See response 15a-and 15d. Short-term and limited construction-related traffic would not create a substantial impact on traffic volumes nor change traffic patterns in such a way as to affect the level of service (LOS) or vehicle to congestion ratio on study area roadways.

c) Would the Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

Potentially significant impact. See response 7e and 7f.

d) Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Potentially significant impact. See response 15a.

e) Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially significant impact. See response 15a.

f) Would the Project result in inadequate parking capacity?

Potentially significant impact. See response 15a.

- g) **Would the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

No impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies or involve elimination of facilities supporting alternative transportation such as bus turnouts or bicycle racks.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a) **Would the Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

No impact. Project implementation would not impact wastewater treatment. Sewer is not required nor part of the proposed Project.

- b) **Would the Project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?**

No impact. Operation of the Project would not require the use of water or generate wastewater.

- c) **Would the Project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less than significant impact. Development of the Project would not significantly increase impervious areas within the local drainage basin. Drainage improvements would be engineered to accommodate minor flows from the Project and impacts would not be significant so as to require or alter offsite drainage systems.

- d) **Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

Less than significant impact. See response 8-b.

- e) **Would the Project result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand in addition to the provider/s existing commitments?**

No impact. No wastewater treatment would be required by the proposed unmanned substation.

- f) **Would the Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?**

Less than significant impact. The Project will generate a limited amount of solid waste during construction. It is anticipated that the solid waste generated by Project construction would have a less than significant impact on local solid waste facilities. No regular solid waste disposal is proposed as part of the substation Project. Wastes produced at the substation by maintenance and repair activities would be transported back to the central SDG&E maintenance facility in San Diego for disposal. The amount of solid waste generated by the proposed substation would not be substantial or interfere with the sufficient permitted capacity of nearby landfills.

- g) **Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No impact. See response 16f. All solid waste will be disposed of in an approved site in compliance with federal, state and county regulations.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) **Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Potentially significant impact. Based on the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist,

the CPUC has determined that the proposed Project may have a number of potentially significant environmental effects. Therefore, CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared to fully analyze the existing environmental setting, the potential impacts resulting from Project implementation, and potential mitigation measures, if necessary, in the following areas: *biological resources, cultural resources, land use, visual quality, public health, safety and nuisance, traffic, noise, air quality, and hydrology/water quality.*

- b) **Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)?**

Potentially significant impact. Based on the analysis of all the above questions, it has been determined that the Project may contribute incrementally to regional impacts to visual resources, biological resources, cultural resources, land use, public safety, traffic, noise, air quality and hydrology and water quality. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses cumulative impacts to these environmental impact categories.

- c) **Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Potentially significant impact. Based on the analysis of all the above questions, it has been determined that the Project may significantly affect land use, noise, air and public safety and therefore could directly affect human beings. See responses 3a, 7b, 7e, 7f, 9a and 11a.

ATTACHMENT B
SDG&E Valley Rainbow
Interconnect Project Protocols
Proponent's Environmental Assessment
(March 2001)

1. Except when not feasible, all Project vehicle movement would be restricted to existing access roads and access roads constructed as a part of the Project and determined and marked by SDG&E in advance for the contractor, contractor-acquired accesses, or public roads. New access road construction for the Project would be allowed year round. However, when feasible every effort would be made to avoid constructing roads during the nesting season . When it is not feasible to keep vehicles on existing access roads or to avoid constructing new access roads during the nesting, breeding, or flight season, SDG&E would perform three site surveys in the area where the work is to occur. The surveys would be performed to determine presence or absence of endangered nesting birds, or other endangered species in the work area. Endangered species for which surveys would be performed include; the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, arroyo toad, southwestern pond turtle, red-legged frog, coastal California gnatcatcher, Stephens' kangaroo rat, San Bernardino kangaroo rat, Quino checkerspot butterfly, Riverside fairy shrimp, San Diego fairy shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp. SDG&E would submit results of those surveys to the USFWS and CDFG, and consult on reasonable mitigation measures to avoid or minimize for potential impacts, prior to vehicle use off existing access roads or the construction of new access roads.

However, these site surveys would not replace the need for SDG&E to perform detailed on the ground surveys as required by Protocols 20, 21, 42, 43 and 44. Parking or driving underneath oak trees is not allowed in order to protect root structures. In addition to regular watering to control fugitive dust created during clearing, grading, earth-moving, excavation and other construction activities which could interfere with plant photosynthesis, a 15 mile per hour speed limit shall be observed on dirt access roads to allow reptiles and small mammals to disperse and reduce dust.

2. The area limits of Project construction and survey activities would be predetermined based on the temporary and permanent disturbance areas noted on the final design engineering drawings to minimize environmental effects arising from the Project, with activity restricted to and confined within those limits. Survey personnel shall keep

survey vehicles on existing roads. During Project surveying activities, brush clearing for foot paths, line-of-sight cutting and land surveying panel point placement in sensitive habitat would require prior approval from the Project biological resource monitor in conformance with Protocol 20 and 21. Hiking off roads or paths for survey data collection is allowed year round as long as other Protocols are met. Stringing of new wire and re-conductoring for the Project would be allowed year round in sensitive habitats if the conductor is not allowed to drag on the ground or in brush and all vehicles used during stringing remain on Project access roads. Where stringing requires that conductor drag on the brush or ground or vehicles leave Project access roads, SDG&E would perform three site surveys to determine presence or absence of endangered nesting birds or other endangered species in the work area. Endangered species for which surveys would be performed include; the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, arroyo toad, southwestern pond turtle, red-legged frog, coastal California gnatcatcher, Stephens' kangaroo rat, San Bernardino kangaroo rat, Quino checkerspot butterfly, Riverside fairy shrimp, San Diego fairy shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp. SDG&E would submit results of those surveys to the USFWS and CDFG, and consult on reasonable and feasible mitigation measures for potential impacts, prior to dragging wire on the ground or through brush, or taking vehicles off Project access roads. However, these site surveys would not replace the need for SDG&E to perform detailed on-the-ground surveys as required by Protocols 20, 21, 42, 43 and 44. No paint or permanent discoloring agents would be applied to rocks or vegetation to indicate limits of survey or construction activity where any sensitive cultural resources or wildlife habitats are encountered in the field.

3. Project construction activities shall be designed and implemented to avoid or minimize new disturbance, erosion on manufactured slopes, and off-site degradation from accelerated sedimentation, and to reduce maintenance and repair costs. Maintenance of cut and fill slopes created by Project construction activities would consist primarily of erosion repair. In situations where revegetation would improve the success of erosion control, planting or seeding with native hydroseed mix may be done on slopes.
4. In areas where re-contouring is not required, vegetation would be left in place wherever feasible and original ground contour would be maintained to avoid excessive root damage and allow for resprouting.

5. In areas where ground disturbance is substantial or where recontouring is required (e.g., marshaling yards, tower sites, spur roads from existing access roads), surface restoration would occur as required by the governmental agency having jurisdiction. The method of restoration normally would consist of returning disturbed areas back to their original contour, reseeding (if required), installing cross drains for erosion control, placing water bars in the road and filling ditches for erosion control. Erosion would be minimized on access roads and other locations primarily with water bars. The water bars would be constructed using mounds of soil shaped to direct the flow of runoff and prevent erosion. Soil spoils created during ground disturbance or recontouring shall be disposed of only on previously disturbed areas, or used immediately to fill eroded areas. However, material for filling in eroded areas in roads or road ruts should never be obtained from the sides of the road that contain habitat without the approval of the on-site biological resource monitor. Cleared vegetation would be hauled off-site to a permitted disposal location. To limit impact to existing vegetation, appropriately sized equipment (i.e. bulldozers, scrapers, backhoes, bucket-loaders etc.) would be used during all ground disturbance and recontouring activities.
6. Potential hydrologic impacts would be minimized through the use of Best Management Practices such as water bars, silt fences, staked straw bales, and mulching and seeding of all disturbed areas. These measures will be designed to minimize ponding, eliminate flood hazards, and avoid erosion and siltation into any creeks, streams, rivers, or bodies of water.
7. Prior to construction, all SDG&E, contractor and sub-contractor Project personnel would receive training regarding the appropriate work practices necessary to effectively implement the Project Protocols and to comply with the applicable environmental laws and regulations including, without limitation, hazardous materials spill prevention and response measures, erosion control, dust suppression and appropriate wildlife avoidance and impact minimization procedures. To assist in this effort, the training would address: (a) federal, state, local and tribal laws regarding antiquities, fossils, plants and wildlife, including collection and removal; (b) the importance of these resources and the purpose and necessity of protecting them; and (c) methods for protecting sensitive cultural, paleontological and ecological resources.
8. SDG&E would respond to third-party complaints of radio or television interference generated by operation of the transmission line by investigating the complaints and by implementing feasible and appropriate measures. As a part of SDG&E's repair

inspection and maintenance program, the transmission line would be patrolled and damaged insulators or other transmission line materials, which could cause interference, would be repaired or replaced.

9. A bundled configuration and large diameter conductors would be used on the 500kV line to limit the audible noise, radio interference and television interference due to corona. Caution would be exercised during construction to try to avoid scratching or nicking the conductor surface, which may provide points for corona to occur. In addition to the bundled configuration and large diameter conductors, special hardware design would also be used to limit corona potential.
10. At the time of construction, SDG&E would conduct a good faith investigation to identify the existing potential for induced currents and voltage hazards which may arise from the operation of the transmission facilities and educate property owners and occupants concerns regarding the probability of induced currents and voltage hazards within conductive objects sharing or within reasonable proximity to the new 500kV right of way.
11. To the extent feasible, access roads would be built at right angles to the streambeds and washes. Where it is not feasible for access roads to cross at right angles, SDG&E would limit roads constructed parallel to streambeds or washes, to a maximum length of 500 feet at any one transmission line crossing location. Such parallel roads would be constructed in a manner that minimizes potential adverse impacts on waters of the U.S. or waters of the state. Streambed crossings and roads constructed parallel to streambeds would require review and approval of necessary permits from the ACOE, CDFG and RWQCB. Culverts would be installed where needed for right angle crossings, but rock crossings would be utilized across most right angle drainage crossings. All construction and maintenance activities would be conducted in a manner that would minimize disturbance to vegetation, drainage channels and stream banks (e.g., towers would not be located within a stream channel, construction activities would avoid sensitive features). Prior to construction in streambeds and washes, SDG&E would perform three pre-activity surveys to determine the presence or absence of endangered riparian species. Endangered riparian species for which surveys would be performed include; the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, arroyo toad, southwestern pond turtle, red-legged frog, Riverside fairy shrimp, San Diego fairy shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp. However, these site surveys would not replace the need for SDG&E to perform detailed on the ground

surveys as required by Protocols 20, 21, 42, 43 and 44. In addition, road construction would include dust-control measures (e.g., watering of construction areas to suppress dust) during construction in sensitive areas, as required (refer to description in Chapter 5, Environmental Impacts). Erosion control during construction in the form of intermittent check dams and culverts should also be considered to prevent alteration to natural drainage patterns and prevent siltation.

12. In the construction and operation of the Project, SDG&E would comply with all applicable environmental laws and regulations including, without limitation, those regulating and protecting air quality, water quality, wildlife and its habitat and cultural resources.
13. Fences and gates would be installed, or repaired and replaced to their original condition to the extent agreed upon between the owner of the fences or gates and SDG&E if they are damaged or destroyed by construction activities. Any temporary gates located outside of the right-of-way would be installed only with the permission of the landowner and, to the extent feasible, would be restored to original condition following construction.
14. Littering is not allowed. Project personnel would not deposit or leave any food or waste in the Project Area, and no biodegradable or nonbiodegradable debris would remain in the right of way following completion of construction.
15. If paleontological resources were encountered, appropriate field mitigation efforts would be implemented to protect the resources. For example, if significant resources are discovered, such as vertebrate fossils, construction would be stopped in this area while SDG&E and their designated paleontologist determine the appropriate method and schedule to recover or protect the resource. When it is not feasible to avoid paleontological sites, SDG&E would consult with the appropriate Federal, State and resource agencies and specialists to either develop alternative construction techniques to avoid paleontological resources or develop appropriate mitigation measures. Appropriate mitigation field measures may include actions such as protection-in-place by covering with earthen fill, removal and cataloging and/or removal and relocation.
16. Hazardous materials would not be disposed of or released onto the ground, the underlying groundwater or any surface water. Totally enclosed containment would be provided for all trash. All construction waste including trash and litter, garbage,

other solid waste, petroleum products and other potentially hazardous materials would be removed to a hazardous waste facility permitted or otherwise authorized to treat, store or dispose of such materials.

17. Prior to construction, the boundaries of plant populations designated as sensitive by USFWS or CDFG, cultural resources and other resources designated sensitive by SDG&E and the resource agencies would be clearly delineated with clearly visible flagging or fencing (refer to description in Chapter 5, Environmental Impacts). The flagging and fencing shall remain in place for the duration of construction. Flagged areas would be avoided to the extent practicable during construction and maintenance activities. Where these areas cannot be avoided, focused surveys for covered plant species shall be performed in conformance with Protocol 21, below, and the responsible resource agency(s) would be consulted for appropriate mitigation and/or re-vegetation measures prior to disturbance. Notification of the presence of any covered plant species to be removed in the work area would occur within ten (10) working days prior to the Project activity, during which time the USFWS or CDFG may remove such plant(s) or recommend measures to minimize or reduce the take. If neither USFWS or CDFG have removed such plant(s) within the ten (10) working days following the written notice, SDG&E may proceed with the work and cause a Take of such plant(s), if minimization measures are not implemented.
18. To the extent feasible, transmission line facilities (e.g. the transmission right of way, access roads, tower sites and other facilities) would be designed to avoid or minimize impact to agricultural land operations and production. Where Project facilities cannot be relocated or re-designed to avoid impacts to agricultural lands or operations, SDG&E would pay just compensation to owners of agricultural lands where those lands or operations are permanently impacted (i.e. removed from practical use) by Project facilities.
19. Wild fires shall be prevented or minimized by exercising care when operating utility vehicles within the right of way and access roads and by not parking vehicles on or in close proximity to dry vegetation where hot catalytic converters can ignite a fire. In times of high fire hazard, it may be necessary for construction vehicles to carry water and shovels or fire extinguishers. Fire protective mats or shields would be used during grinding or welding to prevent or minimize the potential for fire.

20. Brush clearing around any Project facilities (i.e. towers, poles, substations) for fire protection, visual inspection or Project surveying, in areas which have been previously cleared or maintained within a two year or shorter period shall not require a pre-activity survey. In areas not cleared or maintained within a two year period, brush clearing shall not be conducted during the breeding season (March through August) without a pre-activity survey for vegetation containing active nests, burrows or dens. The pre-activity survey performed by the on-site biological resource monitor would make sure that the vegetation to be cleared contains no active migratory bird nests, burrows or active dens prior to clearing. If occupied migratory bird nests are present, fire protection or visual inspection brush clearing work would be avoided until after the nesting season, or when the nest becomes inactive. If no nests are observed, clearing may proceed. Where burrows or dens are identified in the reconnaissance level survey, soil in the brush clearing area would be sufficiently dry before clearing activities occur to prevent mechanical damage to burrows that may be present.
21. In the event that SDG&E identifies a [threatened, endangered, or species of special concern] species of plant, not previously identified in prior surveys performed for the Project, within the 10 foot radius for brush clearing around Project facilities, SDG&E shall; 1.) notify the USFWS (for ESA listed plants) and CDFG (for CESA listed plants) in writing of that plant's location and identity, and 2.) the nature of the Project activity that may affect the plant. Notification would occur within ten (10) working days prior to the Project activity, during which time the USFWS or CDFG may remove such plant(s) or recommend measures to minimize or reduce the take. If neither USFWS or CDFG have removed such plant(s) within the ten (10) working days following the written notice, SDG&E may proceed with the brush clearing for fire protection purposes or visual inspection and cause a Take of such plant(s), if minimization measures are not implemented.
22. No wildlife, including rattlesnakes, may be harmed except to protect life and limb.
23. Firearms shall be prohibited in all Project Areas except for those used by security personnel.
24. Feeding of wildlife is not allowed.
25. Project personnel are not allowed to bring pets to any Project Area in order to minimize harassment or killing of wildlife and to prevent the introduction of destructive animal diseases to native wildlife populations.

26. Plant or wildlife species may not be collected for pets or any other reason.
27. Project supplies or equipment (i.e. foundation excavations, steel pole sections) where wildlife could hide shall be inspected prior to moving or working on them, to reduce the potential for injury to wildlife. Supplies or equipment that cannot be inspected or from which wildlife cannot escape or be removed, shall be covered or otherwise made secure from wildlife intrusion or entrapment at the end of each work day. Supplies or excavations that have been left open shall not be covered or otherwise made secure from wildlife intrusion or entrapment until inspected and any wildlife found therein allowed to escape. If any wildlife are found entrapped in supplies, equipment or excavations, those supplies, equipment or excavations shall be avoided and the wildlife left to leave on their own accord, except as otherwise authorized by the USFWS and CDFG. Where Project construction activities require that supplies, equipment or excavations proceed despite the presence of hiding or entrapped wildlife, SDG&E may request that the USFWS and CDFG allow the on-site biological resource monitor, or a recognized wildlife rescue agency (such as Project Wildlife) to remove the wildlife and transport them to safely to other suitable habitats.
28. All steep-walled trenches or excavations used during construction shall be inspected twice daily (early morning and evening) to protect against wildlife entrapment. If wildlife is located in the trench or excavation, the on-site biological resource monitor shall be called immediately to remove them if they cannot escape unimpeded. The on-site biological resource monitor would make the required contacts with the USFWS and CDFG resource personnel and obtain verbal approval prior to removing any entrapped wildlife. If the biological resource monitor is not qualified to remove the entrapped wildlife, a recognized wildlife rescue agency (such as Project Wildlife) may be employed to remove the wildlife and transport them to safely to other suitable habitats.
29. SDG&E, its contractors and sub-contractors, and their respective Project personnel shall refer all environmental issues including wildlife relocation, sick or dead wildlife, hazardous waste or questions about environmental impacts to the on-site biological construction monitors. Experts in wildlife handling (such as Project Wildlife) may need to be brought in by the Project biological construction field monitor for assistance with wildlife relocations.

30. Emergency repairs may be required during the construction and maintenance of the Project to address situations (i.e. downed lines, slides, slumps, major subsidence etc.) that potentially or immediately threaten the integrity of the Project facilities. During emergency repairs the Project Protocols shall be followed to the fullest extent practicable. Once the emergency has been abated, any unavoidable environmental damage would be reported to the Project biological construction monitor, who would promptly submit a written report of such impacts to the USFWS and CDFG and any other government agencies having jurisdiction over the emergency actions. If required by the government agencies, the biological construction monitor would develop a reasonable and feasible mitigation plan consistent with the Project Protocols and any permits previously issued for the Project by the governmental agencies.
31. When critical habitat exists on either side of the Project rights of way, SDG&E would not oppose dedication by the fee owner of the underlying property for conservation purposes, provided that it shall acknowledge and except therefrom SDG&E's continued use of the property in a manner sufficient to reliably install, operate, maintain, and repair its existing and necessary public utility facilities within the right of way.
32. A hazardous substance management, handling, storage, disposal and emergency response plan would be prepared and implemented.
33. Hazardous materials spill kits would be maintained on site for small spills.
34. In areas where soils and vegetation are particularly sensitive to disturbance (as defined in this PEA), existing access roads would be repaired only in areas where they are otherwise impassable or unsafe.
35. To minimize ground disturbance impacts to streams in steep canyon areas, access roads in these areas would avoid streambed crossings to the extent feasible. Where it is not feasible for access roads to avoid streambed crossings in steep canyons, such crossings would be built at right angles to the streambeds. Where such crossings cannot be made at right angles, SDG&E would limit roads constructed parallel to streambeds, to a maximum length of 500 feet at any, one transmission line crossing location. Such parallel roads would be constructed in a manner that minimizes potential adverse impacts on Waters of the U.S. Streambed crossings or roads constructed parallel to streambeds would require review and approval of necessary permits from the ACOE, CDFG and RWQCB.

36. Environmentally sensitive tree trimming locations for the Project would be identified in SDG&E's existing vegetation management tree trim database utilized by tree trim contractors. The biological field construction monitor shall be contacted prior to trimming in environmentally sensitive areas. Whenever feasible, trees in environmentally sensitive areas such as areas of riparian or native scrub vegetation would be scheduled for trimming during non-sensitive (i.e. breeding or nesting) times. Where trees cannot be trimmed during non-sensitive times, SDG&E would perform three site surveys to determine presence or absence of endangered nesting bird species in riparian or native scrub vegetation. Endangered nesting bird species for which surveys would be performed include; the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher and coastal California gnatcatcher. SDG&E would submit results of those surveys to the USFWS and CDFG, and consult on mitigation measures for potential impacts, prior to tree trimming in environmentally sensitive areas. However, these site surveys would not replace the need for SDG&E to perform detailed on-the-ground surveys as required by Protocol 43. Where riparian areas with overstory vegetation are crossed, tree removal (i.e., clear-cut) widths would be varied where feasible to minimize visual landscape contrast and to maintain habitat diversity at established wildlife corridor edges. Where tree removal widths cannot be varied, SDG&E would consult with the USFWS and CDFG to develop alternative tree removal options that could reasonably maintain edge diversity.
37. All new access roads constructed as part of the Project that are not required as permanent access for future Project maintenance and operation would be permanently closed. Where required, roads would be permanently closed using the most effective feasible and least environmentally damaging methods appropriate to that area with the concurrence of the underlying landowner and the governmental agency having jurisdiction (e.g., stock piling and replacing topsoil or rock replacement). This would limit new or improved accessibility into the area. Mowing of vegetation can be an effective method for protecting the vegetative understory while at the same time creating access to the work area. Mowing should be used when permanent access is not required since, with time, total revegetation is expected. If mowing is in response to a permanent access need, but the alternative of grading is undesirable because of downstream siltation potential, it should be recognized that periodic mowing would be necessary to maintain permanent access. The Project biological construction monitor shall conduct checks on mowing procedures to ensure that mowing for temporary or permanent access roads is limited to a 12 foot wide area on straight portions of the road (slightly wider on turns), and that the mowing height is no less than 4 inches from finished grade.

38. Secure any required NPDES permit authorization from the SWRCB and/or the RWQCB to conduct construction-related activities to build the Project and establish and implement a Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan (SWPPP) erosion control measures during construction to minimize hydrologic impacts in areas sensitive from flooding or siltation into water bodies.
39. To the extent feasible, where the construction of access roads would disturb sensitive features, the route of the access road would be adjusted to avoid such impacts (refer to description in Chapter 5, Environmental Impacts). Examples of sensitive features include, without limitation, cultural sites, identified habitats of endangered species, and streambeds. As another alternative, construction and maintenance traffic would use existing roads or cross-country access routes (including the right of way), which avoid impacts to the sensitive feature. To minimize ground disturbance, construction traffic routes must be clearly marked with temporary markers such as easily visible flagging. Construction routes, or other means of avoidance, must be approved by the authorized officer or landowner before use. When it is not feasible to avoid constructing access roads in sensitive habitats, SDG&E would perform three site pre-activity surveys to determine the presence or absence of endangered or threatened species, or species of special concern, in those sensitive habitats. SDG&E would submit results of those surveys to the USFWS and CDFG, and consult on reasonable and feasible mitigation measures for potential impacts, prior to access road construction. However, these pre-activity surveys would not replace the need for SDG&E to perform detailed on-the-ground surveys as required by Protocols 20, 21 42, 43 and 44. Where it is not feasible for access roads to avoid streambed crossings in steep canyons, such crossings would be built at right angles to the streambeds. Where such crossings cannot be made at right angles, SDG&E would limit roads constructed parallel to streambeds, to a maximum length of 500 feet at any, one transmission line crossing location. Such parallel roads would be constructed in a manner that minimizes potential adverse impacts on Waters of the U.S. Streambed crossings or roads constructed parallel to streambeds would require review and approval of necessary permits from the ACOE, CDFG and RWQCB. When it is not feasible to avoid cultural sites, SDG&E would consult with the appropriate Federal, State (SHPO) and local (indigenous Native American tribes) cultural resource agencies and specialists to either develop alternative construction techniques to avoid cultural resources or develop appropriate mitigation measures. Appropriate mitigation measures may include actions such as, removal and cataloging and/or removal and relocation.

40. To minimize ground disturbance and/or reduce scarring (visual contrast) of the landscape, the alignment of any new access roads (i.e., bladed road) or cross-country route (i.e., unbladed route) would follow the landform contours in designated areas to the extent feasible, providing that such alignment does not additionally impact sensitive features (e.g., riparian area, habitat of sensitive species, cultural site). To the extent feasible, new access roads shall be designed to be placed in previously disturbed areas and areas that require the least amount of grading in sensitive areas. Whenever feasible, in areas where there are existing access roads, preference shall be given to the use of new spur roads rather than linking facilities tangentially with new, continuous roads. Where it is infeasible to locate roads along contours, or in previously disturbed areas, or use spur roads to limit grading, the re-vegetation/seeding plans for the Project would incorporate plant species in areas adjacent to access roads that are capable of screening the visual impacts of the roads.
41. In areas designated as sensitive by SDG&E or the resource agencies (refer to description in Chapter 5, Environmental Impacts) to the extent feasible structures and access roads would be designed so as to avoid sensitive features and/or to reduce visual contrast. These areas of sensitive features include, but are not limited to high-value wildlife habitats and cultural sites, and/or to allow conductors to clearly span the features, within limits of standard tower or pole design (also refer to Protocol 52 for avoidance of sensitive water resource features). If the sensitive features cannot be completely avoided, towers, poles and access roads would be placed so as to minimize the disturbance to the extent feasible. When it is not feasible to avoid constructing towers, poles or access roads in high value wildlife habitats, SDG&E would perform three site surveys to determine presence or absence of endangered species in those sensitive habitats. SDG&E would submit results of those surveys to the USFWS and CDFG, and consult on mitigation measures for potential impacts, prior to constructing roads. However, these site surveys would not replace the need for SDG&E to perform detailed on-the-ground surveys as required by Protocols 20, 21, 42, 43 and 44. Where it is not feasible for access roads to avoid sensitive water resource features such as streambed crossings, such crossings would be built at right angles to the streambeds. Where such crossings cannot be made at right angles, roads constructed parallel to streambeds would be limited to a maximum length of 500 feet at any, one transmission line crossing location. Such parallel roads would be constructed in a manner that minimizes potential adverse impacts on Waters of the U.S. Streambed crossings or roads constructed parallel to streambeds would require review and approval of necessary permits from the ACOE, CDFG and RWQCB. When it is not feasible for towers, poles or access roads to avoid cultural sites, SDG&E would

consult with the appropriate Federal, State (SHPO) and local (indigenous Native American tribes) cultural resource agencies and specialists to either modify the Project or develop alternative construction techniques to avoid cultural resources or develop appropriate mitigation measures. Appropriate mitigation measures may include actions such as, data recovery studies, cultural resource removal and cataloging, and/or cultural resource removal and relocation.

42. Conduct detailed on-the-ground surveys (focused or protocol surveys), as required by the applicable government environmental resource agencies, to determine whether the Quino checkerspot butterfly, arroyo toad, red-legged frog, Stephens' kangaroo rat and San Bernardino kangaroo rat habitat is present within the Project's route. If these species habitat are determined to be potentially affected by Project activities, specific alternative strategies to avoid such habitat and, where avoidance of such impacts is unavoidable, specific mitigation measures would be determined through consultation with the USFWS, CDFG and ACOE. If it is determined that it is not feasible to avoid such habitat impacts, the Project biologist would recommend mitigation in consultation with applicable resource agencies. In those situations where more than one site visit may be necessary to identify a given species no more than three site visits shall be required. It is expected that the typical USFWS search protocols would not be utilized in most situations due to the priority of these protocols to avoid where feasible. Permanent or temporary disturbance of habitat would be rehabilitated or mitigated according to Table 2-11 and section 2.4.1 (below).
43. Conduct surveys as required by the applicable government environmental resource agencies, to determine whether least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and California gnatcatcher are present within the Project's route. If these species are present and unavoidable impacts to suitable habitat would occur, SDG&E would, to the extent feasible, cause such impacts to suitable habitat to occur during the non-breeding season for each species. Specific alternative mitigation measures (e.g., offsite restoration or enhancement of these species' habitats) would be determined through consultation with the USFWS, CDFG, and ACOE. If it is determined that it is not feasible to avoid habitats during the breeding season, the Project biologist would recommend an alternative mitigation approaches to SDG&E, and a decision would be made how to proceed in consultation with the applicable resource agencies. In those situations where more than one site visit may be necessary to identify a given species or its habitat, such as certain birds, no more than three site visits shall be required. It is expected that the typical USFWS search protocols would not be utilized in most situations due to the priority of these protocols to avoid where feasible. Permanent

or temporary disturbance of habitat would be rehabilitated or mitigated according to Table 2-11 and section 2.4.1 (below).

44. Conduct surveys as required by the applicable government environmental resource agencies, to determine whether vernal pools containing vernal pool fairy shrimp, Riverside fairy shrimp and/or San Diego fairy shrimp are present within the Project's route. If vernal pools and/or either of these species are determined to be potentially affected by Project activities, specific avoidance strategies and mitigation measures would be identified through consultation with the USFWS, CDFG, and ACOE. Project facilities and activities shall be planned to avoid disturbance to vernal pools, their watersheds, or impacts to their natural regeneration. Continued maintenance of the Project's facilities, utilizing existing access roads and access routes constructed as a part of the Project, are allowed to continue in areas containing vernal pool habitats. Construction and maintenance of the Project's facilities, which span vernal pool habitats, is allowed as long as the placement of the facilities or location of associated construction activities in no way impacts vernal pools.
45. To the extent feasible, Project facilities would be installed along the edges or borders of private property, open space parks and recreation areas. When it is not feasible to locate Project facilities along property borders, SDG&E would consult with affected property owners to identify facility locations that create the least potential impact to property and are mutually acceptable to property owners. When SDG&E cannot mutually resolve facility locations with property owners, SDG&E would pay just compensation to those property owners based on the facility locations identified by SDG&E.
46. To the extent feasible during final engineering design, coordinate the installation location of the Project facilities line with landowners and/or the government agency having jurisdiction and/or the local government having an interest in the location of the facilities. When SDG&E cannot resolve facility locations in coordination with affected property owners that create the least potential impact to property and that are mutually acceptable to property owners, SDG&E would pay just compensation to those property owners based on the facility locations identified by SDG&E.
47. High-visibility devices, where required by FAA, would be used to minimize the potential for aircraft to collide with the transmission line.
48. Non-specular conductors would be used to reduce visual impacts.

49. Dulled-finish poles may be used to reduce visual impacts.
50. Where necessary to avoid significant protected environmental land use impacts, limit potential visual impacts and reduce the footprint of structures, use single-pole tubular steel structures in place of lattice structures.
51. To minimize perching opportunities for raptors near habitats supporting sensitive prey species, select structures incorporating a design to discourage raptor perching.
52. To the extent feasible, design structure locations to avoid wetlands, streams and riparian areas. These sensitive water resource features include riparian areas, habitats of endangered species, streambeds, cultural resources, and wetlands. If these areas cannot be avoided, a qualified biological contractor shall conduct site-specific assessments for each affected site. These assessments shall be conducted in accordance with ACOE wetland delineation guidelines, as well as CDFG streambed and lake assessment guidelines, and shall include impact minimization measures to reduce wetland impacts to a less than significant effect (e.g., creation and restoration of wetlands). Though construction or maintenance vehicle access through shallow creeks or streams is allowed, staging/storage areas for equipment and materials shall be located outside of riparian areas. Construction of new access through streambeds that require filling for access purposes would require a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFG and/or consultation with the Army Corps of Engineers. Where filling is required for new access, the installation of properly sized culverts and the use of geotextile matting should be considered in the CDFG/Army Corps consultation process.
53. Known and potential cultural and biological resources, which may be affected by the Project, would be monitored during Project implementation. This would involve pedestrian surveys (i.e., Class III) to inventory and evaluate these resources along the selected route and any impacted area (e.g., access roads, substation sites, staging areas, etc.) beyond the right of way. In consultation with appropriate land managing agencies, state historic preservation officers, and applicable resource agencies, specific avoidance strategies and mitigation measures would be developed and implemented to avoid or mitigate identified adverse impacts on private, state, BLM, Tribal or other lands. The primary goal is to avoid impacts to environmental resources, and secondarily to mitigate for unavoidable impacts. These may include Project modifications to avoid adverse impacts, monitoring construction activities, or data recovery studies.

54. In addition to the restoration and habitat enhancement, mitigation measures developed during the consultation period under Section 7 or 10A of the Endangered Species Act (1973) as amended would be implemented and complied with as specified in the Biological Opinion of the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service or approved Habitat Conservation Plan developed and approved for the Project.
55. An Erosion Control and Sediment Transport Control Plan would be included with the Project grading plans submitted to the County of San Diego and Riverside for review and comment. The sediment transport control plan would be prepared in accordance with the standards provided in the Manual of Erosion and Sedimentation Control Measures and consistent with practices recommended by the Elsinore-Murrieta-Anza Resource Conservation District and the Resource Conservation District of San Diego County. Implementation of the plan would help stabilize soil in graded areas and waterways, and reduce erosion and sedimentation. The plan would designate Best Management Practices (BMP) that would be implemented during construction activities. Erosion control efforts such as hay bales, water bars, covers, sediment fences, sensitive area access restrictions (e.g., flagging), vehicle mats in wet areas, and retention/settlement ponds would be installed before extensive soil clearing and grading begins. Mulching, seeding, or other suitable stabilization measures would be used to protect exposed areas during construction activities. Revegetation plans, the design and location of retention ponds and grading plans would be submitted to the CDFG and USACOE for review in the event of construction near waterways.
56. Although the release of PM10 associated with Project construction is insignificant relative to ambient PM10 levels the following protocols would be employed:
- a) Prohibiting construction grading on days when the wind is significant, where feasible.
 - b) Covering all trucks hauling soil and other loose material, or require at least two feet of freeboard.
 - c) Erecting snow-fence type windbreaks in areas identified as needed by SDG&E.
 - d) Limiting vehicle speeds to 15 mph on unpaved roads.
 - e) Treating unpaved roads with chemical stabilizers or by watering as necessary.
 - f) Applying soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas on as-needed basis.
 - g) Placing perimeter silt fencing, watering as necessary, or adding soil binders to exposed stockpiles of soil and other excavated materials.

57. To minimize mud and dust from being transported onto paved roadway surfaces, pave or apply chemical stabilization at sufficient concentration and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface starting from the point of intersection with the public paved surface and extending for a centerline distance of at least 100 feet and a width of at least 20 feet.
58. To the extent feasible, any other air pollution control measures approved by the District and the U.S. EPA as equivalent may be used.
59. If suitable park and ride facilities are available in the Project vicinity construction workers would be encouraged to carpool to the job site. The ability to develop an effective carpool program for the Project would depend upon the proximity of carpool facilities to the job site, the geographical commute departure points of construction workers, and the extent to which carpooling would not adversely affect worker show-up time and the Project's construction schedule.
60. To the extent feasible, unnecessary construction vehicle and idling time would be minimized. The ability to limit construction vehicle idling time is dependent upon the sequence of construction activities and when and where vehicles are needed or staged. Certain vehicles, such as large diesel powered vehicles, have extended warm up times following start-up that limits their availability for use following start-up. Where such diesel-powered vehicles are required for repetitive construction tasks, these vehicles may require more idling time. The Project would apply a "common sense" approach to vehicle use, if a vehicle is not required for use immediately or continuously for construction activities, its engine would be shut off. Construction foremen would include briefings to crews on vehicle use as a part of pre-construction conferences. Those briefings would include discussion of a "common sense" approach to vehicle use.