

APPENDIX A
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

APPENDIX A: CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Banducci 66/12 kV Substation Project

BANDUCCI 66/12 kV SUBSTATION CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title:

Banducci 66/12 kV Substation

2. Lead agency name and address:

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3298

3. Contact person and phone number:

Susan Nelson
Strategic Planning Manager
Regulatory Policy & Affairs
(626) 302-8128

4. Project Location:

The Proposed Project would be located at the southeast corner of Pelliser Road and unimproved Dale Road in the community of Cummings Valley, Kern County, California.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Southern California Edison (SCE)
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770

6. General plan designation:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has primary jurisdiction over the Banducci Substation Project because it authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. CPUC G.O. 131-D Section XIV.B states that "Local jurisdictions acting pursuant to local authority are preempted from regulating electric power line projects, distribution lines, substations, or electric facilities constructed by public utilities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. However in locating such projects, the public utilities shall consult with local agencies regarding land use matters." SCE has considered local land use plans as part of the environmental review process.

The proposed Banducci Substation site is designated by the Kern County General Plan as 8.1, Resource Reserve. The proposed telecommunication routes would occur largely on areas designated as Intensive Agriculture, Resource Reserve, or Residential by the Kern County General Plan.

7. Zoning

The Substation Study Area is located in three Kern County zoning districts: 1) A (Exclusive Agriculture), 2) E (Estate) 2.5 acres with RS (Residential Suburban) Combining and 3) Institutional (for the California Correctional Institution). The proposed Banducci Substation site and the adjacent area are within the Exclusive Agriculture district. Zoning designations along the

proposed telecommunication routes include: Agriculture (both Exclusive and Limited), Residential, and Resource Reserve. There are also areas along the proposed telecommunication routes that would be designated as Commercial, Industrial, and Manufacturing.

8. Description of project:

SCE proposes to construct, operate, and maintain the Banducci 66/12 kilovolt (kV) Substation (proposed Banducci Substation) and associated distribution, subtransmission, and telecommunication facilities (Proposed Project) to meet the forecasted electrical demand, maintain system reliability, resolve anticipated service delivery voltage problems, and enhance operational flexibility in the unincorporated Cummings Valley area of Kern County, California. The Proposed Project is planned to be operational by June 2016.

The Proposed Project includes the following components:

- Construction of a new Banducci 66/12 kV Substation: the proposed Banducci Substation would be an unstaffed, automated, 56.0 megavolt-ampere (MVA), low-profile substation with a potential capacity of 112.0 MVA at final build out; the proposed Banducci Substation would be located on an approximately 8-acre parcel in the unincorporated Cummings Valley area of Kern County
- Construction of two new 66 kV subtransmission line segments from the existing Correction-Cummings-Kern River 1 66 kV Subtransmission Line: one looped into and one looped out of the proposed Banducci Substation, creating the new Banducci-Kern River 1 66 kV Subtransmission Line and the new Banducci-Correction-Cummings 66 kV Subtransmission Line
- Construction of three new underground 12 kV distribution getaways
- Installation of telecommunications facilities to connect the proposed Banducci Substation to SCE’s existing telecommunications system

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The Proposed Project is located in a rural setting. Mountainous areas surround the Proposed Project to the north and south. There are several residences located near the proposed telecommunications routes. The closest of the residences include: one single family residence located off Highline Road just north of the Proposed Telecommunications Route 1 and several clusters of residences located just east and west of the Proposed Telecommunications Route 2 along South Curry Street and South Mill Street in the City of Tehachapi. The nearest cluster of residential development to the proposed Banducci Substation is located in the community of Stallion Springs which is approximately 2 miles southwest of the proposed Banducci Substation site. The community of Bear Valley Springs is located approximately three miles north-northwest of the proposed Banducci Substation. The California Correctional Institution is located approximately 1.6 miles northeast and east of the proposed Banducci Substation, within the City of Tehachapi.

The land surrounding the Proposed Project site is designated as: 1.2, Incorporated Cities; 4.3, Specific Plan Required; 5.7, Min 5 Gross Acres/Unit; 5.8, Min 20 Gross Acres/Unit; 8.1, Intensive Agriculture; and 8.2, Resource Reserve.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality |

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENT IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- (1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- (2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- (3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- (4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- (5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration, Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- (6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- (7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- (8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- (9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - (a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question.
 - (b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California 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 nonagricultural 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland as defined by Public Resources Code 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- (e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- (a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- (b) Violate any air quality standard as adopted in the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD), or as established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or air district or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- (c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- (d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- (e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- (a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- (b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic groundshaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VIII. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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-site or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 site or off site? | <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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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"/> |
| (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- (c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

XI. 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?
- (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?

XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:

- (a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?
- (b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?
- (c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- (d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- (e) For a project located within the Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- (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?

XIII. 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XIV. 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 to other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Fire Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XV. 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"/> |

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian, and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) | Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) | Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

XVII. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 stormwater 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) | Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

XVIII. 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, substantially 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Sources and Explanation of Answers

This section contains a brief explanation for the answers provided in the environmental checklist form. A detailed discussion of each environmental factor can be found in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Assessment* of the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA).

Aesthetics

The Proposed Project would not be visible from the relevant scenic vistas in the region due to the distance and the landscape in the area.

The Proposed Project would not occur near or be visible from any established scenic resource or State Scenic Highway.

The construction and general staging activities, construction related waste, and the potential for the creation of dust during construction activities may be considered unsightly to potential receptors including the occupants of the nearest residence, farmhands or other field laborers or individuals located near or passing by the construction area. However, the construction related activities would be considered temporary nuisances and would not significantly alter the visual resources in the Proposed Project Study Area. Although the landscaping and design features of the proposed Banducci Substation would vary from the existing site, these changes would be incremental, but not significant, and would largely be consistent with the surrounding settings.

The Proposed Project subtransmission line elements, including the new poles and pole replacements, would be consistent with the existing uses within the Proposed Project Study Area. Operation of the Proposed Project would have the potential to cause minor incremental changes to the existing character of the site and surroundings. The most considerable change would be to the proposed Banducci Substation location, where it would be anticipated that the existing visual character would be different following construction of the proposed Banducci Substation. However, this change would be considered low due to the lack of significant visual resources in the area and due to the distance (and the viewshed) of the proposed Banducci Substation from the vantage point of the nearest receptors. Additionally, SCE would implement design features into the Proposed Project which would further reduce potential impacts (see PEA Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*).

Any impacts associated with the potential for construction and operation of the Proposed Project to create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area would be less than significant

Agriculture and Forest Resources

As discussed in Section 4.2, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*, the proposed Banducci Substation component of the Proposed Project would be located on land that is designated as Prime Farmland in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). This land is not designated as Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As this land conversion (approximately 6.3 acres) is relatively minor (0.001 percent) of the over 626,217 acres of lands designated as Prime Farmland in Kern County, impacts related to Prime Farmland would be considered adverse but less than significant. The proposed telecommunication routes would be located on existing right-of-ways (ROWs) or SCE easements and would not change the use of the land. The telecommunications routes would largely be located adjacent to land designated by the FMMP as Urban and Built-Up Land or Grazing Land (CDC, 2008). While portions of the telecommunications routes would be located adjacent to land designated by the FMMP as Prime Farmland, the telecommunication cables would be

compatible with agricultural uses of the land as noted earlier (Kern County, 2009). Installation of the telecommunications would not convert land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.

The Exclusive Agriculture zoning district permits the use of utility substations, transmission lines and supporting poles, and underground facilities for gas, water, electricity, telephone, or telegraph service owned and operated by a public utility company or other company under the jurisdiction of the CPUC. The proposed Banducci Substation would be located in a predominately rural area and would not be located on or near lands zoned as forest land, timberland, or designated Timberland Production lands. The proposed telecommunication routes would be in rural areas and within the City of Tehachapi. These routes would not be located on or near land zoned as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Air Quality

As discussed in Section 4.3, *Air Quality*, the Proposed Project would comply with the applicable air quality policies, plans, and regulations and would not be expected to result in significant impacts related to air quality. Both construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be consistent with the policies, plans, and regulations for reducing air pollution.

The air quality assessment for the Proposed Project determined that the anticipated construction related air quality impacts would not be expected to exceed the established thresholds for the Proposed Project. As further noted in the air quality analysis, neither construction nor operation of the Proposed Project would result in impacts with the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Biological Resources

As discussed in Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*, although construction of the proposed Banducci Substation would result in permanent loss of up to 6.1 acres foraging habitat for several wildlife species, this amount is minor when compared to the availability of habitat in the region. Also, approximately 6.5 acres of habitat would be temporarily impacted by the proposed subtransmission line route. The habitat loss (less than 0.05 percent) is considered relatively minor over the 13,000 acres of potential habitat for these species in the region. Impacts to affected species or their habitat along the proposed telecommunication routes, if present, would be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of APMs BIO-1 and BIO-2.

Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) BIO-1 through BIO-5 have been proposed to avoid, minimize, correct, reduce, or eliminate impacts to special status species native vegetation, wildlife habitat, and unique resources. With these APMs, impacts to biological resources would expected to be less than significant.

Operation of the Proposed Project would require minor maintenance as well as possible emergency repair activities resulting in either less than significant or no impacts to biological resources.

Cultural Resources

As described in Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources*, potential impacts to cultural resources (including important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory) would be avoided during construction and operation activities associated with the Proposed Project and it would not be expected to eliminate important

examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Neither construction nor operation of the Proposed Project would not cause any substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources. The record search and field surveys did not identify any Proposed Project elements that have the potential to encounter human remains. If human remains were encountered, all work would stop and the county coroner and a qualified archaeologist will be notified pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 5097.98 and 5097. Operation of the Proposed Project would not involve the disturbance of subsurface soils or geologic formations.

No paleontological resources were identified in the vicinity of the proposed Banducci Substation parcel. The proposed Banducci Substation parcel has been identified as an area of low paleontological sensitivity for ground disturbance to the depth of ten feet. Since construction activities on this parcel may exceed ten feet in depth with the installation of six proposed tubular steel poles (TSPs) and two proposed light-weight steel (LWS) poles there is the potential “to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.” The implementation of Applicant Proposed Measure (APM) PA-1 would reduce construction impacts during construction of the Proposed Project to less than significant. Based on the results of the locality search and an examination of geologic maps, as well as the proposed excavation depths associated with the Proposed Project, portions of the proposed telecommunication routes would be in an area that has a high sensitivity for paleontological resources (the western side of the Tehachapi Valley). One paleontological locality, LACM 3722, was located within the City of Tehachapi (Smith, 2011). Impacts to significant paleontological resources due to the construction of the proposed Telecommunication Routes would be less than significant with the implementation of APM PA-1. Operation of the Proposed Project would not involve the ground disturbance. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project would have no impact on paleontological resources.

Geology and Soils

As discussed in Section 4.6, *Geology and Soils*, impacts related to geology and soils associated with the Proposed Project would be less than significant. During construction, loss of topsoil and erosion could result from construction activities. However, potential impacts would be avoided or minimize by the implementation of site specific design features and activities like Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be provided in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the Proposed Project.

A review of relevant geotechnical data from various sources including United States Geological Survey, United States Department of Agriculture, and California Geological Survey indicate that the risk of liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides, and expansive soils associated with the Proposed Project would be low. The topography of the Proposed Project site is relatively level and the absence of nearby slopes precludes any slope stability hazards. Therefore, the potential for any on or off site impact is considered low.

The Proposed Project would not be located on an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant with the incorporation of seismic building codes and engineering practices into the design. The Proposed Project site is not considered susceptible to liquefaction, and the potential for landslides is considered low due to the relatively level topography of the Proposed Project site and the lack of nearby slopes. Therefore, exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects during construction or operation of the Proposed Project, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic activity or landslides would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As described in Section 4.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be consistent with the GHG emissions related plans, policies, or regulations including Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and those that have been adopted by the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD).. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is expected to only generate 45 MTCO₂e and would not meet or exceed the 10,000 MTCO₂e GHG emission threshold of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which was applied to this Proposed Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As discussed in Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to hazards or hazardous materials. While it is anticipated that construction-related activities would entail the use of limited quantities of hazardous materials including hazardous liquid materials (such as mineral oil), it would not be anticipated that these activities would result in a foreseeable upset or accident which could impact personnel, the public, or the environment. Any transport, use, and disposal of these hazardous materials associated with the Proposed Project would be in compliance with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines designed to prevent accidents, injury, or other damages to the public or the environment during transport, use, or disposal.

A site-specific construction SWPPP and Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan would be prepared for the Proposed Project and would be implemented to ensure quick response to any spills to avoid impacts to the environment.

The Proposed Project would not be located on a site that has been designated on the Government Code Section 65962.5, Cortese list site (EDR, 2011a). Although the Proposed Project would occur in an area that is defined as having a moderate to high wildland fire risk (CalFire, 2006), SCE would ensure that all vegetation or other potential fire threats are cleared from the site and would implement similar practices to ensure that potential fire risks are substantially reduced. In addition, implementation of APM HAZ-1 would further reduce wildfire risks.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As discussed in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be completed in compliance with the established water quality standards. The Proposed Project would not substantially interfere with existing drainage patterns, nor create additional stormwater runoff. Additionally, implementation of project-specific grading permit(s) and SWPPP, BMPs, and other measures, would protect water quality. The Proposed Project would not interfere with the existing groundwater conditions by substantially depleting groundwater supplies or interfering substantially with groundwater recharge.

The Proposed Project would be located in an area that is designated as having a low flood hazard risk (Zone X) and would not be expected to result in a significant impact related to placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. The Proposed Project construction would be located more than 100 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and would not be located near the coast, there would be no expected impacts related to a tsunami. Finally, it is anticipated that mudflow risks associated with development of the Proposed Project would be low.

Land Use and Planning

As described in Section 4.10, *Land Use and Planning*, the Proposed Project would not result in significant

impacts to land use and planning. Development of the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation. The Kern County Zoning Ordinance defines the Substation Study Area as Exclusive Agriculture. The Exclusive Agriculture zoning district permits the use of utility substations, transmission lines and supporting poles, and underground facilities for gas, water, electricity, telephone, or telegraph service owned and operated by a public utility company or other company under the jurisdiction of the CPUC (Kern County, 2011). Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be compatible with the Kern County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and with the GTASCP. The Proposed Project would not be located near or within any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and thus would not be expected to conflict with any such plans.

Mineral Resources

As discussed in Section 4.11, *Mineral Resources*, lands within the Proposed Project Study Area are not designated by the Kern County General Plan as areas of important mineral resource recovery. A review of the Kern County Online Mapping System indicated that the Barrett Pit Mine is located approximately 0.7 mile northwest of the proposed Banducci Substation site and would not be impacted by the Proposed Project (Kern County Online Mapping, 2011). Monolith Cement Plant is the nearest active mine to the Proposed Project's telecommunication routes. The Monolith Cement Plant is located approximately 0.4 mile slightly north and east of the intersection of the Proposed Telecommunications Routes 1 and 2. In addition the Lee Deposit prospect mine is located approximately 0.25 mile south of the Proposed Telecommunications Route 1 but neither of these mines would be impacted by the Proposed Project. In addition, there are no known mineral resources within the Proposed Project Study Area that would be affected by the Proposed Project.

Four oil/gas wells are located in the Proposed Project Study Area; however, none of the oil/gas wells are within the proposed Banducci Substation site. In addition, all four wells within the Proposed Project Study Area are dry wells. There are no oil/gas wells directly within the proposed telecommunications routes. The nearest well is a dry well located approximately 350 feet east of the Proposed Telecommunications Route 1 (DOGGR, 2011). None of the oil/gas wells would be affected by the Proposed Project. Therefore, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site or the loss of availability of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Noise

As discussed in Section 4.12, *Noise*, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to noise. Construction related noise associated with the Proposed Project would occur intermittently over a period of approximately twelve months, and would not be considered significant due to the duration of the activities, the anticipated noise and vibration levels, as well as the distance of the construction-related activities from the nearest receptors. The Proposed Project's construction would not result in the 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. The impact would be less than significant.

Operation of the Proposed Project would consist of routine, short-term inspection and maintenance of the facilities. These limited operational activities are not expected to generate noise levels that would contribute to a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise in the area. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above

levels existing without the Proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

As discussed in Section 4.13, *Population and Housing*, development of the Proposed Project would not be anticipated to significantly induce population growth. The Proposed Project would not create any new employment opportunities that would potentially require additional housing or encourage an increase in the population in the area. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not impact the existing housing within the area. The Proposed Project would not displace residents, require replacement housing, or conflict with the existing or planned housing. The Proposed Project would be constructed on agricultural land and within existing SCE ROWs and would not require the removal of any existing residences.

Public Services

As discussed in Section 4.14, *Public Services*, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not require the expansion schools, parks, or other public facilities. In addition, operation of the Project would not require the expansion of police protection, fire protection or other public services. SCE would coordinate with Kern County and the local public agencies including the police and fire department to ensure that construction and operation related activities associate with the Proposed Project would not substantially impact emergency access or response times. Thus, any impacts to police and fire protection are expected to be less than significant.

Recreation

As discussed in Section 4.15, *Recreation*, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not cause population growth that would result in the increased use of existing parks or require the construction of new recreation facilities. In addition, the Proposed Project does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities.

Transportation and Traffic

As discussed in Section 4, 16, *Transportation and Traffic*, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to transportation. The addition of construction related vehicles to the Proposed Project Study Area would be considered a less than significant addition to the overall traffic in the area traffic. Traffic related to construction would be temporary (i.e., a short number of hours over the course of a 12 month period) and would be consistent with the established Kern County, California Joint Utility Traffic Control Manual, Caltrans Guidelines, as well as commonly used traffic control measures for construction related traffic measures.

Operation of the Proposed Project would not be expected to contribute to any additional traffic in the area because the proposed Banducci Substation would be unstaffed. Sporadic maintenance of the Proposed Project would contribute only a negligible amount to traffic in the area. The Proposed Project would not include design features or incompatible uses that would increase transportation and traffic related hazards and would not impede access of the emergency vehicles to the Proposed Project site. Therefore, operational impacts related to the transportation and traffic including the effectiveness and performance of the circulation system would be less than significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

As discussed in Section 4.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to utilities and service systems. Construction of the Proposed Project

would be expected to comply with the wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) and would be expected to comply with the Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not be expected to result in impacts related to requiring or resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities and would not alter the existing drainage patterns. After construction of the proposed Banducci Substation and the associated perimeter wall, flows would be diverted around the enclosed substation back towards the natural drainage pattern. It is anticipated that the amount of wastewater that could potentially be discharged as part of the Proposed Project would be minimal and the majority of the wastewater (i.e., that used for dust suppression) would be retained at the proposed Banducci Substation location through the implementation of the SWPPP, BMPs, and NPDES requirements. As such, the Proposed Project would not require the use, modification, or construction of existing or new wastewater treatment facilities.

The existing Kern County utilities and services systems, including the landfills, have the sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate waste from the Proposed Project. As such, the Proposed Project would be adequately served by the existing utilities and services systems located within Kern County.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

The Proposed Project would not be expected to result in impacts related to mandatory findings of significance. The potential impacts to habitat would be considered less than significant and the Proposed Project would not entail components that would otherwise 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. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not be expected to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory as any such cultural resources (including important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory) would be avoided during construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project would not increase or create incremental impacts that would contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts and the Proposed Project would not be expected to substantially alter the physical environment in a manner that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly (see Section 6.4, *Mandatory Findings of Significance*).