#### 4.1 CEQA Initial Study Checklist

As required by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Rule 17.1 and General Order 131-D, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study checklist was used to focus the impact analysis for the Proposed Project. In conformance with CEQA, the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) provides information to the CPUC regarding the potential environmental consequences of the Project. The methodologies used for determining standards of significance of all impact categories analyzed in the PEA derive from Appendix G of the revised CEQA Guidelines and are described for each environmental topic in Chapters 5 through 18. In addition, applicable standards of significance from resource agencies and local governments were incorporated. By applying the appropriate significance criteria, potential impacts under each environmental topic were categorized as significant or less than significant. The methodology used to determine the level of significance of potential impacts varies depending on the environmental topic. Local air quality, for example, is regulated by quantitative standards promulgated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Other topics, such as aesthetics, require professional judgment to determine the level of impact significance.

For some resource categories, it is clear that no potential impacts could result or that the impact category is not particularly applicable to the Project. In this case, "no impact" is checked. In other cases, the potential impact has been analyzed and determined to be less than significant. In this case, the "less-than-significant impact" box has been checked. When mitigation measures can be implemented that reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level, the "less than significant with mitigation incorporation" box is checked, and the mitigation measures are described at the end of each chapter. In some cases, implementation of mitigation measures is not feasible, or the measures would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. These impacts are checked as a "potentially significant impact" in the checklist.

Chapter 19, Table 19-1, identifies each potentially significant impact described in this PEA, the associated mitigation measure, and the criteria for determining the success of the mitigation measure. PG&E is responsible for implementing the mitigation monitoring effort. A full analysis of impacts is found in the corresponding chapter.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the Project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		$\checkmark$		
	a) The Project would affect the character of views seen from several designated scenic roadways and trails. However, it would not have a substantial adverse effect with incorporation of mitigation measures.			
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				√
	b) The Project wil scenic highway; a construction will b	l not damage scenic reas where ground d e revegetated.	resources within isturbance occu	a state rs during
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		✓		
	<ul> <li>c) Project consists utility corridor with Project would affe With implementat part of the Project</li> </ul>	s of replacing a transu n somewhat larger tovect views experienced ion of visual mitigatio c, impacts would be le	mission line in a wers. To a limite l along the Proje n measures prop ess than significa	n existing d extent, the ct route. posed as ant.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	
	d) Security lighting that will be added but would not incr and downward foo	g would be placed on , and may be placed ease glare due to the cus of the lights.	the substation e within the transit use of low-watt	equipment tion station, age bulbs
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 prepared by the California Dept. 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?				~
	a) None of the Pro	oject components wo	uld be located in	prime or

unique farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
	b) None of the Pro zoned for agricult	oject components woo ural use or Williamson	uld be located in n Act contract la	lands nds.
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				~
	<ul> <li>c) None of the Project components are located on or adjacent to agricultural resources or farmlands.</li> </ul>			
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 Attainment Plan or Congestion Management Plan?				✓
	a) The Project wo any air quality atta	uld not conflict with o ainment plans.	r obstruct impler	nentation of
b) Violate any stationary source air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?		$\checkmark$		
	<ul> <li>b) Construction of in the form of fugit construction equip implementation of violate any air quar</li> </ul>	the Project will produ tive dust from ground oment and vehicle exl BAAQMD recommen ality standards.	uce temporary ai disturbance and haust but, with nded measures,	r emissions I from will not
c) Result in a 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)?		✓		
	c) Construction of the Project will produce temporary air emissions in the form of fugitive dust; adoption of BAAQMD recommended mitigation measures will result in a less-than-significant impact.			
d) Create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hot spot" (primarily carbon monoxide)?				$\checkmark$
	d) The Project wo source "hot spot."	uld not create or cont	tribute to a non-s	stationary

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				$\checkmark$
	<ul> <li>e) Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations from ground disturbance or from construction equipment and vehicle exhaust.</li> </ul>			
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				$\checkmark$
	<li>f) Construction and use of equipment of odors.</li>	d operation of the Pro or materials that wou	bject would not re Id cause objectio	equire the onable
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the Project:				
a) Adversely impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, any endangered, rare, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (sections 17.11 or 17.12)?		$\checkmark$		
	a) Project construct endangered, or thr Chapter 6. Mitigation coordination with a than-significant.	ction has the potentia reatened species as o on measures will be agencies planned to r	I to impact rare, described in deta developed as ap reduce impact le	ail in propriate in vels to less-
b) Have a substantial adverse impact, 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?		$\checkmark$		
	<ul> <li>b) Project construct endangered, or thr Chapter 6. Mitigation coordination with a less-than-significant</li> </ul>	ction has the potentia reatened species as o on measures will be agencies planned to r nt level.	I to impact rare, described in deta developed as ap reduce impact to	ail in propriate in a
c) Have a substantial adverse impact 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?		$\checkmark$		
	c) Project will have and potentially on Revegetation plans reduce these to les	e temporary impacts of a small amount of rip s and other measure ss-than-significant lev	on serpentine gr parian communiti s detailed in Cha vel.	asslands es. apter 6

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Adversely impact federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) either individually or in combination with the known or probable impacts of other activities through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		✓		
	d) Construction of estimated 0.2 acre work areas and ac construction work San Andreas Lake reduce impacts to	f the Project could ca es of wetland habitat ccess roads outside t may be conducted w e at two towers. Mitig o a less-than-significa	use temporary ir if it is not possib he wetlands. So <i>v</i> ithin the highwa ation measures nt level.	npacts to an le to locate me ter mark of would
e) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?		~		
	e) The Project wo would not directly permanent wildlife species will be les mitigation.	uld not permanently interfere with migrati e dispersal. Tempora ss-than-significant wit	impact any fish s on corridors or c ry impacts to any h the incorporati	pecies and ause / fish on of
f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				√
	f) The Project wou ordinances or poli	uld not conflict with an icies.	ny local conserva	ation
g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓
	g) The Project is i Habitat Conserva	n compliance with the tion Plan (HCP).	e San Bruno Mo	untain
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the Project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource which is either listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, or a local register of historic resources?				√
	a) The Proposed along the Project	Project has no conflic route.	ct with historical	resources

4.2 Impact Assessment	Summary	Checklist
-----------------------	---------	-----------

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resources (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which is can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a		~		
special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type, or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person)?	b) The Proposed F recorded cultural re adverse changes i archaeological res address potential c	Project has no conflict esource sites; the Pro- n the significance of ources. Measures ha discoveries.	t with any knowr oject would not r any known uniqu we been incorpo	n or esult in any ue prated to
c) Disturb or destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?		$\checkmark$		
	c). Some fossil-bea Project Area. If pal be implemented, th than-significant lev	aring geologic format leontological resource nereby reducing any rel.	ions are located es are found, mi potential impact	in the tigation will to a less-
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			$\checkmark$	
	d) No sites with hu Area. If any such s appropriate mitigat	iman remains have b ites are discovered c tion measures will be	een identified in during construction implemented.	the Project on,
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?		$\checkmark$		
	i) Fault traces asso in the Project Area particularly the trar rupture. However, as part of the Proje facilities.	pociated with the San A and it is possible that nsition station, would incorporation of stan ect will provide for qu	Andreas fault an at Project facilitie be affected by a dard engineering ick repair of the	e mapped es, a fault g practices Project

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		$\checkmark$		
	<ul> <li>ii) It is likely that t moderate or great strong ground sha iii), the incorporati Project will ensure hazards associate</li> </ul>	the Project will be exp ter earthquake locate aking in the Project A on of standard engine that people or structu d with strong seismic	posed to at least ed close enough rea. As describe eering practices a ures are not expo ground shaking.	one to produce d in IV a) is part of the osed to
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		$\checkmark$		
	iii) Seismic-induce displace, and/or d level geotechnical and assess the po and rock materials transition station, Incorporation of st will ensure that pe associated with str	ed ground failure has lestroy Project compo l investigation will be otential for seismic-in s underlying substation and underground tra andard engineering p ople or structures are rong seismic ground s	the potential to performed to co duced ground fa on, transmission nsmission line si practices as part o a not exposed to l shaking.	distress, e, a design- llect data ilure in soil tower, tes. of the Project nazards
iv) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\checkmark$
	iv) Development of to, or be affected	of the Project would n by seiche, tsunami, c	ot increase hum or volcanic hazar	an exposure ds.
v) Landslides?			$\checkmark$	
	<ul> <li>v) Slope instability flows has the pote and distress to ov Project componer performed to eval for unstable slope proposed transmis Project facilities.</li> </ul>	y, including landslides ential to undermine for erlying structures, ar nts. A design-level ge uate the potential and s, landslides, earth fl ssion-line routes and	s, earth flows, ar bundations, caus ad displace or de otechnical surve d guide design to lows, and debris in the vicinity of	d debris- e distortion stroy y will be address flows along other
vi) Flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				$\checkmark$
	vi) Transmission I Segment 1, but th potential flood are However, the Proj inhabited structure structures to flood	ines will span a dam e towers are placed a, and therefore wou ject does not include es and would not incl ling.	failure inundatio above the elevat Ild not be subjec development of rease exposure of	n zone on ion of the t to flooding. any of people or

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
vii) Wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas and where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		$\checkmark$		
	vii) Fires could res measures have be lines could pose a tree limb, comes i conductor falls to the Project is loca PG&E fire hazard underground trans would not pose a significantly increa or residences.	sult during construction een included to minim a fire hazard when a conto nto proximity to a line the ground. The over ted primarily in open abatement practices smission line will be p wildland fire hazard. ase the potential for w	on; however, mit nize this risk. Tra conducting object a, or when a live- head transmissi space areas, bu would be impler volaced in city stre The Project wou vildfires close to	gation Insmission t, such as a phase on line for t typical mented. The æts and Id not urban areas
b) Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\checkmark$	
	<ul> <li>b) Surface disturb of access roads, t increase the poter Best Managemen Prevention Plan ir impacts to a less-</li> </ul>	ance and vegetation ransmission towers, a ntial for erosion. How t Practices in the Stol ncorporated as part of than-significant level.	removal during of and substations ever, implement rm Water Polluti f the Project wou	construction could ation of on Ild reduce
c) Would the Project result in the loss of a unique geologic feature?				$\checkmark$
	c) Some fossil-bea Project Area. If pa be implemented, t than-significant le	aring geologic format leontological resourc thereby reducing any vel.	ions are located es are found, mi potential impact	in the tigation will to a less-
d) Is the Project located on strata 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?		✓		
	d) Saturated, loos access for constru- foundations. Dest occur as a result of geotechnical stud and effects of, sof design features an maintain stable slo	e sands and soft clay uction and in excavati abilization of natural of of construction activiti ies will be performed t or loose soils where nd construction meas opes and excavations	vs may pose diffi ing for pole and or constructed sl ies. However, de to evaluate the e necessary and ures will be imples during construct	culties in tower opes could sign-level potential for, appropriate emented to ction.
	See also IV. a) iv)	, above.		

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Is Project located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property?		✓		
	e) Localized areas the Project route v appropriate desig	s of expansive soils th vould be mitigated th n features and constr	hat could be enc rough incorporat ruction measures	ountered in ion of 5.
f) Where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater, is the soil capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems?				V
	<li>f) Septic tanks wil Project construction</li>	I not be installed at th on will not require dis	ne proposed subs posal of wastewa	stations and ater.
VII. 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?			$\checkmark$	
	a) Maintenance of require the period petroleum produc disposed of in acc	f the substations and ic transport of hazarc ts. The materials wou cordance with applica	transmission line lous materials su Id be transporte ble regulations.	es would ich as d, used and
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?			$\checkmark$	
	b) Implementation measures regulati Section 112) for the would render the the environment u	of spill prevention, c ions (Title 40 Code of ne substations that w potential for a release inlikely.	control, and coun f Federal Regula ill be modified fo e of hazardous m	ter tions r the Project aterials to
c) Reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
	<ul> <li>c) Schools are loc transmission line.</li> <li>emissions or routi with the Project.</li> </ul>	ated adjacent to the However, there woul ne handling of hazard	proposed underg d not be any haz dous materials a	ground ardous ssociated

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Is the Project 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?			✓	
	d) Listed, contaminated sites have been identified that are located on or adjacent to the proposed transmission line route. Testing will be performed to characterize soil and groundwater as appropriate on the underground route, and appropriate personnel protection and waste disposal measures will be implemented.			
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?		✓		~
	e) The Project is la International Airpo during constructio Federal Aviation A not result in a safe Project Area as a	ocated in the vicinity ort (SFO) and propose n would be conducted administration require ety hazard for people result of the proximity	of the San France ed helicopter op- d in accordance ments. The Proj residing or work y of the Project t	cisco erations with ect would ing in the o the SFO.
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?				
	f) There are no kn	own private airstrips	in the Project Ar	ea.
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				~
	g) The Project wo interfere with any	uld not impair implem emergency plans.	entation of or pl	nysically
h) Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			✓	
	h) Transmission lin object, such as a t a live-phase cond transmission line f areas, but typical implemented. The city streets and we would not significat urban areas or res	nes could pose a fire tree limb, comes into uctor falls to the grou for the Project is local PG&E fire hazard aba underground transm buld not pose a wildla antly increase the pot sidences.	hazard when a proximity to a lir nd. The overhea ted primarily in c atement practice ission line will b and fire hazard. <sup>–</sup> ential for wildfire	conducting ne, or when ad pen space is would be e placed in The Project is close to

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the Project:				
a) Violate Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		$\checkmark$		
	a) Soil erosion and reduced surface w construction of the implementation of Prevention Plan, e spill prevention, co impacts to less-the	d subsequent downst vater quality could po e overhead transmiss measures outlined ir prosion control and se pontrol and counter me an-significant levels.	ream sedimenta tentially increase ion line. Howeve n a Storm Water ediment transpore easures plan will	tion and e during er, Pollution rt plan, and reduce
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 (i.e., 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)?			✓	
	<ul> <li>b) Groundwater que because trench de underground trans</li> <li>perched groundwater</li> </ul>	uantity will not be affe watering required fo smission line would b ater which does not s	ected by the Proj r construction of e minimal and lii upport wells.	ect the mited to
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			✓	
	c) Construction of underground line patterns or result i	the substations and would not substantial not substantial not substantial erosion	transmission tov ly alter existing o or siltation on- o	vers and drainage or off-site.
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 off-site?			✓	
	d) Construction of underground trans would not substan flooding because amount of impervi either infiltrate or s	the transmission tow smission line, and mo tially increase runoff the Project will not su ous surfaces in the F sheet flow to unpaved	vers, installation odification to the or result in on- o obstantially chan Project Area. Rain d areas.	of the substations or off-site ge the nfall will

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems to control?			✓	
	e) The Project wou would exceed the of drainage system. N additional stormwa	Id not create or cont capacity of existing o Modification to substa tter control systems t	ribute runoff wate or planned storm ations would not o be added.	er which water require
f) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				~
	f) The Project does	s not include the con	struction of hous	ing.
g) Place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\checkmark$
	g) No structures ar	e planned within 100	)-year floodplains	6.
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the Project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				$\checkmark$
	a) The overhead period existing transmission be built within city of physically divide an	ortion of the Project on line corridor and t streets, therefore the n established commu	will be built within he underground Project would n unity.	n the portion will ot
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?				✓
	b) The Project will adopted to mitigate	not conflict with land an environmental e	use policies, or ffect.	regulations
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				$\checkmark$
	c) See Biological R San Bruno Mounta	Resources IV g). Proj in Habitat Conservat	ect is in complia tion Plan.	nce with the
X. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the Project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				~
	a) No mapped Min Project alignment.	eral Resource Zones	s are located alo	ng the

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				$\checkmark$
	b) The Project wou resource recovery	uld not impact any loo sites.	cally important n	nineral
XI. 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?		✓		
	<ul> <li>a) Temporary nois</li> <li>Project which wou</li> <li>not expose person</li> <li>publicly adopted p</li> </ul>	e impacts would occ Id be minimized by m is to noise or general lans or standards.	ur during constru nitigation. The Pl te noise levels ir	uction of the roject would a excess of
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		$\checkmark$		
	b) Temporary nois Project. The Projec generate excessiv	e impacts would occ ct will not expose per e groundborne vibrat	ur during constru rsons to excessi tion or noise leve	uction of the ve noise or els.
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?			$\checkmark$	
	c) Operation of the transmission line and substations would not create a noticeable permanent increase in noise levels.			
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?		$\checkmark$		
	d) Temporary construction-related noise impacts would occur in the Project vicinity. Implementation of mitigation measures will reduce noise levels to a less-than-significant level.			
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?		✓		
	e) The Project is I Francisco Internati the Project are not experienced by re- construction-relate would be less than	ocated greater than t ional Airport, and noi t expected to contribu sidents affected by a ed noise impacts wou n significant, as descr	two miles from the se levels associ- ute to existing no ircraft noise. Ter ald occur to resider ibed in this sect	ne San ated with ise nporary ents, but ion.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				√
	f) There are no kno	own private airstrips i	n the Project Are	a.
XII. 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)?				✓
	a) The Project wou proposed increase has occurred or is	Id not induce popula in electric power is in continuing to occur.	tion growth beca n response to gr	use the owth that
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				√
	b) The Project would not displace any existing housing.			
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				√
	c) The Project wou	ld not displace any p	eople.	
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the Project:				
a) Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the need for or provision of 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:				✓
i. Fire protection?				$\checkmark$
	i) The demand for Project.	fire protection will not	t change as a re	sult of the
ii. Police protection?				$\checkmark$
	ii) The demand for the Project.	police protection will	not change as a	result of
iii. Schools?				$\checkmark$
	iii) The demand for Project.	schools will not chai	nge as a result o	f the

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv. Parks?				$\checkmark$
	iv) The demand for parks will not change as a result of the Project.			
v. Other public facilities?				$\checkmark$
	<ul> <li>v) The demand for other public services such as hospitals and maintenance of public facilities will not change as a result of the Project.</li> </ul>			
XIV. 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?				$\checkmark$
	<ul> <li>a) The Project will not increase demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.</li> </ul>			
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?				$\checkmark$
	<ul> <li>b) The Project will not affect existing recreational facilities during construction or operation.</li> </ul>			
XV. 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)?			✓	
	<ul> <li>a) Construction traffic is not anticipated to significantly affect the number of trips or volume to capacity ratio on roads; temporary lane closures will be required on roadways that will be trenched for the Project.</li> </ul>			
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				~
	b) The traffic volu be minimal compa	me generated during ared to existing traffic	Project construct levels.	tion would

Issues	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
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?				√
	c) The Project would not impact air traffic patterns. Use of helicopters during construction would be in accordance with FAA requirements and would not result in air traffic pattern changes.			
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			~	
	d) The Project will roadways. Tempor be mitigated such design feature haz	not permanently affe ary effects to roadwa that a substantial incl ards or incompatible	ct design feature lys during consti rease in existing uses would not	es of ruction will roadway occur.
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			$\checkmark$	
	e) The Project will residential roads. L jurisdictions and er	not impact emergend ane closures will be mergency service pro	cy access on reg coordinated with widers.	ional and n local
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			$\checkmark$	
	f) The Project could temporarily affect street parking in residential areas during underground construction activities; temporary parking space closures will be coordinated with local jurisdictions.			
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				$\checkmark$
	g) The Project wou transportation polic transportation, suc lane closures on st significant with sug	Ild not conflict with ac cies. Temporary impa h as temporary detou treets with bus servic ggested mitigation me	dopted alternative acts to alternative urs for existing b e would be less easures for traffic	e e ike paths or than c control.
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the Project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\checkmark$
	<ul> <li>a) The Project would not be subject to wastewater treatment requirements because no wastewater would be generated.</li> </ul>			ment ted.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				$\checkmark$
	<ul> <li>b) The Project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.</li> </ul>			
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?				$\checkmark$
	c) The Project will stormwater draina Drainage facilities the Project.	not require or result ge facilities or expan at the existing substa	in the construction sion of existing fa ations will not be	on of new acilities. affected by
d) Are sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				$\checkmark$
	d) The Project would not require new water supplies. Construction crews will bring in potable water for drinking purposes and non-potable water for dust control.			
e) Has the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				✓
	e) The Project would not generate any wastewater.			
f) Is the Project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?				✓
	<li>f) The Project wou during constructio soil waste due to t transmission line. any soil or constru-</li>	Ild generate a minima n activities. The Proje renching of the unde Local landfills have s uction waste.	al amount of solic ect is expected to rground portion o ufficient capacity	d waste o generate of the v to accept