4.1 CEQA Initial Study Checklist

As required by CPUC Rule 17.1 and General Order 131-D, the 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 16. 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		
	several designate Avenue, Manning	uld affect the charac ed scenic roadways i Road, Route 84, and a substantial advers	including North d Interstate 580.	Livermore However,
b) Damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				\checkmark
	b) The project wil scenic highway.	I not damage scenic	resources with	in a state
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		\checkmark		
	from the Kottingel Construction of th open space areas setbacks from the substations. With	ent, the project would r Ranch and North Liv ne North Livermore a s would be mitigated to e road, and walls and implementation of v of the project, impac	vermore resider and Dublin Subs hrough low prof d landscaping a isual mitigation	itial areas. stations in ile design, round the measures
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			√	
	equipment but wo	ng would be placed a buld not increase gla d downward focus o	re due to the us	ation se of low-

Less Than Potentially Significant Less Than Significant With Mitigation Significant No Issues: Impact Incorporation Impact Impact 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: \square a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or \checkmark 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 project components would be located in prime or unique farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or ~ a Williamson Act contract? b) The development of the Dublin Substation would remove 5 acres of land (of a 380-acre parcel) from Williamson Act contract status. This would not change agricultural practices. Pursuant to Government Code Section 51238, construction of electric facilities is a compatible use with Williamson Act lands. 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? c) Placement of transmission towers in agricultural areas will not result in a significant loss of farmland or result in a new non-agricultural 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 1 applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan or Congestion Management Plan? a) The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality attainment plans.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any stationary source air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓	
	b) Construction of the project will produce minor temporary air emissions in the form of fugitive dust from ground disturbance and from construction equipment and vehicle exhaust but will not violate any air quality standards. Operation of the project will not produce air emissions.			
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)?			✓	
	emissions in the and from constru	f the project will prod form of fugitive dust ction equipment and not produce air emi	from ground dis vehicle exhaust	sturbance
d) Create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hot spot" (primarily carbon monoxide)?				✓
		ould not create or con because no air emis		
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				\checkmark
	pollutants sufficie	nstruction emissions we ent to create exposure are no sensitive popu	e to sensitive po	pulations.
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				\checkmark
	f) Construction ar use of equipmen odors.	nd operation of the proton of	oject would not ould cause obje	require the ctionable
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)?	✓			
	a) Project constru endangered, or the located in the pro	uction has the potent hreatened species if pject area.	ial to impact rar they are found t	e, o be

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	✓			
		uction has the potent cial status species if pject area.		
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?				~
		at or other sensitive or regional plans, po ne project area.		
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?		✓		
	as much as 3,000 possible to locate	of the project could c O square feet of weth access roads outsic reduce impacts to a	and habitat if it i le the wetlands.	s not Mitigation
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?		V		
	directly interfere wildlife dispersal	ould not impact any fi with migration corrid . The project could ir ounts of, nursery site	ors or cause pe npede the use o	rmanent of, or
f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				√
	f) The project wor ordinances or po	uld not conflict with a licies.	ny local conser	vation
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 wo conservation pla	ould not conflict with a ns.	any known habit	at

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				\checkmark
		esources have been routes or at the sub		the
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	recorded cultural	project has no conflir resource sites; there	fore, the project	would not
important prehistoric or historic event or person)?	result in any adverse changes in the significance of any unique archaeological resources.			
c) Disturb or destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	project area. How	✓ earing geologic forma vever, they would be be implemented to re	avoided and/or	mitigation
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			\checkmark	
	project area. If ar	numan remains have ny such sites are disc propriate mitigation n	overed during	
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?			✓	
	the South Area a fault rupture in the expose people to	and Verona faults and nd some evidence s e project area. Howe o adverse effects bec y populated area.	uggests the pos ver, the project	sibility of would not

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			\checkmark	
	earthquake excee	the project will be exp eding threshold limits adverse effects to p populated.	. However, there	would not
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			\checkmark	
	seismic ground f	oject area generally l ailure. Soils in the a ide stream channel c	rea most susce	ntial for otible to
iv) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\checkmark
		of the project would r e affected by seiche,		
v) Landslides?			\checkmark	
	classified as "mo However, these a not possible, imp features and con	of the proposed pro stly landslide" by the areas will either be s lementation of appro struction procedures dies will reduce the i	U.S. Geologica panned or, if av priate engineer s based on desi	l Service. oidance is ing design gn-level
vi) Flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			√	
	zone between Mi does not include	lines will be constru leposts M5.1 and M5 development of any se exposure of peopl	.3. However, the inhabited struct	e project ures and
vii) Wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas and where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			~	
	conducting objec line, or when a liv project is located Near residential underground. Th	n lines could pose a f t, such as a tree limb re-phase conductor f primarily in open spa areas, the transmiss e project would not s fires close to urban a	, comes into pro alls to the grour ace and agricultu sion line will be ignificantly incre	oximity to a nd. The ural areas. ease the

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\checkmark	
	b) Surface disturbance and vegetation removal during construction of access roads, transmission towers, and substations could increase the potential for erosion. However, implementation of standard engineering practices incorporated as part of the project would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.			
c) Would the project result in the loss of a unique geologic feature?				\checkmark
	c) Some fossil-be project area but t	earing geologic form hey would not be imp	ations are locat pacted by the pro	ed in the oject.
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?			✓	
	uncompacted se	ould occur after distu diments during cons generally have a low	truction activitie	s. Soils in
	classified as "mo However, these a not possible, imp features and con	the proposed project stly landslide" by the ireas will either be sp lementation of appro struction procedures dies will reduce the i	U.S. Geologica panned or, if av priate engineer based on desi	I Service. oidance is ing design gn-level
e) Is project located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property?			\checkmark	
	shrink-swell pote	n the project area ha ntial but the placeme I not create substanti	ent of project fa	cilities on
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?				✓
		ill not be installed at ruction will not requi		

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the substations and transmission lines woul require the periodic transport of hazardous materials such as petroleum products. The materials would be shipped and disposed in accordance with Department of Transportation an state and federal EPA regulations.			
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?			√	
	 b) Operation of the substations could result in a release of transformer oil in the event of severe equipment failure. However, implementation of spill prevention, control, and counter measures regulations (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations Section 112) would render the potential for a release of hazardous materials to the environment unlikely. 			
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?				~
	from the propose there would not b	ry schools are locate of underground trans ie any hazardous em terials associated wi	mission line. H issions or routin	owever,
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?			✓	
	adjacent to the pr these sites will b lines, or testing v	ve been identified that oposed transmission e avoided by spannir vill be performed pric onal protection and v ted.	line route. Cons ng them with tra or to constructio	struction at nsmission n and
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?				~
		located neither in an r within 2 miles of an		

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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\checkmark
	f) There are no kr	nown private airstrips	s in the project a	irea.
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\checkmark
	g) The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any emergency plans.			
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?			\checkmark	
	conducting object proximity with a linground. However and agricultural a line will be under	lines could pose a fi t, such as a tree limb ne, or when a live-ph r, the project is locate areas. Near residenti ground. The project ential for wildfires clo	o, comes into cl ase conductor f ed in mostly ope al areas, the tra would not signifi	ose falls to the en space nsmission cantly
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			\checkmark	
	surface water qua erosion. Howeve storm water pollu sediment transpo	r operation of the pro- ality due to hazardou r, implementation of tion prevention plan ort plan, and spill pre es plan will reduce in	us materials spil measures outli , erosion contro vention, control	ls or ned in a I and , and
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)?				~
		uantity will not be aff ions, withdrawals, o occur.		

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the substations and transmission towers would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or resul in substantial erosion or siltation on- 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?			~	
	would not substa flooding because	of the substations an ntially increase runo e most of the project a r infiltrate or sheet flo	ff or result in on area will remain	- or off-site unpaved.
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems to control?			~	
	would exceed the	ould not create or con e capacity of existing . Substations will hav rol systems.	or planned stor	mwater
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 doe	es not include the co	nstruction of ho	using.
g) Place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\checkmark
	project would be section would be	n (0.2 miles) of the un built in a dam inunda underground, no stri ain that would impede	ation zone. Sinc uctures would b	e the e built in a
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				\checkmark
	grasslands. The	mponents are locate underground transmi nton streets but would	ssion line would	be placed

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				~
		l not conflict with lan ed to mitigate an en،		
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				\checkmark
	c) There are no kr area.	nown existing conser	rvation plans in	the project
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?				~
		al Resource Zones (uth Area of the projec ect.		
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?				√
	b) The project wo resource recover	uld not impact any lo y sites.	ocally-important	mineral
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?			√	
	the project. The p	se impacts would oc project would not exp evels in excess of pul	ose persons to	noise or
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			\checkmark	
	the project. The p	se impacts would oc roject would not exp excessive groundb	ose persons to	excessive

Less Than Potentially Significant Less Than Significant With Mitigation Significant No Issues: Impact Incorporation Impact Impact c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? c) Temporary noise impacts would occur during construction of the project. Operation of the transmission line and substations would not create a noticeable increase in noise levels. There are no residences or businesses located near the project facilities. d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? d) Temporary construction-related noise impacts would occur to residents in the area where the transmission line would be underground. 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 located neither within an airport land use plan nor within two miles of a public airport. 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 known private airstrips in the project area. 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 would not induce population growth because the proposed increase in electric power is in response to growth that is already occurring. 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 would not displace any people.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				✓
i. Fire protection?				\checkmark
	i) The demand for the project.	r fire protection will n	ot change as a	result of
ii. Police protection?				\checkmark
	ii) The demand for the project.	r police protection wil	ll not change as	a result of
iii. Schools?				\checkmark
	iii) The demand fo project.	or schools will not ch	ange as a resu	It of the
iv. Parks?				\checkmark
	iv) The demand fo project.	or parks will not char	nge as a result c	of the
v. Other public facilities?				\checkmark
		or other public servic ublic facilities will not		
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?				~
	 a) The project will not increase demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. 			lood or
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?				✓
	b) The project will during construction	not affect existing re	ecreational oppo	ortunities

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?			~	
	a) Temporary lane closures will be required on some rural roadways. All of these roads have low traffic flows.			
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 low amount of traffic volume generated during project construction would be negligible. 			
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 wo	uld not impact air tra	ffic patterns.	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\checkmark	
	right-of-ways, ope roadways. The pr	ion lines would be p en space, residentia roject will cross railro scheduled so that tr	l areas, and alo bad tracks but th	ng existing nese
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			\checkmark	
	residential roads	not impact emergen . Lane closures will t emergency service p	be coordinated	gional and with local
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			\checkmark	
		ld temporarily affect nd construction activ		earst Drive
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			\checkmark	
	Bernal Avenue, ir	uld temporarily affec ncluding WHEEL bus ous stops during con	s routes 8 and 6	06, school

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\checkmark
		ould not be subject to cause no wastewate		
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?				√
	b) The project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.			
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?				~
	c) The project will not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Appropriate drainage facilities will be developed at each 5-acre substation site.			
d) Are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✓
	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?				✓
	f) The project would generate a minimal amount of solid waste during construction activities. Local landfills have sufficient capacity to accept any soil or construction waste.			