1. Project title:

Antelope Transmission Project – Segments 2 and 3

2. Lead agency name and address:

California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

3. Contact person and phone number:

Mr. Thomas Burhenn
Manager of Regulatory Operations
(626) 302-9652

Mr. Daniel C. Pearson
Manager of Natural and Cultural Resources, Corporate Environment, Health and Safety
(626) 302-9562

4. Project location:

The proposed Segment 2 Antelope to Vincent 500 kilovolt (kV) transmission line (T/L) project would include constructing 21.0 miles of 500 kV T/L and 0.5 mile of 220 kV T/L parallel to an existing SCE T/L corridor for the majority of the route from the existing SCE Antelope Substation site located in the City of Lancaster, to the existing SCE Vincent Substation site located in the County of Los Angeles. Proposed Segment 3 consists of a 500 kV T/L between SCE's Antelope Substation and proposed Substation One, and a 220 kV T/L between proposed Substation One and proposed Substation Two. The proposed Segment 3 Antelope to Substation One 500 kV T/L component would include constructing 25.6 miles of new T/L following existing roads over the majority of its length from the Antelope Substation to a new substation site designated as Substation One located several miles west of the community of Mojave. Two alternative T/L routes, Alternative A (25.9 miles) and Alternative B (26.04 miles), have also been identified for possible T/L construction between the Antelope Substation and alternative substation sites 1A and 1B, respectively, which occur next to the Substation One site. An additional alternative substation site 1C is also identified which occurs several miles west of the Substation One site. It is noted that sites 1A and 1C have been reviewed in the PEA and are rejected as viable alternatives for Substation One. The proposed Substation One to Substation Two 220 kV T/L component of Segment 3 would

[1] http: //ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/Appendix_G.html

include constructing a new 9.6 miles of new T/L between Substation One and a new substation site designated as Substation Two located in the vicinity of the City of Tehachapi. An alternative 220 kV T/L route designated Alternative C, extends from Substation One to either of two alternate substation sites designated 2A and 2B which are located 0.5 mile east and 1 mile north, respectively, of the Substation Two site. It is noted that site 2A has been reviewed in the Proponents Environmental Assessment (PEA) and is rejected as a viable alternative for Substation Two.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

6. General plan designations:

The proposed Segment 2 project occurs within the general plan areas of the City of Lancaster, the City of Palmdale, and the County of Los Angeles. The proposed Segment 3 component, as well as Alternatives A and B, occur within the general plan areas of the City of Lancaster, the County of Los Angeles, and Kern County. The Substation One to Substation Two 220 kV T/L system component of Segment 3 occurs entirely within the general plan area of Kern County.

These planning areas contain numerous land use designations, which are summarized by T/L route mileposts in the PEA in Table 4.10-2 for Segment 2, and Table 4.10-4 for Segment 3.

7. Zoning:

The proposed Segment 2 project occurs within the zoning areas of the City of Lancaster, the City of Palmdale, and the County of Los Angeles. The proposed Segment 3 project, as well as Alternatives A and B, occur within the zoning areas of the City of Lancaster, the County of Los Angeles, and Kern County. The Substation One to Substation Two T/L system component of Segment 3 occurs entirely within the zoning area of Kern County.

These zoning areas contain numerous designations, which are summarized in the PEA in Table 4.10-1 for Segment 2, and in Table 4.10-3 for Segment 3.

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed Antelope-Vincent 500/220 kV T/L route is referred to as Segment 2, and the proposed Antelope Substation One (500/220/66 kV) and Substation Two (220/66 kV) T/L route is referred to as Segment 3.

Southern California Edison (SCE) is proposing to construct the following transmission line (T/L) system components and substation facilities associated with the preferred alternatives of Segments 2 and 3 of the Antelope Transmission Project:

- New, 21.0 miles of 500 kV T/L plus 0.5 mile of 220 kV T/L between the existing Antelope and Vincent substations (initially energized at 220 kV) (Segment 2)
- New, 25.6 miles of 500 kV T/L between the existing Antelope Substation and new Substation One (initially energized at 220 kV) (Segment 3)
- New, 9.6 miles of 220 kV T/L between the new Substation One and Substation Two (northern portion of Segment 3 in the Tehachapi Wind Farm Area)
- New, 500/220/66 kV Substation One located near Cal Cement approximately 7 miles west of the community of Mojave
- New, 220/66 kV Substation Two located approximately 3.5 miles east of the City of Tehachapi

The proposed Segment 2 Antelope-Vincent 500 kV T/L would be constructed completely in Los Angeles County and would parallel an existing T/L corridor over much of its length between SCE's existing Antelope and Vincent substations. The proposed route would depart from the existing T/L and traverse open space areas within the Ritter Ranch and Anaverde specific plan areas in western Palmdale.

The proposed Antelope-Substation One 500 kV T/L would be constructed in northern Los Angeles and southern Kern counties and would follow existing roads over much of its length. The proposed Substation One to Substation Two 220 kV T/L would be constructed completely in Kern County in the existing Tehachapi Wind Farm Area (designated by Kern County as Eastern Wind Resource Area). Substation One would be a 500/220/66 kV substation. Substation Two would be a new 220/66 kV substation in the wind farm area near Monolith.

The 500 kV T/Ls would be initially energized at 220 kV. The proposed project would include electrical interconnections at the existing Antelope (Segments 2 and 3) and Vincent (Segment 2) substations.

The proposed Antelope Transmission Project also includes Segment 1 (Antelope-Pardee, 500 kV T/L). Segment 1 is addressed in a separate Certificate of Public Convenience and

Necessity (CPCN) Application/Proponents Environmental Assessment (PEA) dated December 9, 2004.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

Segment 2:

Surrounding land use in the northern portion of the proposed project within the City of Lancaster and unincorporated Los Angeles County includes, primarily, low-density residential, light agriculture, and open space. The middle portion within the jurisdictions of the City of Palmdale and the County of Los Angeles includes, primarily, low-density residential and open space. The lower portion of the project is within the County of Los Angeles and includes, primarily, open space, low-density residential, and a highway and rail transportation corridor.

Segment 3:

Surrounding land use in the southern portion of the proposed project within the City of Lancaster and unincorporated Los Angeles County includes, primarily, low-density residential, light agriculture, and open space. The middle and upper portions of the project occur within Kern County and includes, primarily, low-density residential, light agriculture, wind farm electrical generation facility, and open space resources management and reserve land use areas.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Encroachment permits, and notifications and letters of permission, may be required for crossings over water-supply features, utility corridors, and transportation corridors. California Department of Fish & Game Section (CDFG) 1600-1616 et seq. notification and permitting (stream and lake alteration agreement), Corps of Engineers Section 404 notification and permitting, and State Water Resources Control Board permitting pursuant to Section 401, respectively, may be required for potential direct affects to State and federal jurisdictional waters. If endangered species issues arise during project implementation, incidental take permitting through coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code incidental take of State-listed species permitting through coordination with the CDFG, may become necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

To conserve the number of pages needed to present the CEQA environmental evaluations for both the Segment 2 and Segment 3 components of the Antelope Transmission Project, one checklist is included below and entries pertaining to Segment 2 are indicated with a number 2, while entries pertaining to Segment 3 are indicated with a number 3.

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" are:

__ Aesthetics	__ Agriculture Resources	__ Air Quality
__ Biological Resources	__ Cultural Resources	__ Geology /Soils
__ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	__ Hydrology / Water Quality	__ Land Use / Planning
__ Mineral Resources	__ Noise	__ Population / Housing
__ Public Services	__ Recreation	__ Transportation/Traffic
__ Utilities / Service Systems	__ 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 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL 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.

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; and

b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

	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?			**2,3**	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			**2,3**	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			**2,3**	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				**2,3**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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 (1997) 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?			**2,3**	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			**2,3**	
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			**2,3**	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		**2,3**		
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		**2,3**		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		**2,3**		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		**2,3**		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		**2,3**		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		**2,3**		
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?		**2,3**		
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?		**2,3**		
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?		**2,3**		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		**2,3**		
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?		**2,3**		

	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 as defined in '15064.5?		**2,3**		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?		**2,3**		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		**2,3**		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		**2,3**		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:		**2,3**		
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.		**2,3**		
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		**2,3**		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		**2,3**		
iv) Landslides?		**2,3**		
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		**2,3**		
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?		**2,3**		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		**2,3**		
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				**2,3**

	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?		**2,3**		
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?		**2,3**		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		**2,3**		
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?				**2,3**
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?				**2,3**

	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?				**2,3**
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		**2,3**		
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?		**2,3**		

	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 any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		**2,3**		
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)?				**2,3**
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?		**2,3**		
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?		**2,3**		

	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 or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		**2,3**		
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		**2,3**		
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?				**2,3**
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?		**2,3**		
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?				**2,3**
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				**2,3**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			**2,3**	
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?			**2,3**	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			**2,3**	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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?			**2,3**	
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?			**2,3**	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		**2,3**		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		**2,3**		
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		**2,3**		
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		**2,3**		
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?				**2,3**
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?				**2,3**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				**2,3**
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			**2**	**3**
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			**2**	**3**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				**2,3**
Police protection?				**2,3**
Schools?				**2,3**
Parks?				**2,3**
Other public facilities?				**2,3**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				**2,3**
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?				**2,3**

	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)?		**2,3**		
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		**2,3**		
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?				**2,3**
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				**2,3**
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		**2,3**		
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?		**2,3**		
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				**2,3**

	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?				**2,3**
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?				**2,3**
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				**2,3**
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				**2,3**
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?				**2,3**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				**2,3**
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		**2,3**		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		**2,3**		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		**2,3**		
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			**2,3**	

SOURCES AND EXPLANATIONS OF ANSWERS:

Sources and explanations of answers in the checklist for both Segment 2 and Segment 3 are included below.

I. AESTHETICS

Project construction and operation for both Segments 2 and 3 would have Less than Significant impacts on scenic resources and would not create substantial new sources of light or glare.

Segment 2:

A Less than Significant Impact to the visual environment within the Ritter Ranch and Anaverde specific plan areas between mile 7.6 and 15.0 would potentially occur at the time the residential projects are complete.

Segment 3:

Potential Less than Significant impact to visual environment identified adjacent to proposed Del Sur Ranch development along Proposed and Alternative A T/L routes. Potential Less than Significant impact to visual environment identified adjacent to the proposed Copa de Oro/Kern Ross Estate development along the Alternative B route. Adverse, but Less Than Significant visual impact through degradation of visual character of site and surroundings due to presence of Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail within the Alternative 1C Substation site. Potential adverse impairment of scenic vistas at the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail crossing resultant from T/L installation is regarded as Less than Significant (with consideration of tower setbacks). Potential impact to visual environment associated with required 220 kV T/L crossing of State Route 58 to connect to the Alternative Substation 2B site is regarded as Less than Significant.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have Less than Significant impacts on State-designated or locally-important farmlands, zoning for agricultural use, Williamson Act contracts, or substantially impairing farming and grazing activities and commerce, because only a minimal amount of farmland and grazing land conversion would occur in a regional context, and construction activities would be temporary and intermittent.

III. AIR QUALITY

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation, as specified in Section 5.4. of the PEA. Mitigation incorporation would avoid or minimize the potentials for:

- Conflicts with an applicable air quality plan
- Violating an air quality standard
- Contributing substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation
- Substantial net contribution towards a cumulative increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in a non-attainment condition
- Exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations
- Creating objectionable odors affecting a great number of people

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation, as specified in Section 5.5 of the PEA, upon sensitive species, riparian habitats, other sensitive native habitats, wetlands, species' migrations, wildlife corridors, local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, or upon any established or pending State or County Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation, as specified in Section 5.6 of the PEA, upon sensitive archaeological, historic, and paleontological resources. Mitigation incorporation would include conducting a full-scale cultural resources reconnaissance, and construction activity monitoring to protect and recover cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation upon people and structures with mitigation measures that pertain to the effects of earthquake fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, expansive and collapsible soils, subsidence, and landslides. Mitigation incorporation would include implementation of geotechnical and engineering studies and incorporation of the resultant design recommendations.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation pertaining to risks associated with:

- Transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials
- Reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions causing hazardous material release into the environment
- Hazardous emissions and handling of acutely hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school
- Impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan
- Causing wildland fires and urban interface fires

Mitigation incorporation would include implementation of the Construction SWPPP, and SPCC Plan and through development and implementation of other plans and programs required under State and federal law.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation, as specified in Section 5.9 of the PEA. Mitigation incorporation would avoid or minimize the potential for:

- Violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements
- Causing substantial erosion or siltation through altering existing drainage patterns and/or streamcourses
- Causing substantial flooding through altering existing drainage patterns and/or streamcourses
- Generate polluted water or overload stormwater drainage systems
- Otherwise substantially degrade water quality
- Placement of structures within a 100-year floodplain that will impede or redirect floodflows

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have a Less than Significant impact pertaining to existing land uses, future planning, and/or land management

by the cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, the County of Los Angeles, and Kern County. Neither would the proposed project physically divide an established community nor conflict with a HCP or a NCCP.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have a Less than Significant impact pertaining to limiting the availability of mineral and energy resources within any State or local jurisdiction.

XI. NOISE

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation, as specified in Sections 5.12 of the PEA. Mitigation incorporation would avoid or minimize the potentials for:

- Exposing persons to noise levels above thresholds in local plans, ordinances, and State agency standards
- Exposing persons to excessive ground-borne vibrations and noise levels
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above the pre-project ambient level
- Substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels above the pre-project ambient level

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Project construction of Segment 2 would have a Less Than Significant impact pertaining to the removal of 3 existing homes. No adverse impacts are identified for operation of Segment 2 or project construction and operation of Segment 3.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

No adverse impacts are identified for project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3. No public services would be affected.

XIV. RECREATION

Based upon the CEQA Checklist, there are no impacts for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 pertaining to:

- Increasing the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would result
- Recreational facilities being included in the project, or requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse effect on the environment

However, it is noted that a determination is made in Table 6-2 that a Potentially Significant Impact would occur at the Alternative Substation 1C site due to the on-site occurrence of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail. Also, a determination of an Adverse, but Less Than Significant impact regarding recreational use impairment of the trail is associated with the Proposed Substation One to Two and the Alternative C routes.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation that includes the development of local traffic management and detour plans as specified by local jurisdictions, and any other SCE plans developed according to Section VII, above.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have no impacts pertaining to:

- Exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Causing construction or expansion of water delivery or wastewater treatment facilities
- Causing construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities
- Affect available water supplies and entitlements
- Affecting wastewater treatment provider services
- Affecting landfill capacity from project solid waste disposal

Project construction and operation for either Segment 2 or Segment 3 would have an impact of Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation pertaining to complying with federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste disposal.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

As discussed in Section 5.6, the proposed project has the potential to eliminate important examples of major periods of California prehistory for both the Segment 2 and Segment 3 components. Implementation of mitigation as discussed in Section 5.6 would reduce the potential impacts to Cultural Resources to a less than significant level.

For the reasons described in Section 7.0, the proposed project does not have the potential to cause impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable to the point of being significant.

For the reasons discussed in this PEA, the proposed project does not have environmental effects that would cause unavoidable, substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.