

**APPENDIX A**  
**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

From Appendix G of CEQA Guidelines



**APPENDIX A  
CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST  
FROM APPENDIX G, CEQA GUIDELINES**

---

**1. Project title:**

Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line Project (DPV2)

**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  
Southern California Edison Company  
(626) 302-9652

Mr. Daniel C. Pearson  
Manager, Natural and Cultural Resources  
Environment, Health & Safety  
Southern California Edison Company  
(626) 302-9562

**4. Project location:**

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) proposes to construct a new high-voltage electric transmission line between California and Arizona known as the Devers-Harquahala 500 kilovolt (kV) transmission line. The proposed line would extend from Devers Substation (Devers), located near Palm Springs, California to the Harquahala Generating Station switchyard (Harquahala), west of Phoenix, Arizona. The proposed line would extend for 230 miles, of which 102 miles would be located in Arizona and 128 miles would be located in California. The majority of the proposed route would parallel SCE's existing Devers-Palo Verde No. 1 (DPV1) 500kV transmission line. Two subalternate routes were identified for the termination point in Arizona.

Operation of the proposed line would require that upgrades be made to certain of SCE's existing electrical transmission facilities, west from Devers to the Vista and San Bernardino substations

in the City of Redlands. The upgrades would involve approximately 47 miles of existing transmission lines. The proposed Devers-Harquahala line and associated transmission facility upgrades are referred to as the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 project (DPV2).

SCE is considering an interconnection request that would include the construction of a 500kV substation called the Midpoint Substation. The preferred location for Midpoint Substation is about 10 miles southwest of Blythe. Two alternative sites for the substation have been identified and are evaluated in this PEA: the Mesa Verde site is located 4.5 miles northwest of the preferred location; and the Wiley Wells site is located 17 miles west of Blythe.

**5. Project sponsor's name and address:**

Southern California Edison Company  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770

**6. General plan designations:**

In California, the proposed DPV2 project occurs within the general plan areas of the following jurisdictions:

- |                            |                        |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| City of Banning            | City of Indio          |
| City of Beaumont           | City of Loma Linda     |
| City of Calimesa           | City of Palm Springs   |
| City of Cathedral City     | City of Redlands       |
| City of Coachella          | City of San Bernardino |
| City of Colton             | Riverside County       |
| City of Desert Hot Springs | San Bernardino County  |
| City of Grand Terrace      |                        |

These planning areas contain numerous land use designations, which are summarized below in item 9.

**7. Zoning:**

The proposed DPV2 project would be constructed within existing utility corridors. The majority of the proposed transmission line project construction would be located within SCE fee-owned rights-of-way or easements granted to SCE. The proposed DPV2 project would not conflict with any existing zoning designations.

**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.)**

Construction of the proposed Devers-Harquahala 500kV transmission line would utilize the same four types of structures as the existing DPV1 and Harquahala-Hassayampa 500kV transmission lines. Of the approximately 784 structures required, approximately 709 would be four-legged, single-circuit lattice steel towers. To reduce potential impacts to agricultural operations, approximately 39 two-legged (or H-frame) single-circuit towers would be used in the Palo Verde Valley south of Blythe, California. Where feasible, structures would be constructed next to the existing DPV1 towers. In anticipation of the eventual construction of DPV2, during construction of DPV1 conductors for a 3-mile portion of the DPV2 line were installed on 13 double-circuit towers constructed for the DPV1 line to minimize impact to bighorn sheep habitat in the Copper Bottom Pass of the Dome Rock Mountains in Arizona. Approximately 23 new tubular steel poles would be constructed parallel to the existing Harquahala-Hassayampa 500kV line east of Harquahala, in Arizona.

Because the majority of the Devers-Harquahala line would be constructed within the utility corridor that contains the existing DPV1 line and existing access for line maintenance, construction of new main access roads would not be needed in most locations. Spur roads would be extended from the existing DPV1 main access roads to provide construction access for the proposed Devers-Harquahala 500kV line.

The existing 230kV transmission line system west of Devers consists of one set of double-circuit tower lines and two separate sets of single-circuit lines between Devers and San Bernardino Junction. San Bernardino Junction is the intersection of 230kV transmission line corridors located 3.4 miles south of the San Bernardino Substation. The proposed 230kV system upgrade would require the following activities between Devers and San Bernardino Junction: removal of an existing single-circuit 230kV tower line on wood H-frame structures, removal of an existing single-circuit 230kV tower line on lattice steel structures; replacement with a new double-circuit 230kV line; and reconductoring and modification of the existing double-circuit 230kV tower line.

Also, the 230kV system upgrade would require reconductoring of both circuits on an existing double-circuit 230kV tower line between Vista Substation and San Bernardino Junction. In addition, one circuit on each of the two existing double-circuit 230kV tower lines between San Bernardino Junction and San Bernardino Substation would be reconducted. Intersetting structures, or raising existing structures, would be necessary at some locations. Existing access roads would be utilized wherever possible for construction and line maintenance.

Construction of new support facilities would include: a new Optical Repeater facility located approximately 3 miles west of Blythe within the DPV2 right-of-way; a proposed California series capacitor bank located just north of and adjacent to the existing DPV1 series capacitor bank, approximately 64 miles east of Devers and 0.4 mile south of I-10; and a 500kV shunt line reactor bank and associated disconnect switches within Devers Substation. A 500kV Static VAR Compensation (SVC) would terminate into the 500kV switchrack.

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

Along the proposed Devers–Harquahala 500kV transmission line, federal land and associated uses dominate the study corridor. Areas designated by federal agencies for preservation, conservation, and/or recreation include wilderness areas (WAs), areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs), Joshua Tree National Park and the Coachella Valley NWR/Preserve. The Agua Caliente Indian Reservation is the only Native American land in the study corridor located near the proposed DPV2 route.

Private land can be found primarily within the Coachella Valley north of Palm Springs and south of Blythe. Other existing and future land uses within the study corridor include vacant/undeveloped and grazing, agriculture, open space, recreation, rural residential, low- and medium-density residential, industrial/commercial, energy related industrial, utility and transportation infrastructure, and extraction/mining.

Along the proposed 230kV system upgrades west of Devers, private land predominates. A small amount of BLM land is present, including the Whitewater Canyon Area of Critical Environmental Concern. The Morongo Indian Reservation is within the west of Devers study corridor. The proposed route involves ten incorporated areas. Other population centers include unincorporated communities (White Water, Cabazon, and Cherry Valley), and large-lot rural residential areas.

Existing and future land uses within the proposed upgrade corridor include vacant/undeveloped and grazing, agriculture, open space, recreation, rural residential, low-, medium-, and high-density residential, industrial/commercial, energy related industrial, transportation and utility infrastructure, and extraction/mining.

**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 and Game Section (CDFG) 1600-1616 et seq. notification and permitting (stream and lake alteration agreement), and Corps of Engineers Section 404 notification and permitting,

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 Memorandum of Understanding permitting through coordination with the CDFG, may become necessary.

SCE will submit an application to the BLM for an Amended Right-of-Way Grant and, if approved, the BLM would issue a Notice to Proceed, allowing construction to be administered by the BLM in California and Arizona. The Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee (Siting Committee) and the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) are responsible for the environmental review on state-jurisdictional land in Arizona; and the BLM has jurisdiction for environmental review for federal land. The ACC siting process in Arizona is comparable to CEQA review, and thus, pursuant to Arizona Revised Statute 40-360, et. seq., the ACC will conduct the environmental review of the Arizona portion of the project.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |



**DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 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.

---

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **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

Sample Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b> – 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 impact on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> – 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Sample Question</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES- Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means/	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project?</b>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

Sample Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on an expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sample Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY –</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sample Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>XI. NOISE</b> – Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



<b>Sample Question</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XIV. RECREATION –</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Sample Question	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Sample Question</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **SOURCES AND EXPLANATIONS OF ANSWERS:**

Sources and explanations of answers in the checklist regarding the DPV2 project are included below.

### **I. AESTHETICS**

The existing visual conditions include the presence of the DPV1 500kV transmission line that would be paralleled by the proposed Devers-Harquahala 500kV line (DPV2). West of Devers, the existing conditions include four lines of transmission structures from Devers–San Bernardino Junction. The proposed upgrades would remove one line of existing wooden H-frame structures and another line of existing steel lattice structures and replace those two lines with a new double-circuit line on steel lattice structures that would match the existing structure line.

The west of Devers transmission upgrade corridor crosses a state scenic highway, but would not impact resources within the scenic highway. The proposed existing and new tower lines would span the roadway at all highway crossings, and actually reduce the number of transmission line structures within the existing utility corridor. No state-designated scenic vistas would be affected by the proposed project.

Construction and operation activities for the DPV2 project would occur within an existing utility corridor and would not damage any scenic resources.

As a result of the existence of parallel transmission line(s), the DPV2 project would have a Less Than Significant Impact on the existing visual character or quality of the project corridor. The new line would have a Less Than Significant Impact regarding new sources of substantial light or glare.

### **II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

Construction and operation of the proposed DPV2 project would have an impact of Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated on state-designated or locally important farmlands. Within the Palo Verde Valley, 39 new two-legged single-circuit towers, also referred to as H-frames, would be used to cross farmland to minimize impacts to farming operations. There would be Less Than Significant Impacts on zoning for agricultural use, Williamson Act contracts, or conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use due to the minimal amount of farmland that might be affected.

### **III. AIR QUALITY**

The proposed DPV2 project would have an impact of Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated regarding implementation of air quality plans, existing air quality standards and non-attainment areas. Mitigation measures are described in Section 6.1.6 in the PEA. During construction, potentially significant impacts for air quality could occur from fugitive dust and vehicles emissions. Currently, all of Riverside County is identified as non-attainment for particulate matter based on California Air Resources Board Standards. The Federal EPA also identifies the Coachella Basin and South Coast Air Basin as non-attainment for particulate matter. Best Available Controls Measures would be used to control dust and vehicle emissions; emissions credits would be purchased to offset any emissions levels that exceed the emissions thresholds.

The project would have a Less Than Significant Impact on exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and will not create objectionable odors.

### **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Construction and operation of the DPV2 project would have an impact of Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated upon sensitive species, riparian habitats, or other sensitive natural communities. A discussion of mitigation measures is found within Sections 6.1.8.2 and 6.2.8 of the PEA. Possible impacts to cushion foxtail cactus, desert tortoise, Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard and Palm Springs round-tailed ground squirrel are considered to be potentially significant and would have to be mitigated in order to reduce them to less than significant. Impacts to sensitive reptile species are also considered potentially significant and would have to be mitigated to reduce them to less than significant levels. It is anticipated that the USFWS would provide mitigation recommendations as part of the Section 7 Consultation process for the DPV2 project.

Specific strategies for mitigating impacts to desert tortoise include identifying site-specific occurrences and having an SCE contracted biological monitor, certified by the USFWS, present during construction activities that include the use of earth-moving equipment in desert tortoise habitat. The monitor would remove any tortoises (in burrow, cover-sites, or on the surface) that could be impacted. An SCE contracted tortoise biologist would present a pre-construction class on tortoise ecology and mitigation to project personnel. A maximum 25 mph speed limit would be in effect along all access roads associated with the project. Other practices would be implemented to mitigate impacts to desert tortoise, including surveys, use of existing access routes, avoidance of burrows in disturbed areas, restoration, and discouraging/removing raven nests. SCE would compensate for loss of tortoise habitat through monetary contributions to an appropriate fund.

Potentially significant impacts to riparian and sensitive communities are associated with xeroriparian wash woodlands, wash crossings, and occurrences of Alverson's pincushion cactus, Coachella Valley milkvetch, California silverbush and California barrel cactus. These impacts would be reduced to Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, by spanning washes, careful local adjustment in tower foundation placement, minimizing construction access in xeroriparian wash woodlands, and identifying site-specific occurrences of sensitive species. Where applicable, impacts to plants located on tower sites or access roads would be reduced either by transplanting plants or by adjusting tower site locations.

Within the Coachella Valley Preserve and other sand dune communities, a qualified SCE contracted biological monitor certified by the USFWS would be present with construction crews on a daily basis to clear areas for sensitive species. Impacts would also be reduced by avoiding: habitat occupied by sensitive lizard communities; activities that tend to create wind barriers that might result in sand stabilization; and by spanning areas of windblown sand where possible.

West of Devers, potential impacts to the California Coastal gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo and Stephens' kangaroo rat are Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Mitigation activities would include avoidance of habitat, including relocation of tower sites and/or access roads. In those situations where loss or damage to habitat cannot be avoided, off-site restoration activities would be undertaken or funding would be provided for monitoring programs.

DPV2 project impacts to protected wetlands, species' migrations, wildlife corridors, or local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would be Less Than Significant.

Project impacts on established or pending conservation plans would be Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Specific mitigation measures would include those identified within the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

## **V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Within the preferred DPV2 corridor, twenty-one National Register of Historic Places eligible or potentially eligible archaeological resources have been identified, along with thirteen National Register of Historic Places eligible or potentially eligible historic-era resources. The project corridor passes along three miles of the lower slopes of Edom Hill, which is an existing or potential traditional cultural property. The proposed project traverses approximately 27 miles of high or undetermined areas of paleontological sensitivity.

During construction of the proposed DPV2 project, impacts would be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated, as described in Section 6.1.12 of the PEA. For archeological and historic-era resources, mitigation efforts would include minor adjustments to the locations of

earth-disturbing project activities, implementation of protection measures, and/or application of appropriate data recovery archeological methods. As a general mitigation measure for ethnographic resources, the applicant would undertake an appropriate upgrade of the landmark ethnographic study Persistence and Power (Bean and Vane 1978). For paleontological resources, mitigation would include a preconstruction survey in areas of high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity to identify and collect surface specimens that could be affected by project construction, as well as paleontological monitoring of earth-disturbing construction activities and salvage of significant specimens.

## **VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Project construction and operation would have a Less Than Significant Impact upon people and structures regarding the effects of earthquake fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, erosion, expansive and collapsible soils, subsidence, or landslides.

## **VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Project construction activities would involve the operation of heavy equipment and support vehicles. The presence of hazardous materials or wastes within the project area could pose a threat to the environment only if substances were improperly stored or handled, if construction equipment were to leak or spill petroleum or hydraulic fluids, or if hazardous materials were encountered during excavation of foundations resulting in inadvertent releases to the environment.

Regarding the possibility of site locations on hazardous material sites, impacts would be Less Than Significant, as described in Section 5.1.13.1 of the PEA. The majority of the proposed transmission line project construction would be located within SCE fee-owned rights-of-way or easements granted to SCE. Within areas subject to new right-of-way acquisition, SCE will conduct an Environmental Site Assessment (ESA). The ESA (also known as a Phase I review) includes a review of published information, aerial photographs, and environmental databases; interviews with persons knowledgeable about the area; and site inspections to identify sites located within or near the designated area of construction that have a potential to release hazardous materials to the subsurface in actionable concentrations. Further investigation in the form of a Preliminary Site Investigation would be performed within areas of concern, if and where warranted by the findings of the ESA.

Project construction and operation would have a Less Than Significant Impact regarding: hazards associated with the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions causing the release of hazardous materials; emitting or

handling hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; residing or working in the project area within the vicinity of a private airstrip; or causing wildland fires or urban interface fires.

There would be no project impacts associated with residing or working in the project area within two miles of a public or public use airstrip, or impairing an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

Measures to avoid and/or minimize impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would be included as part of the project design or would be incorporated per regulation and SCE standard construction, operation, and maintenance procedures. A hazardous substance management, handling, storage, disposal, and emergency response plan would be prepared, implemented, and kept on site (or in vehicles) during construction and maintenance of the project. To minimize, avoid and/or clean up any hazardous material, should an unforeseen spill occur, SCE and its contractors would be responsible for following SCE's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

## **VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

The construction and operation of the proposed DPV2 project would have Less Than Significant Impacts regarding violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, increased erosion and/or siltation, increased surface water runoff, other degradation of water quality, or placement of structures within a mapped 100-year flood hazard area. Erosion and flood control measures, required by the BLM Right-of-Way Grant, would be implemented during construction of the transmission line on public lands to reduce impacts to hydrological resources.

The project would have No Impact regarding placement of housing within a mapped 100-year flood hazard area, flooding as a result of structural failure, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

## **IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

The proposed DPV2 project would not physically divide an established community. Project construction and operation would have a Less Than Significant Impact regarding conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Project impacts upon established or pending conservation plans would be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated, as described in Section 6.1.8.2. of the PEA. Specific mitigation measures would include those identified within the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.



## **X. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Impacts from the DPV2 project on the availability of mineral resources would be Less Than Significant.

## **XI. NOISE**

Noise levels associated with construction activities within the project corridor would be Less Than Significant and would vary according to the type and number of machinery and vehicles used. Typical noise levels associated with construction equipment fall in the range of 80 to 100 dBA, at a range of 50 feet from the active construction site.

Construction of the proposed project would comply with local noise ordinances. Typically, these stipulate that activities producing ambient noise should not exceed 55-50 dBA during nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) and 60-55 dBA during daytime hours (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.), at residential property lines or sensitive areas. However, exemptions are allowed for temporary construction except on Sundays and federal holidays. There may be a need to work outside of the local ordinance standards in order to take advantage of low electrical draw periods during the nighttime hours. SCE would comply with variance procedures established by local authorities, if a variance is required.

## **XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

The DPV2 project would have a Less Than Significant Impact on population and housing, and would not induce substantial population growth. No residents or existing housing would be displaced as a result of the project.

## **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

The proposed project would have no adverse impacts on public services.

## **XIV. RECREATION**

The DPV2 project would neither increase use of local and regional parks or other recreational facilities nor would it include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

## **XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

Project construction activities would involve the operation of heavy equipment and support vehicles. This would result in Less Than Significant Impacts regarding increases in traffic, exceeding a level of service standard for designated roads or highways, increases in hazards, inadequate emergency access, and conflicts with alternative transportation programs. The project would result in No Impacts to changes in air traffic patterns or levels of parking capacity.

## **XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Construction and operation of the DPV2 project would have a Less than Significant Impact in regards to new storm water drainage facilities, landfill capacity for solid waste disposal, and compliance with federal, state, and local regulations related to solid waste disposal. The proposed project would have no impacts pertaining to wastewater treatment requirements, facilities or existing capacity, and water supply.

## **XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed DPV2 project is located within an existing utility corridor, parallel to one or more existing transmission lines. The project is not expected to substantially degrade the environment. Any Potentially Significant Impacts associated with project construction and operation would be addressed with mitigation measures that reduce the impact to Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. These impacts and mitigation measures are identified and described in the preceding sections addressing air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous materials and wastes, and land use planning.

Based on the analysis provided in Chapter 7.0, the incremental impact of the proposed DPV2 project would be minimal when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Construction and operation of the proposed Devers-Harquahala transmission line and west of Devers transmission upgrade would not cause significant cumulative impacts on the environment.

The proposed project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. As described in preceding sections, impacts to agriculture, air quality, hazardous materials and wastes, and land use planning, would be Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.