

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of SOUTHERN) Application No. 07-02-_____
CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E)) (Filed February 16, 2007)
for a Permit to Construct Electrical Facilities)
With Voltages Between 50 kV and 200 kV:)
El Casco System Project)
_____)

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

EL CASCO SYSTEM PROJECT

STEPHEN E. PICKETT
RICHARD TOM
LINDA ANABTAWI

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6832
Facsimile: (626) 302-1926

Dated: February 16, 2007

APPENDICES

Appendix A
CEQA Initial
Study Checklist

1. Project title:

El Casco System Project

2. Lead agency name and address:

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

3. Contact persons and phone numbers:

Ms. Christine E. McLeod
Project Manager – Regulatory Affairs
Southern California Edison Company
(626) 302-3947
Christine.McLeod@sce.com

4. Project location:

The proposed El Casco Substation would be constructed in northern Riverside County in close proximity to San Timoteo Canyon Road and SCE's existing Devers-San Bernardino No. 2 220 kV transmission line right-of-way within the Norton Younglove Reserve. The Norton Younglove Reserve is located within the San Timoteo Creek area between I-10 and SR 60 west of the Cities of Beaumont and Calimesa and owned by the County of Riverside. Southern California Edison's (SCE's) Devers-San Bernardino No. 2 220 kV transmission line would serve as the electrical source for the El Casco Substation and its 115 kV system. The 115 kV Subtransmission Line work would occur between El Casco, Maraschino, and Banning Substations within existing SCE rights-of-way within unincorporated Riverside County and the Cities of Beaumont and Banning.

The El Casco System Project would also include the construction of five new fiber optic circuits to provide the necessary communication paths for control and protection of the 220 kV transmission lines and 115 kV subtransmission lines, as well as the various substations in the area. The majority of the proposed fiber optic cables would be constructed either underground within public streets or on existing SCE structures between the Cities of Bedlands and Banning. In addition, Microwave communication towers would be install at El Casco Substation and the Mill Creek Communication Site.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

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

6. General plan designation:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has primary jurisdiction over the El Casco System Project because it authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. Such projects are exempt from local land use and zoning regulations and discretionary permitting; however, General Order No. 131-D Section III.C requires “the utility to communicate with, and obtain the input of, local authorities regarding land use matters and obtain any non-discretionary local permits.” SCE has considered land use plans as part of the environmental review process and will obtain applicable non-discretionary local permits.

7. Zoning:

The proposed El Casco System Project route would cross several zoning districts in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties and the Cities of Redlands, Yucaipa, Banning, and Beaumont. The proposed El Casco Substation site is currently zoned by the County of Riverside as open space and conservation. The rest of the proposed El Casco System Project would traverse the following types of zoning districts within the aforementioned jurisdictions: commercial, industrial, public/institutional, residential, parks, agriculture, planned residential and open space.

8. Description of Project:

The proposed El Casco System Project includes the following elements:

Construction of the new El Casco 220/115/12 kV Substation within the Norton Younglove Reserve in the County of Riverside, associated 220 kV and 115 kV interconnections, and new 12 kV line getaways;

Replacement of approximately 13 miles of existing single-circuit 115 kV Subtransmission Lines with new, higher capacity double-circuit 115 kV Subtransmission Lines and replacement of support structures within existing SCE rights-of-way in the Cities of Banning, Beaumont, and unincorporated Riverside County;

Replacement of approximately 1.9 miles of existing single-circuit 115 kV Subtransmission Lines with new, higher capacity single-circuit 115 kV Subtransmission Lines and replacement of support structures within existing SCE rights-of-way in the City of Beaumont and unincorporated Riverside County;

Replacement of approximately 0.5 miles of existing single-circuit 115 kV Subtransmission Lines with new, higher capacity single-circuit 115 kV Subtransmission Lines on existing support structures within existing SCE rights-of-way in the City of Beaumont and unincorporated Riverside County.

Rebuilding 115 kV switchracks within Zanja and Banning Substations in the Cities of Yucaipa and Banning, respectively;

Installation of telecommunications equipment at the proposed El Casco Substation and at SCE's existing Mill Creek Communications Site; and

Installation of fiber optic cables within public streets and on existing SCE structures between the Cities of Redlands and Banning.

The El Casco System Project would be constructed in two phases (Phase 1 and Phase 2) from approximately June 2008 to June 2010, and the project would be operational in two phases. The 115/12 kV portion of the El Casco Substation would be constructed as part of Phase 1, and would be operational by June 2009. The 220/115 kV portion of the substation and remaining components of the project would be constructed as part of Phase 2, and would be operational by June 2010.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The Preferred Site for the El Casco Substation is located south of San Timoteo Canyon Road in an unincorporated portion of Riverside County. The site is located within the boundaries of the Norton Younglove Reserve, which is a 640 acre regional park located within the San Timoteo Creek area. The Reserve is bounded by Interstate 10 and State Route 60 and is presently managed by the Riverside County Regional Parks and Open Space District.

SCE's existing Banning Substation is located in a commercial/industrial area in the City of Banning just south of Interstate 10. The City of Banning zoning code classifies the Banning Substation and surrounding area for industrial development.

SCE's existing Zanja Substation is located within the northwestern portion of the City of Yucaipa. The existing substation and the surrounding land uses within the vicinity of the substation include rural residential land uses.

The Proposed Project's 115 kV subtransmission line route begins within the boundaries of the Norton Younglove Reserve at the site of the proposed El Casco Substation and follows the route (in an easterly direction) of an existing 115 kV line through the City of Beaumont and portions of unincorporated Riverside County towards the City of Beaumont. The route passes through rural residential areas with some recreational parks interspersed throughout the route. Some of the rural land is currently being converted to subdivisions. Table 3.9-1 in SCE's Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) summarizes the land uses within the vicinity of the 115 kV Subtransmission Line route by approximate mile-marker and city or county designation.

SCE's existing Mill Creek Communications Site is located on the top of a foothill of the San Bernardino Mountains to the north of the City of Yucaipa. The property is an SCE in-holding within the San Bernardino National Forest. The County of San Bernardino's General Plan designates the site as a resource conservation area within the Mountain Subregion of the County of San Bernardino.

The Proposed Project's fiber optic system route would begin in San Bernardino County within the City of Redlands, and would pass through the following land uses: commercial, medium, low, and very low density residential, commercial/industrial, agricultural, and public/institutional. It would also run adjacent to a park and golf course. The route would continue through commercial/industrial and agricultural areas in the City of Redlands. It would then continue through the City of Yucaipa, and pass through the following land uses: rural living, single residential, institutional, commercial, multiple residential, planned development, and industrial/commercial. In addition, the proposed fiber optic system would travel through the following land uses within the City of Banning: low, very low, and medium density residential, public/quasi public housing, industrial, and mixed use. Ultimately, the proposed fiber optic system would travel through the City of Beaumont in the following land uses: open space recreation, low and medium density residential, light industrial, high industrial, business park, and commercial retail.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agricultural Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources	X	Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
X	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	X	Hydrology and Water Quality		Land Use/Planning
	Mineral Resources	X	Noise		Population and Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation and Traffic
	Utilities and 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.

Signature _____ Date _____

Signature _____ Date _____

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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 "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, 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

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURAL 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 US 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

ISSUES	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative 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"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 situation onsite or offsite?	<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 onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION AND 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)?	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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"/>
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?	<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"/>

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

SOURCES AND EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS

This section contains a brief explanation for all answers provided in the environmental checklist form.

I. AESTHETICS

The operation of the proposed El Casco Substation would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas, but would potentially degrade the existing visual character/quality of the site and its surroundings. However, impacts are less than significant when analyzed in the context of various design features included in the project description that serve to minimize and/or avoid visual impacts.

Further, operation of the proposed substation would not damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Occasional maintenance lighting associated with the operation of the El Casco Substation would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Maintenance lights would normally be off and would be directed downward and shielded to reduce light and glare.

The Proposed Project's changes to the existing Banning and Zanja substations would be viewed in the context of the existing substation equipment and would be essentially imperceptible. Therefore, operational visual impacts would be less than significant for all four CEQA significance.

The Proposed Project's 115 kV Subtransmission Line route would follow an existing 115 kV right-of-way throughout its entire length and therefore presents limited visual impact because the proposed Subtransmission Line is simply replacing an existing Subtransmission Line. Because of this, operation of the 115 kV Subtransmission Line would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project sites and their surroundings. The Proposed Project's 115 kV Subtransmission Line route would cross State Route 243, a State Designated Scenic Highway. The designated portion begins further south of the project (outside of Banning City limits). While the Subtransmission Line may be visible from the designated portion of the scenic highway, the project is replacing an existing sub-transmission line and would therefore, not substantially damage scenic resources.

Similarly, the Proposed Project's fiber optic route would be located in the vicinity of several eligible State Scenic Highways, but would only involve the addition of a fiber optic cable to an existing

Subtransmission Line route, and as a result, would not substantially damage scenic resources. With the exception of the four new 35-foot-tall wooden poles that would need to be erected within the vicinity of the Fishermans Village community several miles west of the El Casco Substation, and the fiber optic portion that would be strung along the Proposed 115 kV Transmission Line route, the construction of the fiber optic route would only involve the addition of a fiber optic cable to existing Subtransmission Line facilities. Because the new fiber optic cable would be barely discernable, the operation of the fiber optic system would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project sites and their surroundings. Neither the proposed fiber optic cables nor the proposed Subtransmission Line would create new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

At the existing SCE Mill Creek Communications Site, a new 110-foot self-supporting steel lattice antenna tower would be constructed adjacent to the existing communication building. While the San Bernardino foothills provide a backdrop view from the City of Yucaipa, they compete with manmade elements (i.e., utility lines, street lights, signage) when viewed from the city. Because the Mill Creek Communications Site is at such a great distance from viewers, the proposed antenna tower and would only be remotely visible. As such, impacts to visual resources due to operation of the Mill Creek Communications Site would be less than significant. It is not anticipated that the Mill Creek Communications Site would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Any lighting proposed for the facility would be designed to minimize lighting impacts to a less than significant level while maintaining safety. Therefore, operation of the Mill Creek Communications Site would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and surroundings.

In summary, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant effect on aesthetic resources.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The proposed El Casco Substation, existing substations, and existing Mill Creek Communications Site are not located on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and would therefore not convert such Farmlands to non-agricultural uses.

However, the Proposed 115 kV Subtransmission Line runs through a Williamson Act preserve in Riverside County and would also cross a portion of a 40 acre Unique Farmland, also in Riverside County. A portion of the fiber optic route would be strung on the same poles as the proposed 115 kV Subtransmission Line route, and would also cross the same lands. The use of these routes would not result in a significant conversion of such lands to non-agricultural uses because the proposed Subtransmission Line would replace an existing Subtransmission line along that existing line's current alignment. Additionally, since the fiber optic line and the proposed 115 kV Subtransmission Line route would be contained within the same structures, the fiber optic route would not create an additional impact to agricultural uses. An Applicant Proposed mitigation measure states that any agricultural soils that would be disturbed due to the construction of the new 115 kV Subtransmission Line or the Proposed El Casco Substation would be stockpiled and reclaimed with supervision of a qualified biologist after construction is complete; thus, the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

In summary, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant effect on agricultural resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

Once constructed and operating, the Proposed Project would not result in long-term air emissions from stationary sources. Operational emissions associated with the Proposed Project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds and would not conflict with the adopted Air Quality Management Plan. None of the elements of the Proposed Project would generate odors that could potentially affect individuals in the immediate area, nor would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Consequently, there are no associated impacts with the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to air quality due to the operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

With the exception of fugitive dust (PM10) generated during the grading phase, construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Particulate emissions from the grading of access roads and the proposed El Casco Substation are likely to exceed the daily significance thresholds. The implementation of the procedures listed in Air Quality, Section 3.3 of SCE's PEA and compliance with all rules and regulations administered by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) (in particular, Rule 403), would reduce PM10 emissions generated during grading to the greatest extent possible.

While emissions from the remainder of construction activities are expected to be below significance thresholds, impacts to air quality from PM10 emissions are significant and unavoidable, and no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce construction air quality impacts to a less than significant level. Consequently, project construction impacts related to air quality would be significant and unavoidable.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The greatest potential impacts to biological resources resulting from the Proposed Project are impacts to native and nonnative vegetation communities and populations of special-status plant and wildlife species. Impacts would be associated predominately with construction activities. The implementation of Applicant Proposed mitigation measures listed in the Section 3.4, Biological Resources, of SCE's PEA would limit impacts to less than significant levels.

SCE compliance with the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), adopted for western Riverside County in 2004, will additionally mitigate for any impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife species that are covered by the Plan.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Construction of the 115 kV Subtransmission Line route could impact a historic structure (33-8344) within the City of Banning, which is eligible for listing in the local register. It is possible that the structure could be damaged when new poles are erected. However, implementation of mitigation measures identified in Chapter 3.5 of SCE's PEA would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

The proposed El Casco Substation is located within one-half mile of paleontological resource localities. Consequently, there is a high probability that paleontological resources, including datable organic materials, would be encountered within the project area at surface exposures or during excavation associated with the substation and 115 kV Subtransmission Line construction. SCE has identified mitigation measures in Chapter 3.5 of the PEA that would reduce potential impacts to less than

significant.

VI GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Landslides have been mapped on the slopes located on the southern part of the proposed El Casco Substation site. Landslide debris, adverse rock bedding planes, and two landslide failure underlying the proposed substation site were identified in soil borings during a preliminary geotechnical investigation. In addition, the preliminary geotechnical investigation identified moderate susceptibility to liquefaction and lateral spreading. The existing landslide at the site would likely be susceptible to seismically induced failure. Proposed design measures would be incorporated into the project to address slope instability at the proposed El Casco Substation site. While some design measures are identified in the PEA, details of some measures cannot be more fully determined until additional detailed future geotechnical evaluations are conducted. SCE anticipates that such design and mitigation measures would reduce these potential geotechnical hazards at the proposed El Casco Substation site to a less than significant level.

Although soils underlying the substation site would be improved to remediate hazards for the substation, communications circuits passing beneath San Timoteo Creek within the 12 kV distribution line conduits would remain subject to both potential liquefaction and lateral spreading hazards. These hazards could result in severed communications circuits during a major earthquake. Since the fiber optic communications circuits and the microwave system create a redundant telecommunications system, potential damage to the telecommunications system from geologic hazards would be less than significant.

The proposed El Casco Substation, existing Banning and Zanja Substations, and the existing Mill Creek Communications Site, and the proposed Subtransmission Line routes, are located within the California Building Code (CBC) Seismic Zone IV. SCE substation design standards meet or exceed CBC criteria and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE) 693 "Recommended Practices for Seismic Design of Substations" (IEEE) 693 standards. SCE designs overhead electric lines to meet or exceed CPUC General Order (GO) 95 wind loading criteria. SCE's design standards for overhead electric lines incorporate lateral wind loading requirements that exceed seismic loading forces. Consequently, impacts from potential seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

SCE's Banning Substation is located in an area designated as moderately susceptible to liquefaction (City of Banning General Plan, 2004). However, implementation of foundation design recommendations identified as a mitigation measure in Chapter 3.6 of SCE's PEA would reduce the impact to less than significant during construction.

The easternmost five miles of the Subtransmission Line with the fiber optic cable is considered to have a moderate susceptibility to liquefaction (Riverside General Plan, 2003). Implementation of mitigation measures pertaining to foundation design recommendations would reduce the impact to less than significant during construction.

The westernmost 6.5 miles of the proposed Subtransmission Line is underlain by a geologic unit that is susceptible to both seismically-induced landslides, as well as landslides due to other causes. Because the proposed tower construction will be at existing sites, no new access roads are planned. This would reduce slope stability impacts to insignificant during construction.

The Uniform Building Code (UBC) defines "expansive soil" in Table 18-1-B. The California Building Code (CBC) is modeled after the UBC. The CBC provides minimum seismic design requirements for

structures. As already noted, SCE substation design standards meet or exceed CBC criteria and the IEEE 693 standards. Further, SCE designs overhead electric lines to meet or exceed CPUC GO 95 wind loading criteria. SCE's design standards for overhead electric lines incorporate lateral wind loading requirements that exceed seismic loading forces. Preliminary geotechnical studies have identified most of the Proposed Project area as generally having non-expansive soils. Consequently, impacts from potential expansive would be less than significant.

The proposed fiber optic circuits would primarily be installed on existing poles and in existing underground conduits. While the fiber optic route would cross a number of faults along its length, SCE designs overhead lines to meet or exceed GO 95 wind loading criteria. SCE's design standards incorporate lateral wind loading requirements that exceed seismic loading forces. Any impacts to underground conduits resulting from seismic ground shaking would be addressed as appropriate. Consequently, construction impacts from potential seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

The proposed fiber optic system would be installed primarily on existing, generally accessible poles. Therefore, there would be no significant grading, or construction of new access roads. Soils underlying the proposed route generally have a low expansion factor.

Operationally, the Fiber Optic System may cross delineated geologic hazard areas, such as active faults, unstable slopes or liquefaction areas. In the event of a major earthquake, these hazards may result in severed communications circuits. Since the fiber optic communications circuits and the microwave system create a redundant telecommunications system, potential damage to the telecommunications system from geologic hazards would be less than significant. Other CEQA factors pertaining to soil erosion/loss of topsoil and soils incapable of supporting a septic system, are not impacted by the Proposed Project.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

High fire risk areas have been noted on the proposed 115 kV Subtransmission line route (which is in an existing Subtransmission Line). The existing Mill Creek Communications Site is also in an area considered at high risk for wildfires. Portions of the fiber optic line would pass through areas of moderate to high fire risk. As such, construction of the Proposed Project has the potential to create sparks from mechanical equipment operation, welding, gasoline and diesel engines, electrical equipment, and cigarette smoking. Further, construction related fire hazards could cause fires. However, risks related to fire caused by construction would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures listed in PEA Section 3.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Project construction, operation, and maintenance impacts related hazardous materials (such as gasoline, diesel fuel, oil and lubricants) would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. With implementation of mitigation measures, the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

The Proposed Project would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. The operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project will would also not result in a safety

hazard for people residing or working in the public area, or impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The implementation of recommended mitigation measures will lessen the impacts of exposure to people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires to a less than significant level. The operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The impact on emergency response services would be less than significant. Operation of the Proposed Project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The construction of the Proposed Subtransmission Line route, El Casco Substation, and fiber optic system would have the potential to cause water quality impacts through drainage and erosion. These impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and the mitigation measures listed in SCE's PEA Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality. Hydrology impacts would be limited to potential polluted stormwater runoff. Potential for polluted stormwater runoff to impact local waterways, such as San Timoteo Creek, would be lessened with implementation of mitigation measures and implementation of a SWPPP. Project construction and operation would have a less than significant effect on hydrology and water quality in the Proposed Project Area.

Implementation of the SWPPP would help stabilize graded areas and waterways, and reduce erosion and sedimentation. The construction SWPPP would identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented during construction activities. Erosion control measures such as installation of hay bales, water bars, covers, sediment fences, sensitive area access restrictions (for example, flagging), vehicle mats in wet areas, and retention/settlement ponds would be installed to protect San Timoteo Creek and other drainages before extensive clearing and grading begins. Mulching, seeding, or other suitable stabilization measures would be used to protect exposed areas during construction activities. Revegetation plans, the design and location of any retention ponds, and grading plans would be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Game for review for the construction near San Timoteo Creek and any other waterways.

Construction activities conducted when the ground is wet also create the potential for increased runoff due to a reduction in infiltration and evaporation through vegetation removal. However, with implementation of mitigation measures to control erosion, impacts would be less than significant.

SCE would be required to apply for coverage under the General Construction Activity National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Permit. The permit is required for any construction activity that includes clearing, grading, excavation, reconstruction, and dredge and fill that results in the disturbance of at least one acre of total land area. The general permit requires preparation of a site-specific SWPPP, which would include measures from the general permit to avoid any potential for generating polluted storm water runoff.

The Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) for the fiber optic system has the potential to cause a significant adverse effect on water quality in San Timoteo Creek. Water quality impacts to the creek could result from vertical leakage of drilling fluids in the formation over the boring, or transmission of hazardous materials from equipment during boring. Migration through existing natural fractures, induced fractures, or porous and permeable zones (gravels and cobbles) could allow drilling fluids to reach the surface. If drilling fluids reach the creek, they could degrade water quality and could cause a

significant effect on water quality. The HDD contractor would contain, handle, and dispose of drilling fluids in accordance with the requirements listed in Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, and those specified in the SWPPP from the Regional Water Quality Control Board to avoid significant effects to water quality. The potential for significant effects to water quality would be avoided through compliance with permit conditions, and implementation of mitigation measures. Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impacts to surface water to less than significant levels.

Impacts from the construction of the 115 kV Subtransmission Line to water quality, drainage, and water discharge would be less than significant with implementation of SCE Proposed Measures, BMPs, and mitigation measures. The effects to water quality from construction of the El Casco Substation would be less than significant. The installation of the fiber optic cable on existing overhead poles and towers would not have a significant effect on water quality, drainage, flooding, or groundwater. When necessary, SCE will implement industry standard BMPs and comply with the MS4 permit requirements (MS4 permits require the discharger to develop and implement a Storm Water Management Plan/Program with the goal of reducing the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable (MEP)) (State Water Resources Quality Control Board 2006). SCE will apply mitigation measures as appropriate to reduce the construction impacts to drainage, water quality, and flooding to less than significant levels.

Diesel fuel, lubrication oil, hydraulic fluids, antifreeze, and other construction-related materials would have a limited likelihood of affecting surface water quality. Drips and spills would be contained on-site before they could be released to storm water. Construction of the Proposed Subtransmission Line would not violate water quality standards or discharge requirements. The Subtransmission Line construction would have a less than significant effect on surface water or groundwater quality. Implementation of SCE BMPs, mitigation measures, and SWPPP conditions would avoid significant impacts to water quality from construction of the El Casco Substation Site.

The construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed 115 kV Subtransmission Line, Substation, and fiber optic system, with the implementation of mitigation measures, would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding off site, or otherwise degrade water quality. The Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, nor would it place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map. Elements of the Proposed Project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, nor would it expose people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

The proposed 115kV Subtransmission line work, the construction the existing Zanja and Banning Substations, and the fiber optic route work, will occur on existing rights of way and facilities. As such, these project elements would not not physically divide an established community.

The proposed El Casco Substation site, which would be located within the boundaries of the Norton Younglove Reserve, which is operated by the County of Riverside, is not bounded by any development, and therefore would not divide an established community. The site location is, however, designated for open space and conservation, and the area within the park is used for passive recreational purposes.

Construction of the proposed El Casco Substation would have an impact to the open space designation of the area, as approximately 28 acres would be utilized by SCE for the construction of the substation. Therefore, construction of the substation would result in a potential conflict with an applicable land use plan. However, the use of the 28 acres for a substation use represents a loss of only four percent of the 640 acres currently utilized for recreational activities. Recreational users would continue to enjoy use of the area, and recreational activities would not be impeded by the construction of the substation.

An agreement to use the land for the substation site would be entered into by SCE and the Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District (Park District) and will be subject to the approval of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. The agreement for the use of the site would include a provision that would require SCE to purchase replacement parkland at a ratio to be agreed upon by SCE and the Park District, as well as make certain recreational improvements around the substation site. Therefore, although the use of the site for substation use is not consistent with its designation as open space, this impact is less than significant.

Portions of Western Riverside County, including the El Casco Substation site, are located within a habitat conservation plan. Impacts to local habitat conservation plans can be reduced to less than significant levels by proposed mitigation.

Construction activities occurring at the existing Banning and Zanja Substations would not cause a conflict with an applicable land use plan. The existing Banning Substation is not located within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Consequently, construction activities occurring at Banning and Zanja Substations would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, nor would it conflict with an applicable land use plan.

Construction of the 115 kV Subtransmission Line would comply with any applicable provisions of the Banning Municipal Airport Land Use Plan and Federal Aviation Administration regulations. Construction activities at the Banning Substation would not cause a conflict with an applicable land use plan. Portions of Western Riverside County, including segments of the 115 kV Subtransmission Line, are located within a habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of proposed mitigation.

The existing Mill Creek Communications is located within an SCE in holding in an resource conservation area in the San Bernardino National Forest. All construction activities would occur within the existing property boundaries of the communications site. Thus, construction activities occurring at this location would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

In summary, impacts to land use and planning due to the construction and operation of the 115 kV Subtransmission Line route, communications tower at Mill Creek Station, improvements to the existing Banning and Zanja Substation, and construction of the fiber optics system would not physically divide an established community or conflict with applicable land use plans. Construction of the proposed El Casco Substation would conflict with an applicable land use plan, but with mitigation through an agreement with the County, its impact would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would conflict with applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans, but with implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Known mineral resources of significance to the region and the state are not located within approximately 0.5 miles of the Proposed Project. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project

would not require the use of sand and gravel. In general, local metallic mineral mines are not in operation due to economic viability. In addition, potential oil wells were designated as dry.

Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of California, nor would it 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; as a result, the construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not impact mineral resources.

XI. NOISE

The construction activities of the Proposed Project would expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in local noise ordinances, but would be short term and the impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Such short term impacts during construction would not occur during regular operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project. The construction, maintenance, and operation of the elements of the Proposed Project would not expose persons to excessive groundborne noise levels, substantially increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, nor would it substantially increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

In summary, the Proposed Project would not expose persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plans or noise ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies. Further, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels within two miles of a public airport or airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The purpose of the Proposed Project is to meet the forecasted electrical demands of residents in the cities in Northern Riverside County. This area is projected to have continued population and housing increases over the next 25 years. SCE has identified the need for the Proposed Project to meet this continued growth in the area. In addition, the El Casco Substation and all other components of the Proposed Project would operate as unattended facilities, and only occasional maintenance or emergency repairs would be required.

The construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not displace any people or housing, nor would it directly or indirectly induce population growth in the area. The Proposed Project would be constructed on either existing sites or undeveloped sites where housing does not currently exist. Therefore, construction of the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or displace substantial numbers of people.

The Proposed Project construction, operation, and maintenance impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

The Proposed Project would not require the expansion of fire and police protection, schools, or other public facilities. Construction activities for the Proposed Project would be temporary and short-term. The proposed El Casco Substation would be unmanned, and its operation would not significantly affect

police and fire protection response times or create higher demand for these public services.

The Proposed Project construction, operation, and maintenance impacts related to public services would be less than significant.

XIV. RECREATION

The construction work force for the Proposed Project would consist primarily of local workers, and construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not increase the use of parks or recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated, nor would the Proposed Project result in the need to construct or expand recreational facilities in the area.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Project would have no significant impact on parks or recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Traffic generated by the construction of Proposed Project would be temporary, short-term, and minimal. Operation and maintenance of the Proposed would have negligible impacts on the ground transportation system (roadways and railroads) under normal circumstances because the substation inspection and maintenance activities would generate only a very small volume of vehicular traffic.

During construction, the transportation of workers, equipment and materials to various areas along the proposed 115 kV Subtransmission Line, El Casco Substation site, and fiber optic system route would utilize various local roadways. There is a potential during construction at the proposed El Casco Substation site, to temporarily generate up to 40 vehicular trips by workers commuting to the site on a daily basis. Additionally, the periodic movement of materials and construction equipment would temporarily generate an additional 4-5 truck trips on a daily basis. The traffic volumes that would be generated by activities associated with the construction at the El Casco Substation site would not significantly affect intersection or roadway operations in the area due to the limited number of trips that would be generated. Movement of heavy equipment and materials to various work sites and marshalling yards may cause temporary traffic delays. However, such activities would occur in off peak hours in order to avoid the morning and evening peak vehicular travel times on weekdays.

The construction of the Proposed Project's 115 kV Subtransmission Line route across SR-79, SR-60, and SR-243 could cause traffic delays. However, encroachment permits would be obtained through the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans). Through coordination with CalTrans, measures would also be taken to minimize traffic delays. Construction of the proposed 115 kV Subtransmission Line route would also contribute to routine construction traffic on state highways and freeways. In the event that oversized loads or other special construction vehicles are utilized, appropriate permits and procedures would be followed to ensure that the equipment and materials are safely hauled and do not damage state or federal roadway facilities.

The majority of the truck traffic would use major streets and would be scheduled for off-peak traffic hours. If any construction work would affect public streets, a local permit process would be implemented for the Proposed Project. Parking for construction workers would be accommodated on nearby substation sites or within SCE right-of ways.

Construction of the Proposed Project, with the appropriate permits taken to minimize traffic delays,

would not cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load.

The construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project would not exceed a level of service standard established by the counties' congestion management agencies, result in a change of air traffic patterns, result in inadequate parking capacity, substantially increase hazards due to a design features, result in inadequate emergency access, or inadequate parking capacity. Further, the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

Construction, operational and maintenance impacts relating to transportation/parking matters relating to the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The Proposed Project would not require wastewater disposal, and thus activities would not exceed wastewater treatment capacity in the area. The Proposed Project would not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The proposed project would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.

It anticipated that either the Lambs Canyon Landfill, located south of Beaumont, or the Badlands Landfill, located southwest of the project area, would be utilized for waste generated from the construction of the Proposed Project. Both landfills are permitted, operational, and have sufficient capacity to accept waste generated from construction activities. Non-hazardous waste materials generated during construction would be either recycled or disposed of at approved landfills. Scrap metal and wood poles generated during removal of the existing Subtransmission towers and overhead lines would be recycled to the extent possible as noted above. Therefore, impacts from construction of the Proposed Project to generation of solid waste would be less than significant.

Impacts due to construction of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. However, there would be no impacts to utilities and service systems during operation of the Proposed Project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

As discussed in Section 3 of this PEA, the Proposed Project would not 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.

The Proposed Project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, except for air quality. Air quality impacts would be significant based on the SCAQMD significance thresholds for PM10 even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Significant impacts to air quality would likely occur during site grading of the proposed El Casco Substation. Significant impacts are based on daily thresholds and these impacts would be temporary. All air quality impacts associated with grading of the proposed substation site would cease after site preparation. There would be no long-term impacts to air quality from the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project and alternatives would not lead to impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable in the following areas: Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems. However, the Proposed Project, along with other related projects could generate a considerable cumulative impact related to PM10 emissions during construction.

The Proposed Project would not have any substantial direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings, with the exception of potential air quality impacts during construction.