### Appendix A

**CEQA Checklist** 

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

#### **Project Title**

Ivanpah-Control Project

#### **Lead Agency Name and Address**

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

#### **Contact Person and Phone Number**

Lori Charpentier Senior Advisor - Infrastructure Licensing (626) 302-7918

#### **Project Location**

The Proposed Project is located wholly in California. Federal lands constitute a majority of the land area crossed by the Proposed Project, including lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and Department of Defense (DoD). The Proposed Project would rebuild existing subtransmission lines that extend south and east from the Control Substation (located approximately 5 miles west-southwest of the City of Bishop in Inyo County) to Ivanpah Substation (located in northeastern San Bernardino County approximately 6 miles southwest of Primm, Nevada). Portions of the Proposed Project would also cross the City of Barstow and scattered unincorporated communities.

#### **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**

Southern California Edison 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue Rosemead, CA 91770

#### **General Plan Description**

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has primary jurisdiction over the Project because it authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. Although such projects are exempt from local land-use and zoning regulations and permitting, CPUC General Order (G.O.) 131-D Section XIV.B. states that "... local jurisdictions acting pursuant to local authority are preempted from regulating electric power line projects, distribution

lines, substations, or electric facilities constructed by public utilities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. However, in locating such projects, the public utilities shall consult with local agencies regarding land use matters." Consequently, public utilities are directed to consider local regulations and consult with local agencies, but the county and cities' regulations are not applicable as the county and cities do not have jurisdiction over the Proposed Project. Accordingly, the following discussion of local land use designations and zoning is provided for informational purposes only. A summary of the planned land use designations of the Proposed Project is provided in Table A-1: Planned Land Use Designations and Zoning by Proposed Project Component.

Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designations	Zoning
Inyo County	Agriculture (A) Natural Hazards (NH) Natural Resources (NR) Open Space and Recreation (OSR) Residential Medium Density (RM) Rural Protection (RP) Residential Rural High Density (RRH) State and Federal Lands (SFL) Tribal Lands (TL) Residential Estate (RE) Public Service Facilities (PF) Residential Ranch (RR) General Industrial (GI)	Open Space - 40 acre minimum (OS-40) Single Residence Mobile Home Combined - 5,800 sq ft minimum (RMH-5,800) Multifamily Residential - 2 acre minimum - mobile home (R2-2.0-MH) Rural Residential - 1 acre minimum - mobile home (RR-1.0-MH) Rural Residential - 5.0 acre minimum - mobile home (RR-5.0-MH) Not Zoned - Tribal Lands (TL) Rural Residential - 10 acre minimum - mobile home (RR-10.0-MH) General Industrial and Extractive - 10 acre minimum (M1-10.0) Planned Unit Development (PUD) Single Residence Mobile Home Combined - 1 acre minimum (RMH-1.0)
Kern County	Map Code 1.1 (State and Federal Land) Map Code 3.3 (Other Facilities) Map Code 4.1 (Low Density Residential) Map Code 4.2 (Resource Reserve, Minimum 20 Acre Parcel Size) Map Code 5.5 (1 Dwelling Unit/Net Acre Maximum) Map Code 5.6 (Residential - Minimum 2.5 Gross Acres/Unit) Map Code 5.7 (5.0 Gross Acres/Dwelling Unit Maximum) Map Code 5.75 (10.0 Gross	Limited Agriculture (A-1) Open Space (OS) Estate 1-acre (E-1) Estate 2.5-acre (E-2.5) Estate 5-acre (E-5) Estate 10-acre (E-10) Estate 20-acre (E-20) Estate 40-acre (E-40) Estate 80-acre (E-80) Natural Resource 20-acre (NR-20) Light Industrial (M-1)

	Acres/Dwelling Unit Maximum) Map Code 5.8 (20+ Gross Acres/Dwelling Unit Maximum) Map Code 8.3 (Extensive Agriculture, Minimum 20 Acre Parcel Size) Map Code 8.4 (Mineral and Petroleum, Minimum 5 Acre Parcel Size) Map Code 8.5 (Resource Management, Minimum 20 Acre Parcel Size)	
San Bernardino County	CR (Rural Commercial), FW (Floodway) IC (Community Industrial), IN (Institutional) IR (Regional Industrial) RC (Resource Conservation) RL (Rural Living) RS (Single Residential) SD (Special Development)	San Bernardino County utilizes a "one-map approach" that combines both General Plan land use designations and zoning classifications.
City of Barstow	GI (General Industrial) DU (Diverse Use) LDR (Low Density Residential) SFR (Single Family Residential) ROS (Resource Conservation/Open Space) IOS/ROS (Interim Open Space/Resource Conservation)	I (Industrial) DU (Diverse Use) LDR (Low Density Residential) OS (Open Space) MZ (Military Zone)

#### **Zoning**

A summary of the zoning designations of the Proposed Project is provided in Table A-1: Planned Land Use Designations and Zoning by Proposed Project Component.

### **Project Description**

The Proposed Project consists of the following major components:

- Subtransmission. Remediate discrepancies along 262 miles of existing 115 kV subtransmission circuits by:
  - Removing existing subtransmission towers and poles and replacing them with tubular steel poles (TSPs); lightweight steel (LWS) poles; TSP, LWS, and wood pole multipole structures; and TSP, LWS, and wood pole H-frames.
  - Removing existing conductor and installing new Aluminum Conductor Composite Core (ACCC) 'Dove' conductor on replacement structures.

- Subtransmission. Remediate discrepancies along 96 miles of existing 115 kV subtransmission circuits by derating the existing subtransmission circuit and replacing existing subtransmission structures with TSP, LWS pole, and wood pole H-frames.
- Telecommunications/System Protection
  - Install approximately 174 miles of optical groundwire (OPGW) and/or All-Dielectric Self-Supporting (ADSS) fiber optic cable overhead on replacement structures and new structures and approximately 3.600 feet underground.
  - Install system protection and telecommunications-associated equipment at existing substations.

#### Substations

- Install new ringbus at the existing Baker Substation.
- Disconnect existing conductor from existing positions at substations and connect new conductor to those existing positions.
- Install new overhead groundwire (OHGW) and make minor modifications to the existing racks to accommodate the new OHGW.
- Install cabling between existing breakers to the existing mechanical electrical equipment room (MEER)/communication room/telecommunications cabinet and install new relays and relay racks in the existing MEER/communication room/ telecommunications cabinet.

#### **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting**

The Proposed Project is located wholly in California. Federal lands constitute a majority of the land area crossed by the Proposed Project, including lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and Department of Defense (DoD). The Proposed Project would rebuild and repair existing subtransmission lines that extend south and east from the Control Substation (located approximately 5 miles west-southwest of the City of Bishop in Inyo County) to Ivanpah Substation (located in northeastern San Bernardino County approximately 6 miles southwest of Primm, Nevada). Portions of the Proposed Project would also cross the City of Barstow and scattered unincorporated communities

The existing land use along the Proposed Project alignment is primarily open space, with scattered residential uses. Widely-dispersed industrial uses are found in the eastern portions of Segment 4 (mining and solar electric generating facilities). Institutional uses, primarily military facilities, are located adjacent to Segments 1, 2, 3S and 4 and adjacent to Inyokern Substation and Coolwater Substation. Portions of the Proposed Project are located on lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, Edwards Air Force Base, and Marine Corps Logistics Base-Barstow. Surrounding land uses are described further in Section 3.1, Project Location in Chapter 3, Project Description, and in Section 4.11, Land Use and Planning.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the Proposed Project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry	$\boxtimes$	Air Quality
$\boxtimes$	Biological Resources	$\boxtimes$	Cultural Resources		Energy
	Geology/Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions	$\boxtimes$	Hazards and Hazardous Materials
	Hydrology/Water Quality		Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources
$\boxtimes$	Noise		Population/Housing		Public Services
	Recreation	$\boxtimes$	Transportation/Traffic		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities/Service Systems		Wildfire	$\boxtimes$	Mandatory Findings of Significance

### **CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social and economic factors that might be affected by the Project. In many cases, studies performed in connection with the Project indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included within the body of the environmental document itself (in this case, the Proponent's Environmental Assessment). The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista				$\boxtimes$
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), to non-agricultural use?				$\boxtimes$

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
<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?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
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?				
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?				
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?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				$\boxtimes$

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				
VI. ENERGY: Would the project:				
a) Would the Project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				
b) Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				$\boxtimes$

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
iv) Landslides?			$\boxtimes$	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	
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?				
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?				
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?				$\boxtimes$

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				$\boxtimes$
IX. 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?				
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?				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
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?				
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?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	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?				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
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?				
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
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?				
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?				
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?				
e) Create or contribute to runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\boxtimes$	
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?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			$\boxtimes$	
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?				
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				$\boxtimes$
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?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
XII. 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?				$\boxtimes$

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
XIII. 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?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
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?				
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?				
XIIII. 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 infractructure)?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		Mitigation		$\boxtimes$
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:				
a) 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:				
XVI. RECREATION: Would the project:				
a) 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?				
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
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?				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		$\boxtimes$		
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
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?				
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?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
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?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
XX. WILDFIRE: Would the project:				
a) Would the Project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
b) 4.20.3.2 Would the Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
c) Would the Project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
d) Would the Project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslisdes, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. 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, substantially 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?				
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)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

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

Chapters 4 and 5 of the PEA provide detailed discussions for each resource area.