

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

This chapter summarizes the potential environmental impacts associated with the Miguel–Mission 230kV #2 Project. The Environmental Checklist from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines aids in determining the scope and detail of the environmental setting and potential impacts for this project, as required by the CPUC. Chapter 6 details the methodologies used to determine standards of significance for potential impacts. These methodologies vary by resource; some are quantifiable according to local agency requirements and others require professional judgment to determine significance thresholds.

4.1 AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 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"/>
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanations:

- 1) There is a potential for the project to result in visual impacts. Potential initial visual impacts could be effectively reduced through implementation of Project Protocols, such as nonspecular conductors and dull-finish poles, that would minimize visibility of the project from sensitive viewpoints and/or the visual contrasts associated with installation of the new line (e.g., towers and conductors, access roads).
- 2) Because the project would be constructed primarily within SDG&E's existing right-of-way, no substantial damage would occur to scenic resources (trees, rock outcroppings, historical buildings). The project would be visible along both State Route 67 and Interstate 8 (both

eligible for designation as State Scenic Highways). Implementation of the Project Protocols would reduce the potential visual impacts in these areas.

- 3) Pole installation for the relocated 69kV/138kV circuits would result in an increase in the visual impact of the site and its surroundings. Because the project would be constructed primarily within SDG&E’s existing right-of-way and placement of new poles would match existing structures span for span to the greatest extent feasible, any adverse visual impacts would be reduced. These impacts would also be reduced through the implementation of the Project Protocols, which are designed to minimize the degradation of the existing visual character of the site.
- 4) Construction activities on the project are expected to occur during daylight hours. No additional light sources would be needed for either construction or operation of the project, except when occasional nighttime repair is required (as in emergency situations). No substantial new sources of light or glare are expected to develop as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, construction, operations, and usual maintenance would not result in permanent substantial light or glare that would adversely affect views in the area.

4.2 AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantial number of people?				

Explanations:

- 1) The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any air quality attainment plans.
- 2) Construction of the project would result in short-term, temporary air emissions, including ozone, carbon monoxide, unburned hydrocarbons, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter, which are not expected to violate any relevant federal, state, or regional air quality standards for the SDAB. Operation and maintenance of the project would result in minimum air emissions from maintenance vehicles and activities and would not result in significant impacts to air quality.
- 3) Employing effective dust control measures according to the Project Protocols throughout construction would minimize the potential for even minor air quality impacts.
- 4) Emissions as a result of construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would be temporary and/or short term and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- 5) Construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not generate objectionable odors, and would not, therefore, negatively impact people in the project area.

4.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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"/>
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified 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"/>
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanations:

- 1) The project may have a potentially significant impact on the federally listed Quino checkerspot butterfly. In the limited locations where this species occurs, it is a year-round resident. Therefore, potential impacts to this species during construction may be difficult to avoid. However, application of Project Protocols and the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in this section, are expected to reduce potential impacts to this resident species to a less than significant level.
- 2) The project’s existing right-of-way traverses native habitat, including numerous areas that support sensitive Diegan coastal sage scrub habitats and several drainages that support riparian habitat. The project’s existing right-of-way also crosses designated critical habitat for the arroyo southwestern toad, San Diego fairy shrimp, and the Quino checkerspot butterfly, as well as proposed critical habitat for the Otay tar plant. Because implementation of the Project Protocols and SDG&E’s NCCP would allow for the avoidance or the minimization of any permanent loss of these habitats, and because mitigation would be provided for all unavoidable losses, potential impacts to these habitats would be less than significant.
- 3) The project’s existing right-of-way traverses at least one known fenced and protected vernal pool complex. Application of Project Protocols, where feasible, would avoid or minimize the permanent loss of jurisdictional wetlands, drainages, and vernal pool habitat. Where avoidance of those areas is not feasible and work is required in jurisdictional areas, SDG&E would obtain and comply with all necessary ACOE and CDFG permits under CWA 404 and CDFG 1600. Adherence to the Project Protocols and any applicable regulatory requirements would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels.
- 4) Public utility and electric transmission facilities are compatible with sensitive wildlife movement corridors (i.e., stream channels). Sufficiently wide natural areas would remain to allow the continued unobstructed movement of wildlife in the region. Because the project would traverse no large waterbodies, there would be no potential impact to migratory waterfowl. Because regional wildlife movement would not otherwise be significantly affected through significant loss of protective vegetation cover, roosts, or foraging habitat,

the potential effect of the project on existing wildlife movement would be less than significant.

- 5) The project does not conflict with known local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
- 6) Because SDG&E would ensure that the proximity (within or adjacent) of the project with established conservation areas complies with the conservation measures established for these areas, the project would not conflict with adopted habitat conservation plans (HCP), NCCPs or other conservation plans. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanations:

- 1) No known historical resources have been identified in the project area. If historical resources are discovered during cultural resource surveys prior to construction, the Project Protocols would be implemented to minimize impacts to these sites (monitoring or avoidance). Construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not result in a substantial change in significance of a historical resource.
- 2) Seven archaeological resources were identified for a previous, unrelated project in the vicinity of SDG&E's existing project right-of-way. If additional archaeological resources are discovered during resource surveys prior to construction, the site would be flagged and avoided, and the Project Protocols would be implemented to minimize impacts to these sites.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not result in a substantial change in the significance of archaeological resources.

- 3) Based on previous data searches and studies in the project area, SDG&E does not expect to encounter human remains during construction of the project. However, if human remains are discovered during construction, no further excavation or disturbance would be allowed at the site, or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until the remains have been investigated, as outlined in Section 10564.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

4.5 GEOLOGY, SOILS, MINERAL RESOURCES, AND PALEONTOLOGY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>Geology and Soils</u>				
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
a. 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"/>
b. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>Mineral Resources</u>				
1. 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"/>
2. 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"/>
<u>Paleontology</u>				
1. 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"/>

Explanations:

Geology and Soils

- 1) SDG&E’s transmission circuits and substation equipment are typically designed to accommodate significant seismic events. In the event of a strong earthquake, there would be minimal exposure of people or structures to any potential substantial adverse effects.

- 2) Earth-disturbing activities at the structure sites, spur roads, and staging areas would potentially increase the soil’s susceptibility to wind and water erosion. However, implementation of the Project Protocols and the best management practices for erosion and

sedimentation control in its *Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan* (SWPPP) would minimize the potential for substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil to a less than significant level. SDG&E would obtain an NPDES permit under and comply with the regulatory provisions of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) relative to the discharge of stormwater associated with construction activities, including, without limitation, the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP for the project.

- 3) Small portions of the existing project right-of-way are susceptible to landslides, land spreading, and liquefaction. Generally, poles and structures would be located to avoid these areas. If poles were required for engineering or other reasons to be located in such areas, SDG&E would conduct design-level geotechnical investigations to determine appropriate design and construction measures (e.g., soil treatment or replacement, efficient drainage) to eliminate or minimize the potential for damage to poles. The types of soils along the existing right-of-way pose a very low potential for subsidence. Implementation of the Project Protocols would minimize the potential risk of soils becoming unstable as a result of construction to a level of insignificance.
- 4) Expansive soils have not been documented within the project area. Therefore, no impacts resulting from risks to life or property are expected as result of construction or operation of the proposed project.
- 5) The construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not require modifications or additions to current wastewater disposal systems, and would be primarily located in areas with existing sewer systems. Therefore, no impact would occur to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Mineral Resources

- 1) The only mineral-related resource located in the vicinity of the project area is an existing gravel pit immediately east of SDG&E's Mission Substation. However, construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not occur outside of SDG&E's existing right-of-way or substation property and would not impact operations of the gravel pit site. In conclusion, the project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the state residents.
- 2) The existing project right-of-way does not cross any known any known unique geologic features delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource.

Paleontology

- 1) Excavation for installation of new structures would affect a very small area at each site, spacing for pole footing excavations sites would be infrequent/spread over long distances, and the project would be constructed primarily within SDG&E's existing right-of-way. Therefore, potential impacts to paleontological resources/sites or unique geologic features resulting from pole footing excavations and other construction activities would be limited.

For these reasons, and because SDG&E is committed to implementing Project Protocols, potential impacts to these resources would be less than significant.

4.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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"/>
2. 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"/>
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Lie on a site that 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Lie within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport and, as a result, would it 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"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. Lie within the vicinity of a private airstrip and, as a result, would it 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"/>
7. 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"/>
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanations:

- 1) Through the required, routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, such as fuels, lubricating oils, and hydraulic fluid, construction equipment could potentially create a temporary, short-term hazard during project construction. Implementation of SDG&E Project Protocols would reduce such potential risk to the environment and public to a less than significant level.
- 2) Construction equipment would require the use of potentially hazardous materials, such as fuels, lubricating oils, and hydraulic fluid, that could be accidentally released during construction. SDG&E Project Protocols would be implemented to ensure the lawful and proper storage and use of these materials and to ensure prompt and effective cleanup of any spills during construction.
- 3) Three schools lie within 0.25 mile of the project right-of-way. However, construction is not expected to result in impacts at either site. The implementation of SDG&E Project Protocols with regard to hazardous materials containment, control, and transport would minimize the potential impact to schools in the vicinity of the project to a less than significant level.
- 4) No listed hazardous material sites have been identified on the proposed project. If hazardous materials are discovered during construction activities, SDG&E would follow its Project Protocols to ensure prompt and effective cleanup, reducing the potential hazards to the public or the environment to a less than significant level.

- 5) Although one airport is located within 2 miles of SDG&E's Mission Substation, the project would not result in a safety hazard to people residing or working in the project area. Any helicopter use by the project during construction would be brought to the attention of the Federal Aviation Administration for a hazard determination, rendering the potential impact to a less than significant level.
- 6) No private airstrips are located in the vicinity of the project area, thus the project would not pose an impact/safety hazard for people residing or working in the area.
- 7) Construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not impair or interfere with any existing emergency response or evacuation plans adopted in the project area, resulting in "no impact" as a result of the project.
- 8) Project construction (equipment in particular) may create a temporary and short-term increase in the risk of wildland fires in unimproved areas along the existing right-of-way. SDG&E's Project Protocols would be implemented to minimize such risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of fire during construction, resulting in less than significant impacts.

4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. 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"/>
3. 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Create or contribute runoff water that 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"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 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"/>
8. 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"/>
9. 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"/>
10. Cause inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanations:

- 1) There is a potential for stormwater runoff from tower sites, staging areas, improved access roads and other disturbed sites as a result of construction. Implementation of the best management practices for erosion and sedimentation control in the SWPPP and implementation of the Project Protocols would minimize the potential to violate water quality standards to a less than significant level.
- 2) Groundwater supplies and recharge would not be impacted because no removal or addition of groundwater is involved with the project.
- 3) The alignment of streams and rivers would not be altered as a result of the project. No substantial alteration to existing drainage patterns on and in the vicinity of the site is expected. Therefore, no substantial erosion or siltation as a result of drainage alteration is expected on- or off-site.
- 4) Alteration of streams, rivers, or a substantial effect on drainage patterns would not occur during construction. Some vegetation removal and soil disturbance would occur during clearing of towers, staging areas, and spur roads, resulting in an increased potential for stormwater runoff. However, implementation of the best management practices for erosion

and sedimentation control in the SWPPP and implementation of the Project Protocols would minimize the potential for flooding on- or off-site to a less than significant level.

- 5) There is the potential for additional stormwater runoff as a result of construction. However, implementation of the best management practices for erosion and sedimentation control in the SWPPP and implementation of the Project Protocols would minimize the potential to exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff to a less than significant level.
- 6) There is a potential for stormwater runoff from areas under construction to impact water quality. However, implementation of the SWPPP and the Project Protocols would minimize the potential to degrade water quality to a less than significant level.
- 7) No housing would be constructed as a result of the project. Therefore, no impact for flooding of housing would occur as result of project construction, operation, or maintenance.
- 8) No structures would be constructed for the project that would impede or redirect flood flow within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impact to people or structures is expected.
- 9) Construction of the project would not involve the construction or modification of a dam or levee, and pole sites would not be located in proximity to any existing levee or dam structure. Therefore, construction of the project would not pose an impact in terms of exposing people or structures to an increased risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of dam or levee failure.
- 10) Construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not increase the potential for people or structures to be affected by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impact is expected.

4.8 LAND USE, PLANNING, RECREATION, AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. 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"/>
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. 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"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. 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"/>
7. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanations:

- 1) The project is located along an existing right-of-way and would not displace any existing facilities or physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impacts of the project would affect such communities.

- 2) The project does not conflict with any jurisdictional agencies' plans, policies, or regulations in the project area, none of which contain specific policies regarding the siting of electric transmission lines. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or have a negative impact on the plans or policies of agencies with jurisdiction over the project. Moreover, with the exception of certain access roads, the project would be constructed within the existing SDG&E right-of-way.

- 3) The project is covered by SDG&E's existing NCCP and would be consistent with San Diego's HCP, with the exception of certain access roads would be located within SDG&E's existing right-of-way, and would be designed and sited to avoid and minimize effects to sensitive habitats. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or negatively impact applicable environmental conservation plans.

- 4) The project would neither affect the use of nor demand for existing parks and recreation facilities. No parks would be closed as a result of construction. However, some trails could be subject to short-term closure during construction. Therefore, physical deterioration of parks and facilities would not occur as a result of project construction.

- 5) Although the existing project right-of-way crosses several parks and recreation areas, the project would neither affect the use of nor demand for existing parks and recreation facilities, and it would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts to recreation in the project area would occur.
- 6) The project does not cross Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, none of these lands would be converted to non-agricultural use, and the project would not pose any impacts to such lands.
- 7) The project would not conflict with any land zoned for agricultural use or cross any Williamson Act contract parcels. Therefore, no impacts to these lands would occur.
- 8) Although some agricultural lands may be affected by placement of utility structures or by temporary construction use, the project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to other uses. Some existing (but not zoned) agricultural lands could be affected by the placement of utility structures or by temporary construction use, but no designated Farmland would be affected.

4.9 NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in 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"/>
2. 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"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. 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"/>
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Lie within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, and, as a result, would it expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Lie in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and, as a result, would it 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"/>

Explanations:

- 1) Because construction activities would be short term and temporary, the project would not exceed noise limits set in the *San Diego County General Plan* and, therefore, would not result in exposure of persons to the generation of noise levels above the standards.
- 2) Vibration from earth-moving and transport equipment may be perceptible to residents near the project area. However, the effects would be temporary and short term and would cease at the end of each workday and upon completion of construction. Groundborne vibrations from construction are considered exempt from the limitations set by the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance; therefore, exposure of people to such vibrations would be less than significant.
- 3) Operation of the project, including occasional use of vehicles for maintenance and repair activity, and a slight increase in audible noise (corona) from the new circuits during foul weather, could potentially cause a minimal and incremental increase in ambient noise levels. However, simulations demonstrate that even under worst-case scenario conditions and locations, corona does not exceed acceptable levels. The project would involve only

modifications and upgrades to existing transmission structures; therefore, eventual project operation would result in a less than significant impact to noise levels.

- 4) Noise generated during construction would result in elevated noise levels in the vicinity of SDG&E’s existing right-of-way. However, construction-related noise is temporary and short term and would return to preconstruction levels at the end of each workday and at the completion of construction. Short-term impacts to ambient noise levels would not be substantial to those in the project vicinity. Therefore, they are considered less than significant.
- 5) The existing project right-of-way does not lie within any known airport land use plan areas, but SDG&E’s Mission Substation is located within 2 miles of Montgomery Field in San Diego. However, temporary, short-term noise generated from project construction is not expected to contribute significantly to elevated noise levels from aircraft operating in the area. Construction activities would not expose people residing or working in or in the vicinity of the project area to excessive noise levels.
- 6) Because no private airstrips are located in the vicinity of the project area, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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"/>
2. 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"/>
3. 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"/>

Explanations:

- 1) Because SDG&E would, to the greatest extent feasible, employ the majority of the 25 to 35 workers needed for the two-year project from the San Diego area, substantial population growth is not expected as a result of the project.
- 2) Construction activities primarily would occur within or adjacent to the existing right-of-way and approved work areas. Therefore, no residences or businesses would be impacted/permanently displaced as a result of project construction. In addition, with temporary housing (e.g., motel, hotels, apartments, etc.) available in the project vicinity, the project would not necessitate displacement and, therefore, construction of additional housing. No impact to infrastructure would occur.
- 3) Construction activities primarily would occur within or adjacent to the existing right-of-way and approved work areas. No residents would be displaced as a result of the project.

4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES, UTILITIES, AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. 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"/>
3. 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"/>
4. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 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"/>
6. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanations:

- 1) Project construction has been designed to avoid short- or long-term impacts to public services or utilities. It would not affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the fire or police protection agencies, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Therefore, the project would result in no impacts to these services and utilities.
- 2) Wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) would not be exceeded during project construction because only a small amount of wastewater would be collected during potential dewatering at pole installation locations. Any dewatering would be managed according to all federal, state, and local laws, and the lawful discharge of wastewaters would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements established by the RWQCB. Therefore, no impacts to wastewater facilities would result from the project.
- 3) No new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required as a result of the long-term operation of the project. Therefore, no impacts to such facilities are expected.
- 4) Construction, operation, and maintenance of the project would not result in a significant increase in stormwater runoff. Therefore, it would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. With the application of Project Protocols and SDG&E's SWPPP and best management practices, potential stormwater runoff impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- 5) Sufficient sources of potable water are available to supply SDG&E's dust and fire suppressant activities, and for crew consumption during construction. Therefore, project construction would not tax existing local water supplies, and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed.
- 6) The project would not require any significant increase in treated wastewater. The wastewater treatment provider would continue to have adequate capacity to serve its existing commitments.
- 7) Any project construction-generated debris would be minimal and easily be served by local landfills. As a result, there would be no impacts to such services from project construction.
- 8) Any solid waste generated as a result of project construction activities would be managed according to all federal, state and local laws, resulting in no impact to solid waste-related public services.

4.12 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. 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"/>
2. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 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"/>
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. 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"/>

Explanations:

- 1) Traffic related to project construction (such as materials delivery, and specialized construction and crew trucks traveling to and from pull sites, staging areas, etc.) would be short term and temporary. Such traffic would occur throughout the day, primarily outside of peak commuting times, and would not result in a substantial increase in existing traffic load. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.
- 2) Construction activities would have only short-term, temporary effects and would involve fewer than 100 vehicle trips per day during peak construction periods. Projected level of project-related traffic is negligible when added to the existing daily traffic on freeways and arterial roadways and, because it would not exceed the established level of service standard for roads or highways in the project area, no impact would occur.
- 3) Local air traffic could potentially increase in areas where structure erection activities involve the use of a helicopter. Air traffic patterns around existing airports are unlikely to be affected, because any helicopter-related construction activities would be based at existing project-material staging areas and would be coordinated with local air traffic control. Therefore, temporary, short-term impacts to air traffic patterns would be less than significant. (If the project does not use helicopters, it would not affect air traffic.)
- 4) The project does not involve any design hazards or incompatible uses related to transportation. Therefore, no temporary or permanent impacts would occur as a result of the project.
- 5) Access for emergency vehicles would be maintained throughout project construction. If construction activities require temporary road closures, appropriate traffic control plans would be followed and permits would be obtained from the relevant authority/authorities. Therefore, the project would not result in an adverse impact to emergency access vehicles and services.
- 6) Project personnel would park in designated areas and SDG&E's staging facilities, and construction workers would be encouraged to carpool to the job site where suitable park-and-ride facilities are available in the project vicinity. The project's short-term, temporary construction activities would not displace any existing parking capacity. Therefore, the project would have no impact on parking in the project area.
- 7) The project would not conflict with any existing policies, plans, or programs that support alternative transportation in the project area.