

**APPENDIX A**  
**CEQA CHECKLIST**

**Appendix A  
Environmental Checklist Form**

**1. Project title:**

Riverway Substation 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. Susan J. Nelson  
Project Manager – Regulatory Affairs  
(626) 302-4332

**4. Project location:**

The Proposed Substation Site is located north of Riggan Avenue and east of Mooney Boulevard. The future Ranch Circle Drive would serve as the access road in and out of the Proposed Project substation.

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

Southern California Edison  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, California 91770

**6. General plan designation:**

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has primary jurisdiction over the Riverway Substation 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 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 local and state land-use plans as part of the environmental review process.

The substation site is zoned CSO (Shopping/Office Commercial) with several areas of residential housing and businesses located in the area, primarily on the south of Riggan

Avenue. On the northwest corner of Riggin Avenue and Mooney Boulevard, the land is also zoned CSO (Shopping/Office Commercial). The immediate north, east and south Riggin Avenue of the Proposed Project is designated low density residential.

**7. Zoning:**

The substation site is zoned CSO (Shopping/Office Commercial). The zoning designation to the immediate west and south of the Proposed Project is CSO. The immediate north and east of the Proposed Project is designated low density residential.

**8. Description of Project:**

The Proposed Substation Site is located north of Riggin Avenue and east of Mooney Boulevard. The future Ranch Circle Drive would serve as the access road in and out of the Proposed Substation. The existing Rector-Oak Grove No. 1 66 kV subtransmission line would be reconfigured to form the Rector-Riverway and Oak Grove-Riverway 66 kV subtransmission lines at the intersection of Mooney Boulevard and Riggin Avenue. The new section of the lines would be underground and would serve as source lines to the substation. The underground sections of the future Oak Grove-Riverway 66 kV and the Rector-Riverway 66 kV lines would travel north on the east side of Mooney Boulevard, turning east on the south side of the future Ranch Circle Drive, travel east along future Ranch Circle Drive and turn south into the substation. In order to complete the underground route of the new Rector-Riverway and Riverway-Oak Grove 66 kV subtransmission lines, one tubular steel pole riser with a concrete footing would be constructed.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting:**

The substation site is located north of Riggin Avenue and east of Mooney Boulevard. The future Ranch Circle Drive would serve as the access road in and out of the substation. European walnut trees are currently growing on the substation site and the current land use is agriculture. Residential housing and businesses are located south of Riggin Avenue.



**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" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agricultural Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology/Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/ Water Quality	Land Use/Planning
Mineral Resources	Noise	Population/Housing
Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/Traffic
Utilities/Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_



## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, 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, and then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiring, 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 that 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 Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				



ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on 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"/>
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
<b>XI. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				



ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 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"/>
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>				



ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC.</b>				
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"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>



ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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

There are no designated scenic roadways or scenic corridors or public recreation areas with views of the Proposed Project. There is one major public street from which the Proposed Project can be seen and one residential neighborhood south of the substation site that affords partial views in the direction of the Proposed Project.

The substation would have operations lighting. Operations lighting would consist of high pressure sodium lights located in the switch racks, around the transformer banks, and in areas of the yard where manual activity may have to take place during night time hours. Lights would normally be off and controlled by a manual switch. No new sources of permanent light and glare would be created.

Less than significant visual impacts as a result of the Proposed Project have been identified. Further, the Proposed Project is consistent with applicable visual resources goals and policies of local planning documents.



## **II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

The substation site is zoned CSO (Shopping Office/Commercial) which includes retail level commercial and office uses. The construction of the Proposed Project would not conflict with this existing zoning. The substation site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The substation site would be located on land that has been designated soils considered to be prime farmland. The City of Visalia 1991 General Plan Update (General Plan) rezoned this area to provide service and commercial uses to support planned residential development. The Environmental Impact Report supporting the General Plan included a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the resulting conversion of prime farmland. The Proposed Project is consistent with the conditions of the General Plan, and therefore would not convert additional prime farmland to nonagricultural use. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts to agriculture.

## **III. AIR QUALITY**

Construction of the Proposed Project would generate emissions from the operation of heavy equipment and support vehicles. In addition, some dust could be generated during clearing, grading or scraping activities associated with site preparation. Particulate matter and exhaust emissions are not anticipated to exceed the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) impact thresholds.

After construction, the Proposed Project would not generate emissions; and thus, would not affect implementation of air quality management plans or expose people to substantial pollutant concentrations. The Proposed Project would not generate or expose people to odors.

All emissions are below thresholds of significance established by the SJVAPCD. Therefore, impacts to air quality are less than significant.

## **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Construction of the Proposed Project is not expected to have a significant effect on biological or water resources in the area, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is not expected to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, or with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

SCE Proposed Measures, outlined in Section 4.4.4, to avoid and/or minimize biological resource impacts have been included as part of the Proposed Project design and SCE standard construction and operation protocols. With the implementation of these SCE Proposed Measures, impacts to sensitive biological resources are expected to be less than significant.



## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

No surface evidence of cultural resources was found either within the substation site or along the subtransmission line route during the pedestrian surveys. Although no evidence of historical resources was found and there have been no reports of resources made to the Southern San Joaquin Information Center, it is not possible to completely negate the potential to encounter buried archaeological resources in this area of California. The SCE Proposed Measures, as outlined in Section 4.5.4, would be implemented if archaeological resources or human remains are encountered during construction. SCE Proposed Measures to avoid and/or minimize cultural resources impacts have been included as part of the Proposed Project design and SCE standard construction and operation protocols. With the implementation of these SCE Proposed Measures, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

Geologically the Project Area is underlain by Quaternary age *Great Valley* fan and basin sedimentary deposits (Matthews and Burnett, 1965). Fan deposits are not conducive to fossil formation or preservation, and are therefore rated low or negligible sensitivity. Basin deposits may preserve fossils, and are rated moderate sensitivity. As a result, it is very unlikely that paleontological specimens would be encountered anywhere in the Project Area. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The substation site is located on a relatively flat area. Given the site topography, there is negligible potential for landslides or other slope stability concerns from Proposed Project construction. Furthermore, substation and transmission line construction would not involve extensive excavation, grade or elevation changes. Therefore, no impacts associated with slope stability or topographic changes are anticipated.

Soil expansion is a phenomenon by which clay-rich soils expand when they are wet and shrink upon drying. In the vicinity of the substation site clay content is low, and soils have a low shrink-swell potential. Therefore, potential hazards associated with expansive soils are less than significant.

The project is not situated in an area prone to subsidence, and does not include activities that could induce subsidence. Therefore, potential hazards associated with subsidence are less than significant.

No known geologic resources of recreational, commercial, or scientific value (including mineral resources) are present within the Project Area. The alluvial and wash deposits such as those found in the vicinity of the substation site are not quarried and are unlikely to be quarried. Once in operation, the substation would have no impact on geologic or soil resources on site or within the surrounding area.

During construction, erosion control measures would be implemented to avoid or minimize soil erosion and off-site deposition. It is estimated that approximately 1,500 cubic yards of soil would be removed from the site and 7,000 cubic yards of new clean fill material would be imported. Because Proposed Project disturbance would be greater than one acre, specific erosion control measures would be identified as part of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan



(SWPPP) required for the Proposed Project (See Water Quality and Hydrology for regulatory framework).

No active or potentially active faults are documented in the Project Area, thus fault rupture is not a hazard. The Project Area is approximately 70 miles from the San Andreas Fault (Jennings, 1994). Due to its distance from major active faults, the Project Area would experience relatively low levels of earthquake-induced ground shaking generated by large earthquakes occurring at one of these faults. Additionally, due to the unlikelihood of an extended period of strong ground shaking during an earthquake, in combination with the deep depth to groundwater beneath the site this region would not likely experience liquefaction. Therefore, potential impacts associated with fault rupture, strong ground motion, and liquefaction are less than significant.

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

Hazardous materials to be used during the construction of the Proposed Project include gasoline, diesel fuel, oil, and lubricants. There are no feasible alternatives to these materials for operation of construction vehicles and equipment. No acutely hazardous materials (AHMs) would be used or stored on-site during construction. Best management practices would be implemented during construction to reduce the potential for or exposure to accidental spills or fires involving the use of hazardous materials.

Due to the low volume and low toxicity of the hazardous materials, the potential for environmental impacts from hazardous material incidents during construction is less than significant. The most likely incidents involving these hazardous materials are associated with minor spills or drips. Impacts from such incidents would be avoided by thoroughly cleaning up minor spills as soon as they occur. A site specific Construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Best Management Practices (see Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality for more detail) would be followed to ensure quick response to minor spills and minimal impacts to the environment.

Operation of the Proposed Project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Proposed Substation Site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites nor would operation of the substation impact operation of an airport or private airstrip. The substation would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan nor would it expose people or structures to wildland fires. Therefore, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant.

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

Construction of the Proposed Project would not impact groundwater resources. There are no streams or rivers that cross, or come into contact with the substation site, thus no stream or river would be altered in a manner that results in substantial erosion or siltation, on or off site, nor would storm water be directed into such resources. A retention basin would be constructed on the site in order to impound runoff and reduce erosion.

Construction impacts for the subtransmission lines would generally be the same as described above for the substation site. Storm water erosion control measures would be



implemented for all areas cleared for construction of the Proposed Project. In addition, a Notice of Intent to comply with the Stormwater General Permit requirements for Construction activities would be submitted to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) and a SWPPP prepared and implemented to ensure consistency standards and discharge requirements. All activities would be subject to storm water control requirements defined in the NPDES permit and SWPPP.

No project components would be placed within the 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation maps.

Once in operation, the substation would comply with all of the CRWQCB water quality standards and/or drainage discharge requirements. Runoff volumes are not forecasted to be substantial; and therefore, would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. An on-site retention basin would be constructed to minimize runoff from the Proposed Project. Water from the City of Visalia water system would be used for landscape irrigation. This water usage would be minimal and therefore, is not considered a significant impact. No groundwater or surface water resources would be impacted nor would any subsequent structures be placed on site or result in activities that could adversely impact or be impacted by site or neighboring hydrology.

Once operational, the substation would be periodically maintained. However, these activities would not impact hydrologic resources within or adjacent to the 66 kV corridor. As a result, impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

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

Construction of the substation would not cause the physical division of an established community or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project.

The substation would be located on a site zoned CSO (Shopping/Office Commercial). This zoning designation includes electric distribution substations and communication equipment buildings as a conditional use, and is consistent with the operational activities of the substation (Ord. 9717 § 2 (part) Ch. 17.18 City of Visalia Municipal Codes).

The zoning designation to the immediate west and south of the Proposed Project is CSO (Shopping/Office Commercial). The immediate north and east of the Proposed Project is designated low density residential, but there is currently no residential development in this area. As a result, the Proposed Project substation use would not conflict with adjacent existing land uses, and operation of the Proposed Project would not divide an existing community. Therefore, impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant.



## **X. MINERAL RESOURCES**

The Proposed Project is not located on land delineated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan for Tulare County. The Proposed Project is also not located on or near known oil and gas resources. Therefore, no impact to mineral resources would occur.

## **XI. NOISE**

Construction of the substation would adhere to the noise ordinance provisions set by the City of Visalia. It may be necessary, particularly during cut over activities, to work during nighttime hours when loads on the lines are reduced. Should the need arise to work outside the time permitted in the aforementioned local ordinances; SCE would comply with variance procedures required by the County of Tulare and/or the City of Visalia.

The Proposed Project would not generate groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. The Proposed Project would not result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project Area. The Proposed Project would cause less than significant noise impacts.

## **XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Construction of the substation site, associated transmission lines and telecommunication installation is considered short-term and temporary. Workers would come from either Tulare County or surrounding communities and it is unlikely that they would require temporary housing. If SCE construction crews are used they would be based at SCE's Alhambra facility, and they would require temporary, short-term housing.

During the construction phase of the Proposed Project the peak number of construction workers is expected to be 25. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not require a large temporary workforce that may displace existing housing or people, or necessitate relocation or construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Construction of the Proposed Project would have no impacts to population and housing.

The substation would be unmanned and the electrical equipment within the substation would be remotely monitored and controlled by a power management system from Rector Substation. Due to the substation being remotely operated, SCE personnel would generally visit for electrical switching and routine maintenance. Routine maintenance would include equipment testing, equipment monitoring and repair, as well as emergency and routine procedures for service continuity and preventive maintenance. SCE personnel would generally visit the substation two to three times per week. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project would not generate a large operation-related workforce from out of the area that would require permanent housing.

In addition, demand for electricity is a result of, not a precursor to, development in the region. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. Operation of the Proposed Project would have no impacts to population and housing.



### **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Construction related activities would not require expansion of fire and police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities. Construction of the Proposed Project would not significantly affect police and fire protection response times or create higher demand for these public services.

Operation related activities would not require expansion of fire and police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities. Operation of the Proposed Project would not significantly affect police and fire protection response times or create higher demand for these public services.

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts to public services.

### **XIV. RECREATION**

The Proposed Project would not result in the increased use of city parks or other recreational facilities, or cause the deterioration of these facilities. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on the recreational character of the City of Visalia. Therefore, no impact to recreational resources would occur.

### **XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

During construction of the subtransmission lines, periodic single lane closures along Riggin Avenue and Mooney Boulevard (north of Riggin Avenue) may be necessary and could have an effect on traffic along these routes. If lane closures are required, SCE would comply with best management practices established by the Work Area Protection and Traffic Control Manual (California Joint Utility Traffic Control Committee, 1996).

An estimated 280 truck trips would be necessary to import fill material during grading. SCE Proposed Measures include the use of off-peak hours when possible and staggering trips throughout the 4-week period of grading. Further, the trucks would use the designated truck routes to access the substation site.

Traffic caused by Proposed Project construction would be temporary, short-term and minimal, and would not result in increased hazards due to design features, a loss of adequate emergency access or disturb the city's parking capacity. Construction impacts to traffic would be less than significant.

The substation would be unmanned and the electrical equipment within the substation would be remotely monitored and controlled by a power management system from Rector Substation. Due to the substation being remotely operated, SCE personnel would generally visit for electrical switching and routine maintenance. These visits are anticipated to occur only two or three times per week, and would have a negligible impact on traffic within the Project Area. Thus, with the exception of periodic site visits by SCE staff or contractors, operational activities at the Proposed Project would have no impact on transportation and traffic in the Project Area. In addition, the Project is not located in the vicinity of air or rail transport and as such would not result in any change to air traffic or rail patterns. With the



implementation of SCE Proposed Measures, set forth in Section 4.15.4, impacts to traffic and transportation would be less than significant.

SCE Proposed Measures, outlined in Section 4.15.4, to avoid and/or minimize traffic and transportation impacts have been included as part of the Proposed Project design and SCE standard construction and operation protocols. With the implementation of these SCE Proposed Measures, impacts to traffic and transportation are expected to be less than significant.

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

Small volumes of construction-related debris may require disposal during construction, but these volumes are not expected to impact the landfills in the Project Area. Water, wastewater services or other utilities would not be required for construction of the Proposed Project. Underground construction could inadvertently contact underground utilities, possibly leading to short-term service interruptions. As with all SCE underground construction, Underground Service Alert would be contacted at least 48 hours prior to excavation in order to minimize impacts to other utilities.

The substation would not require wastewater disposal and thus, would not exceed wastewater treatment capacity in the area. The operation of the substation would require irrigation of the surrounding landscaping and would require a tie-in to a municipal water source. Operation of the substation would not require construction or expansion of wastewater or solid waste disposal facilities, or new or expanded water entitlements.

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts to utilities and service systems.

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

Prior to implementation of the SCE Proposed Measures the Proposed Project and alternatives have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce wildlife habitat, reduce the numbers or range of a rare, threatened, or endangered species, and affect traffic circulation. With the implementation of these SCE Proposed Measures, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Neither the Proposed Project nor alternatives have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.

Neither the Project nor alternatives will lead to impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

Neither the Proposed Project nor alternatives have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.