D.6 Agriculture

The following discussion focuses on the project-specific impacts to agriculture that would result from the operation of the Proposed PROJECT. Section D.6.1 provides a description of the environmental setting/affected environment, including existing agricultural conditions within the vicinity of the three project areas. Section D.6.2 presents a general description of plans, policies, and ordinances applicable to the Proposed PROJECT. An analysis of the Proposed PROJECT impacts/environmental effects is provided in Section D.6.3. An analysis of project alternatives is provided in Sections D.6.4 through D.6.7. Section D.6.8 provides mitigation monitoring, compliance, and reporting information. Section D.6.9 addresses residual effects of the project, and Section D.6.10 lists the references cited in this section.

D.6.1 Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Methodology and Assumptions

This section presents agricultural data and analysis, which involved review of the open space and land use elements of the existing San Diego County General Plan (County of San Diego 2002, 2003), the Central Mountain Community Plan (County of San Diego 2005), and the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan (County of San Diego 1995). The analysis also included review of aerial photographs and relevant maps, including the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) map (DOC 2006), the Williamson Act map for San Diego County (DOC 2008), and San Diego County Land Use Designation and Zoning maps.

This section also summarizes the existing agricultural resources within the East County (ECO) Substation, Tule Wind, and Energia Sierra Juarez U.S. Generator-Tie (ESJ Gen-Tie), as well as the Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy project areas. The Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects are being analyzed at a program level in this EIR/EIS as no site-specific survey data is available. Due to the close proximity of these wind energy projects to the ECO Substation, Tule Wind, and ESJ Gen-Tie projects, a similar agricultural setting is assumed

D.6.1.1 General Overview

Within eastern San Diego County (County) are approximately 134,892 acres designated as Farmland of Local Importance; 8,251 acres of Prime Farmland; 10,959 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance; and 53,250 acres of Unique Farmland (DOC 2006). As shown on Figure D.6-1B, Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Overview Map, there is a portion of land northwest of the Jacumba Airport along Old Highway 80 designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland (DOC 2006). Additionally, there are several isolated pockets of Farmland of Statewide Importance and Farmland of Local

Importance in the general vicinity of the three projects. Due to a lack of water resources and poor soil quality, there are no lands within the project boundary that are under a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2008).

D.6.1.2 ECO Substation Project

ECO Substation 500 kV and 230/138 kV Yards

As shown on Figure D.6-1B, Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Overview Map, and Figure D.6-2B, Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring ECO Project Components, the ECO Substation 500-kilovolt (kV) and 230/138 kV yards' site would not be located on or adjacent to lands designated as Important Farmlands or land entered into Williamson Act contracts (DOC 2006, 2008). The nearest occurrence of Important Farmland is located approximately 2.7 miles west of the substation site and includes Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland. No active agricultural operations are present.

Southwest Powerlink Loop-In

Similar to the ECO Substation, the Southwest Powerlink (SWPL) Loop-In would not be located on or adjacent to lands designated as Important Farmlands or land entered into Williamson Act contracts (DOC 2006, 2008). The nearest occurrence of Important Farmland is located approximately 2.7 miles west of the SWPL Loop-In site and includes Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland. No active agricultural operations are present.

138 kV Transmission Line

As shown on Figure D.6-2B, the 138 kV transmission line would traverse approximately 1,750 linear feet of land between Mileposts (MPs) 3.1 and 3.3, which is designated Farmland of Statewide Importance (DOC 2006). These lands are part of Ketchum Ranch and are actively used for the agricultural production of row crops, including organic lettuce. The remainder of the alignment would traverse areas designated Other Land.

Boulevard Substation Rebuild

The Boulevard Substation rebuild site would not be located on or adjacent to lands designated as Important Farmlands or land entered into Williamson Act contracts (DOC 2006, 2008). The nearest occurrence of Important Farmland is located approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the rebuild site and consists of Farmland of Local Importance. No active agricultural operations are present.

General Plan Designation and Zoning

As described in Section D.4.1.1, the ECO Substation Project components would be located on a variety of County-planned land use designations (refer to that section for a detailed explanation). The ECO Substation Project components would occur on lands zoned for agricultural uses, but the ECO Substation site would not be located on lands zoned for forest use or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

D.6.1.3 Tule Wind Project

The Tule Wind Project would be primarily located in the In-Ko-Pah Mountains near the McCain Valley. Small-scale agriculture operations are scattered throughout the subregion and are typically dry land farming or grazing. Topography is the primary limiting factor for agriculture because of the area's steep, rocky terrain. The nearest agricultural enterprise to the project area is Ketchum Ranch near Jacumba, which is approximately five miles to the southeast. As shown on Figure D.6-1B, no portion of this project would be located on or adjacent to lands designated as Important Farmlands or land entered into Williamson Act contracts (DOC 2006, 2008).

One parcel located within the project area previously had an Agricultural Preserve designator (AP-30). This designation was removed as part of a rezone (04-026) and administrative permit (04-003) in April 2006, reducing 1,722 acres of a larger 14,000-acre agricultural preserve. ~~According to the County Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) Geographic System Mapping data, the project extent boundary contains 202.7 acres of agricultural preserves as shown in Figure D.6-3, Williamson Act and Grazing Lands.~~

According to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Eastern San Diego County ~~Proposed~~ Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (2007), the McCain Valley Allotment covers 31,481 acres (including the In-Ko-Pah, Mt. Tule, Table Mountain, and Tierra Blanca sub-allotments) of grazeable land. The McCain Valley/In-Ko-Pah and Tierra Blanca Areas allotment currently has 20,497 active acres or 1,112 animal units per month (AUM), with the BLM permit to expire in 2010. Additionally, according to the BLM RMP, wells that have supported grazing cattle have gone dry and have not been re-drilled. Current grazing allotments are shown in Figure D.6-3B.

Currently, there is livestock grazing within the McCain Valley area. However, grazing policies have changed and public lands are not available for livestock grazing in accordance with the San Diego County RMP. The current permit will not be renewed and a 2-year nonrenewal notification letter for the McCain Valley Allotment was sent by BLM to the permit holder on September 18, 2009. The grazing permit expires on September 18, 2010.

General Plan Designation and Zoning

A ~~small~~ portion of the Tule Wind Project~~'s 138 kV transmission line alignment~~ would be located on County land designated as General Agriculture and ~~for~~ Multiple Rural Use (1 DU/4, 8, 20 acres), but would not be located on any lands designated ~~zoned~~ for forest use or timberland or zoned as Timberland Production.

D.6.1.4 ESJ Gen-Tie Project

The ESJ Gen-Tie Project would be located approximately 4 miles east of Jacumba, immediately south of the proposed ECO Substation 500 kV and 230/138 kV yards. As shown on Figure D.6-1B, no portion of this project would be located on or adjacent to lands designated as Important Farmlands or land entered into Williamson Act contracts (DOC 2006, 2008).

General Plan Designation and Zoning

According to the San Diego County General Plan, the project site is designated Regional Category 1.4, Rural Development Area. The site is zoned General Rural (S-92), with a minimum lot size of 8 acres. The ESJ Gen-Tie site would not be located on any lands zoned for forest use or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

D.6.2 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards

The following section presents a general description of plans, policies, ordinances, and regulations applicable to the Proposed PROJECT, as well as the Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects. In addition to the federal regulations identified, the Campo and Manzanita wind energy projects may be subject to the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA's) policies and regulations and tribe-specific policies and plans.

D.6.2.1 Federal Regulations

Farmland Protection Policy Act (Public Law 97-98, 7 U.S.C. Section 4201)

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) is intended to minimize the impact federal programs have on the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. It assures that—to the extent possible—federal programs are administered to be compatible with state and local units of government and private programs and policies to protect farmland. Federal agencies are required to develop and review their policies and procedures to implement the FPPA every 2 years.

The FPPA does not authorize the federal government to regulate the use of private or nonfederal land or, in any way, affect the property rights of owners. For the purpose of FPPA, farmland

includes Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Land of Statewide or Local Importance. Farmland subject to FPPA requirements does not have to be currently used for cropland. It can be forest land, pastureland, cropland, or other land, but not water or urban built-up land.

Projects are subject to FPPA requirements if they may irreversibly convert farmland (directly or indirectly) to non-agricultural use and are completed by a federal agency or with assistance from a federal agency (NRCS 2008).

D.6.2.2 State Laws and Regulations

Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

The FMMP produces Important Farmland maps, which identify the suitability of agricultural lands in the State of California on a county-by-county basis. The classification of important farmlands is based on both land use and soil. In order for land to be shown as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance, land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some point within 4 years of the Important Farmland map publishing date and must contain soils that meet the physical and chemical requirements for classification as Prime Farmland/Farmland of Statewide Importance, as determined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The NRCS evaluates soil based on a variety of criteria including available water capacity, soil temperature, acid-alkali balance, soil sodium content, and permeability rate (DOC 2009a). The FMMP maps approximately 47.9 million acres of land in 49 counties in the State of California. FMMP maps are updated and released every 2 years.

The DOC identifies farmlands as follows:

- **Prime Farmland:** Land that has the best combination of physical and chemical properties for the production of crops
- **Farmland of Statewide Importance:** Similar to Prime Farmland, but with minor shortcomings (e.g., steeper slopes, inability to hold water)
- **Unique Farmland:** Land of lesser-quality soils, but recently used for the production of specific high-economic-value crops
- **Farmland of Local Importance:** Land of importance to the local agricultural economy, as determined by each county's board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.

Williamson Act

Formally known as the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, the Williamson Act permits local governments to restrict specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use by

entering into voluntary contracts with private landowners. Upon entering into the contract, landowners are afforded lower-than-normal property tax assessments because the assessment is based on farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. Williamson Act contracts are regulated by 10-year terms (DOC 2009b).

The county and city are also afforded the opportunity to establish agricultural preserves. Only land located in an agricultural preserve is eligible to enter into a Williamson Act contract. According to the DOC, an agricultural preserve must be no smaller than 100 acres, although smaller parcels of land may be combined to meet the minimum acreage requirement, provided the combined parcels are contiguous (DOC 2009b).

D.6.2.3 Regional Policies, Plans, and Regulations

San Diego County General Plan

The Land Use Element of the existing County General Plan (County of San Diego 2003) contains two goals that are relevant to the Proposed PROJECT. Land Use Goals 2.3 (to "retain the rural character of non-urban land") and 2.5 (to "encourage continuance and expansion of agricultural use in appropriate portions of the unincorporated area") are relevant because the Proposed PROJECT would construct industrial project components in a primarily rural area (southeastern San Diego County), and the ECO Substation Project 138 kV Transmission Line component would traverse active agricultural operations.

The Open Space Element of the County General Plan contains the following policy as a means of conserving resources and natural processes: "preserve productive agriculture areas and recognize their value as open space" (County of San Diego 2002). Since the proposed transmission alignment route associated with the ECO Substation Project would traverse active agricultural land between MPs 3.1 and 3.3, this policy is relevant to the ECO Substation Project.

The project area contains land use designated as General Agriculture, and according to the San Diego Zoning Ordinances, portions of the project area are zoned General Agriculture (A72). Use regulations are intended to create and preserve areas for the raising of crops and animals. Processing of products produced or raised on the premises would be permitted, as would certain commercial activities associated with raising crops and animals.

The construction of large wind turbines systems is allowable on agricultural land under Section 6951 of the County Zoning Ordinance. The County Zoning Ordinance states that "large wind turbine systems shall be permitted on a parcel of at least 5 acres and considered a Major Impact Services and Utilities use type requiring a major use permit" (County of San Diego 2010, Section 6951).

Mountain Empire Subregional Plan

The Mountain Empire Subregional Plan was reviewed to identify any agricultural and forest policies that would be relevant to the Proposed PROJECT. While none of the policies were specifically relevant to the Proposed PROJECT, the Agricultural Goal of Chapter 2, Land Use, is applicable. The Agricultural Goal seeks to "encourage the expansion and continuance of agricultural uses in the subregion" (County of San Diego 1995). The proposed transmission alignment route associated with the ECO Substation Project would cross active agricultural land used for the production of row crops. In addition, two transmission line towers would be located on these lands.

The Mountain Empire Subregional Plan does not specify forest preservation goals, aside from oak tree preservation (County of San Diego 1995, p. 28).

D.6.3 Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

D.6.3.1 Definition and Use of CEQA Significance Criteria~~/Indicators under NEPA~~

In accordance with Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), the Proposed PROJECT would have a significant impact to agriculture if it would result in any of the following conditions:

- Convert more than 10 acres of DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use, and as a result, the project would substantially impair the ongoing viability of the site for agricultural use.
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or convert more than 10 acres of Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.
- Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).
- Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

In California, agricultural land is typically presumed to be in parcels large enough to sustain agricultural use if the land is at least 10 acres in size in the case of Prime agricultural land, or at least 40 acres in size in the case of land that is not prime agricultural land (California Government Code, Section 51222). The conversion of DOC Farmland would be considered

significant if more than 10 acres of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Significance, and/or Grazing Land are converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the Proposed PROJECT. As an optional method, impacts to farmland are also sometimes assessed using the California Department of Conservation's (DOC's) Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model, which is used for rating the relative quality of land resources based upon specific measurable features. The LESA model is identified in the CEQA Guidelines as an optional methodology for addressing impacts to farmland and agricultural resources. It is typically used to analyze impacts to Prime farmland. As indicated in Section D.6.3.3, the Proposed PROJECT would not result in impacts to Prime farmland and hence the LESA Model is not utilized.

Regarding forest resources, Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines "Forest Land" as "land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." Public Resources Code Section 4526 defines "Timberland" as land, "other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Commercial species shall be determined by the board on a district basis after consultation with the district committees and others." Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) is defined by California Government Code Section 51104(g) as "an area which has been zoned pursuant to Section 51112 or 51113 and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses, as defined in 51104(h). With respect to the general plans of cities and counties, 'timberland preserve zone' means 'timberland production zone'."

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) provides no specific thresholds of significance for the assessment of project impacts on agricultural or applicable forestry resources; hence, significance conclusions for individual impacts are not required for compliance with NEPA.

D.6.3.2 Applicant Proposed Measures

No applicant proposed measures (APMs) have been identified for the ECO Substation Project, Tule Wind Project, or the ESJ Gen-Tie Project related to agricultural resources.

Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy Projects

At the time this Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/EIS was prepared, the project proponents for these three wind energy projects have not developed project-specific APMs.

D.6.3.3 Direct and Indirect Effects

Table D.6-1 lists the impacts and classifications of the impacts under CEQA identified for the Proposed PROJECT. See definitions for Class I, II, III, IV, and No Impact in Section D.1.2.2, CEQA vs. NEPA Criteria, of this EIR/EIS. Because this project is being analyzed in an EIS under NEPA, there is no requirement for federal agencies to classify impacts or to determine the significance of impacts; rather, the BLM must take a "hard look" at the impacts of the Proposed PROJECT and its alternatives and determine whether they are adverse. Therefore, while these criteria are used as indicators to frame the analysis of the impacts under NEPA, any determination of significance is a determination under CEQA, not NEPA. Cumulative effects are analyzed in Section F of this EIR/EIS.

Table D.6-1
Agricultural Impacts

Impact No.	Description	CEQA Classification
ECO Substation – Agricultural Impacts		
ECO-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
ECO-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	Class III
ECO-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ECO-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ECO-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
Tule Wind – Agricultural Impacts		
Tule-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
Tule-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
Tule-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	Class III (existing zoning for agricultural use)/No Impact (convert Williamson Act lands)
Tule-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
Tule-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
ESJ Gen-Tie – Agricultural Impacts		
ESJ-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact

Table D.6-1 (Continued)

Impact No.	Description	CEQA Classification
ESJ-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
Proposed PROJECT (COMBINED – including Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy)		
AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	Class III
AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	Class III
AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.

ECO Substation Project

As stated in Section D.6.1, most of the ECO Substation components would not be located on land that is actively being farmed. The only exception is the 138 kV transmission line component, which would traverse approximately 1,750 linear feet (0.3 mile) of Ketchum Ranch land, some of which is actively being farmed with organic lettuce row crops. Two transmission towers would be installed on this land.

To provide a safe work space, each transmission structure would require approximately 70 feet by 70 feet of cleared workspace for construction activities. Additionally, temporary disturbance of an approximately 115-foot by 115-foot area may be required for staging and operation of vehicles and equipment to facilitate each pole installation. Therefore, a total of approximately 0.8 acre of temporary disturbance is anticipated for the construction of both transmission structures.

Permanent roads would need to be constructed to access these transmission structures. Spur roads to the transmission structures would be constructed off existing farm roads, thereby minimizing the amount of disturbance. Roads would be a maximum of approximately 14 feet

wide and a total of 430 feet in length, resulting in a total area of approximately 0.14 acre that would be permanently disturbed and removed from agricultural production.

The total agricultural portion of Ketchum Ranch is approximately 320 acres; the maximum area that would be temporarily removed from agricultural production (0.8 acre) represents 0.3% of this total. Permanent impacts (0.14 acre) would represent .004% of total ranch land.

Inspections would be infrequent and operation and maintenance (O&M) activities would be minimal.

Identified impacts to agricultural resources would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Tule Wind Project

Currently, the only active agricultural activity within the project area is livestock grazing. As part of the BLM's 2008 Eastern San Diego County RMP, the BLM has determined that livestock grazing is not permitted on public land (BLM 2008, p. 78). The BLM has notified the current permit holder in the vicinity that grazing in the McCain Valley Allotment will expire on September 18, 2010. At that time, no livestock grazing will be permitted. As such, construction and decommissioning of the Tule Wind Project would not interfere with active agricultural operations or convert farmland to agricultural use (No Impact).

ESJ Gen-Tie Project

The project site and surrounding area within a 0.25-mile radius does not contain active agricultural operations. As such, construction activities would not interfere with active agricultural operations (No Impact).

Proposed PROJECT

The combined analysis of the Proposed PROJECT indicates that only the ECO Substation Project would temporarily interfere with active agricultural operations. The other projects, including Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy, would not result in environmental effects.

The CEQA conclusion for the ECO Substation Project would be a Class III level of significance. The other projects would result in no impact. Overall, CEQA impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed PROJECT would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-2: Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.

ECO Substation Project

Figures D.6-1B and D.6-2B show the location of project components and DOC Farmlands. The ECO Substation Project components would mostly occur on land designated Other Land. However, for the section between MPs 3.1 and 3.3, the 138 kV transmission line component would traverse approximately 1,750 linear feet (0.3 mile) of Ketchum Ranch land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance (Figure D.6-2B). Two transmission towers would be installed on this land. Since the amount of conversion of DOC Farmland resulting from construction of the two towers would be less than 10 acres, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Tule Wind Project

As shown on Figure D.6-1B, the Tule Wind project site does not contain any Prime Farmland, Farmlands of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmlands, or Farmland of Local Importance. As such, no DOC Farmlands would be converted to non-agricultural uses, and no impacts would result (No Impact).

ESJ Gen-Tie Project

As shown on Figure D.6-1B, the ESJ Gen-Tie Project is located on land designated as Other Land according to the FMMP. As such, no conversion of DOC Farmland to a non-agricultural use would occur as a result of this project (No Impact).

Proposed PROJECT

The combined analysis of the Proposed PROJECT indicates that only the ECO Substation Project and Jordan wind energy project would impact DOC Farmland. Preliminary analysis indicates that the Jordan wind energy project could impact 46.4 acres designated Farmland of Local Importance and Farmland of Statewide Importance. The other projects would result in no impact to DOC Farmland.

The ECO Substation CEQA analysis indicates that impacts would be less than significant (Class III). Although project-specific information for the Jordan wind energy project has not been developed and the extent of impacts to DOC Farmland are not known at this time, given the overall available DOC Farmland in the region impacts would be similar to those of the ECO Substation Project. The other projects, including Campo and Manzanita Wind Energy, would result in no impact to DOC Farmland. Overall, CEQA impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed PROJECT would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-3: Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.

ECO Substation Project

None of the ECO Substation components would be located on land protected under a Williamson Act contract. Construction of the ECO Substation components would not convert any Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural uses. In addition, the ECO Substation Project site is not located within any agricultural zones. Accordingly, no impact would result (No Impact).

Tule Wind Project

For those parcels under County land use jurisdiction, the Tule Wind project would be considered a "Civic Use Type" by the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance Part One, Basic Provisions, 1300 Civic Use Types. The project would be considered Major Impact Services and Utilities, which according to the County Ordinances is a permitted General Agriculture (A72) use. A Major Use Permit was submitted to the County of San Diego on October 9, 2009, seeking permission to build the portion of the project located within the County's land use control. Since the proposed use is an allowable use within the General Agriculture zone, the project would not impact County zoning for agricultural use.

Regarding federal BLM lands, the project would be consistent with the BLM's Eastern San Diego County RMP. As discussed in Section D.4.2.1, the Tule project is located within the RMP's McCain Valley Recreation Management Zone. This zone is managed for its historical, cultural, and natural qualities and also as a diverse recreational area (primary activities include off-highway vehicle (OHV) use, hiking, horseback riding, and mountain bike riding). Therefore, as the project is consistent with the RMP, the project would not conflict with BLM land use designation.

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

According to the County DPLU, there are no agricultural preserves or Williamson Act contracts within the Tule Wind Project area. Therefore, the Tule Wind Project would not impact agricultural preserves or Williamson Act contracts (No Impact).

ESJ Gen-Tie Project

The County of San Diego has zoned the project site as S-92, which is not an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not preserved under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the ESJ Gen-Tie Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract (No Impact).

Proposed PROJECT

No impact would result to any Williamson Act contract lands. Only minor impacts to existing agricultural zoning would result.

Under CEQA, Williamson Act land and zoning impacts resulting from the Proposed PROJECT, including Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-4: Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

ECO Substation Project

The ECO Substation Project would not be located on lands zoned for forestry. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. As such, the ECO Substation Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Tule Wind Project

The Tule Wind Project would not be located on lands zoned for forestry and would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would result.

Under CEQA, identified impacts would result in no impact (No Impact).

ESJ Gen-Tie Project

The ESJ Gen-Tie Project would not be located on lands zoned for forestry and would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would result (No Impact).

Proposed PROJECT

As none of the component projects would result in impact to forest lands, the Proposed PROJECT, including Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy, would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

The CEQA impact conclusion would be the same: impacts would not result (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

ECO Substation Project

The ECO Substation Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because it would not be located on forest land and would not affect forest resources. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would result.

Similarly, under CEQA, impacts would not result (No Impact).

Tule Wind Project

The Tule Wind Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because it would not be located on forest land and would not affect forest resources. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would result.

Under CEQA, impacts would not result (No Impact).

ESJ Gen-Tie Project

The ESJ Gen-Tie Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because it would not be located on forest land and would not affect forest resources. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site (No Impact).

Proposed PROJECT

As none of the component projects would result in impact to forest lands, the Proposed PROJECT, including Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan Wind Energy, would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.4 ECO Substation Project Alternatives

Table D.6-2 summarizes the impacts and classification of the impacts under CEQA that have been identified for the ECO Substation Project alternatives. See definitions for Class I, II, III, IV, and No Impact in Section D.1.2.2, CEQA vs. NEPA Criteria of this EIR/EIS. Because this project is being analyzed in an EIS under NEPA, there is no requirement for federal agencies to classify impacts or to determine the significance of impacts; rather, the BLM must take a "hard look" at the impacts of the Proposed PROJECT and its alternatives and determine whether they are adverse. Therefore, while these criteria are used as indicators to frame the

analysis of the impacts under NEPA, any determination of significance is a determination under CEQA, not NEPA.

Table D.6-2
Agricultural Resource Impacts Identified for ECO Substation Project Alternatives

Impact No.	Description	CEQA Classification
ECO Substation Alternative Site		
ECO-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
ECO-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	Class III
ECO-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ECO-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ECO-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
ECO Partial Underground 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative		
ECO-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
ECO-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	Class III
ECO-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ECO-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ECO-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
ECO Highway 80 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative		
ECO-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
ECO-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	Class III
ECO-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ECO-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ECO-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
ECO Highway 80 Underground 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative		
ECO-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
ECO-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	Class III
ECO-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ECO-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ECO-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact

D.6.4.1 ECO Substation Alternative Site

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Section D.6.1.2 describes the environmental setting for the proposed ECO Substation Project. This alternative would result in a shift of the proposed ECO Substation site 700 feet to the east and change the access route to along the west and southern substation boundary. As such, the environmental setting would be the same as described in Section D.6.1.2.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: The relocated ECO Substation site would not be located on an active agricultural area. The 138 kV transmission line alignment would be similar to the proposed ECO Substation and would occur on active agricultural land owned by Ketchum Ranch. When compared to the proposed ECO Substation, the same disturbance to the agricultural operations at the ranch would result.

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-2: Under this alternative, the ECO Substation site would be shifted 700 feet to the east. The Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie components would not be changed under this alternative when compared to the Proposed PROJECT. The relocated ECO Substation site would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP.

As under the proposed ECO Substation Project, the 138 kV transmission line would mostly occur on land designated Other Land. However, for the section between MPs 3.1 and 3.3, the 138 kV transmission line component would still traverse approximately 1,750 linear feet (0.3 mile) of Ketchum Ranch land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. Two transmission towers would be installed on this land. Since the amount of conversion of DOC Farmland resulting from construction of the two towers would be less than 10 acres, it would not be adverse under NEPA; under CEQA, it would be less than significant (Class III), a level of impact similar to that identified for the proposed ECO Substation.

Impact AG-3: Under the proposed ECO Substation Project, the following conclusions were made for the ECO Substation components:

- None of the ECO Substation components would be located on land protected under a Williamson Act contract.
- Construction of the ECO Substation components would not convert any Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural uses.
- The ECO Project site is not located within any agricultural zones.

With implementation of this alternative, the same conclusions would apply because the relocated substation site would not be located on Williamson Act contract lands or within any agricultural zones (No Impact).

Impact AG-4: Similar to the proposed ECO Substation Project, the relocated ECO Substation site proposed under this alternative would not be located on any lands zoned for forestry. The site is not located on forest land or on any lands zoned for forest or timberland use, or Timberland Production. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. As such, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would result (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: Similar to the Proposed ECO Substation Project, the relocated ECO Substation site proposed under this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because it would not be located on forest land and would not affect forest resources. Forest land and timberland do not exist on or in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would result (No Impact).

D.6.4.2 ECO Partial Underground 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

With the exception of the undergrounding of the proposed 138 kV transmission line between MP 9 and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation and the rerouting and undergrounding of the proposed 138 kV transmission line between MP 0.3 and MP 2.4, components of this alternative would be the same as those identified for the ECO Substation Project as presented in Section B, Project Description, of this EIR/EIS. Under this alternative, from MP 9 to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, the proposed 138 kV transmission line would be installed underground (instead of on overhead transmission poles) along the same route as the proposed ECO Substation Project. Also, between MP 0.3 and MP 2.4, the proposed 138 kV transmission line would be rerouted and installed underground along Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road (for an approximate 2.7-

mile distance) and would then rejoin the proposed 138 kV transmission line. With the exception of the Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge underground reroute, ~~Since~~ this alternative would follow the same route as the proposed ECO Substation Project and~~,~~ the jurisdictions traversed and ~~the~~ existing land uses adjacent to proposed project components of this alternative would be ~~the same~~similar as those identified in Sections D.4.1.2, ECO Substation Project, and D.6.1.2.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Under this alternative the proposed 138 kV transmission line between MP 9 and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation would be undergrounded. In addition, between MP 0.3 and MP 2.4, the proposed 138 kV transmission line would be rerouted and undergrounded along Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road. The remaining ECO Substation components would not be changed under this alternative. The undergrounded 138 kV transmission line segments would not be located in ~~an~~ active agricultural areas. The overhead 138 kV transmission line alignment would be similar to the proposed ECO Substation Project and would occur on active agricultural land owned by Ketchum Ranch. The same disturbance to the agricultural operations at the ranch would result.

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-2: As with the proposed ECO Substation Project, the undergrounded 138 kV transmission line segments proposed under this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same impact conclusion determined for the proposed ECO Substation Project would apply for this alternative.

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-3: Under the proposed ECO Substation Project, the following conclusions were made for the ECO Substation components:

- None of the ECO Substation components would be located on land protected under a Williamson Act contract.
- Construction of the ECO Substation components would not convert any Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural uses.
- The ECO Project site is not located within any agricultural zones.

With implementation of this alternative~~,~~ the same conclusions would apply because with the exception of the Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road underground reroute, the undergrounded 138 kV transmission line segments would traverse the same lands as under the proposed ECO Substation Project. The Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road underground reroute would not traverse land protected under a Williamson Act contract and the reroute would not be located within any agricultural zones. Accordingly, no impact would occur as a result of the undergrounded 138 kV transmission line segments (No Impact).

Impact AG-4: Between MP 9 and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, ~~T~~the undergrounded 138 kV transmission line would have the same alignment as that under the proposed ECO Substation Project and~~.~~ the Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road underground reroute would not conflict with existing zoning for forest lands (the underground reroute alignment would not traverse land zoned for forest, timberland, or Timberland Production). ~~Consistent with~~Therefore, similar to the impact conclusion for the proposed ECO Substation, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: Between MP 9 and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, ~~T~~the undergrounded 138 kV transmission line would have the same alignment as that under the proposed ECO Substation Project and the rerouting of the proposed 138 kV transmission line between MP 0.3 and MP 2.4 and undergrounding of the segment along Old Highway 80 and Carrizo Gorge Road would not impact forest lands. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ECO Substation, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.4.3 ECO Highway 80 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

With the exception of the 138 kV transmission line route, the existing land uses adjacent to proposed project components of this alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed ECO Substation Project in Section D.6.1.2. From the intersection of the Southwest Powerlink (SWPL) transmission line and Old Highway 80 (approximately 1.5 miles northwest of Jacumba), this alternative would expand and utilize an existing utility right-of-way (ROW) and overbuild an existing distribution line for approximately 4.8 miles along Highway 80 to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation.

The affected segment of Old Highway 80 (and the ECO Highway 80 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative) is entirely within the jurisdiction of the County of San Diego. Land adjacent to Old Highway 80 along this route is designated Multiple Rural Use (1 dwelling unit (DU)/4, 8, 20 acres) by the County General Plan and is primarily zoned General Rural (S92).

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect **(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)**

Impact AG-1: Under this alternative, the 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an active agricultural area. As a result, there would not be a temporary interference with active agricultural operations; as such, impacts would be lesser when compared to the proposed ECO Substation Project (No Impact).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed ECO Substation Project, the Old Highway 80 138 kV transmission line route proposed under this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same impact conclusion determined for the proposed ECO Substation Project would apply for this alternative.

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-3: With implementation of this alternative, the same conclusions identified for the proposed ECO Substation Project would apply because the Old Highway 80 138 kV transmission line route would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use (No Impact).

Impact AG-4: The Old Highway 80 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ECO Substation Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: The Old Highway 80 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ECO Substation Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.4.4 ECO Highway 80 Underground 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

With the exception of the 138 kV transmission line Old Highway 80 underground route alternative, the land uses adjacent to proposed project components under this alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed ECO Substation Project in Section D.6.3.3. From the intersection of the SWPL transmission line and Old Highway 80, this alternative would place the 138 kV transmission line underground adjacent to Old Highway 80 (expanding and utilizing an existing utility ROW) and would follow the roadway north and west to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation.

The environmental setting adjacent to the affected segment of Old Highway 80 associated with this alternative would be the same as previously identified for the ECO Highway 80 138 kV Transmission Route Alternative in Section D.6.4.3, Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Under this alternative, the underground 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an active agricultural area. As a result, there would not be a temporary interference with active agricultural operations (No Impact). Impacts would be lesser when compared to the proposed ECO Substation Project.

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed ECO Substation Project, the Old Highway 80 138 kV transmission line route proposed under this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same impact conclusion determined for the proposed ECO Substation Project would apply for this alternative.

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-3: With implementation of this alternative, the same conclusions identified for the proposed ECO Substation Project would apply because the Old Highway 80 underground 138 kV transmission line route would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. This alternative would result in the same impacts as the proposed ECO Substation Project (No Impact).

Impact AG-4: The Old Highway 80 underground 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ECO Substation Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: The Old Highway 80 underground 138 kV transmission line route would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ECO Substation Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.5 Tule Wind Project Alternatives

Table D.6-3 summarizes the impacts and the classification of impacts under CEQA that have been identified for the Tule Wind Project alternatives. See definitions for Class I, II, III, IV, and No Impact in Section D.1.2.2, CEQA vs. NEPA Criteria of this EIR/EIS. Because this project is being analyzed in an EIS under NEPA, there is no requirement for federal agencies to classify impacts or to determine the significance of impacts; rather, the BLM must take a "hard look" at the impacts of the Proposed PROJECT and its alternatives and determine whether they are adverse. Therefore, while these criteria are used as indicators to frame the analysis of the impacts under NEPA, any determination of significance is a determination under CEQA, not NEPA.

Table D.6-3
Agricultural Resource Impacts Identified for Tule Wind Project Alternatives

Impact No.	Description	CEQA Classification
Tule Wind Alternative 1, Gen-Tie Route 2 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch		
Tule-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
Tule-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
Tule-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	Class III
Tule-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
Tule-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
Tule Wind Alternative 2, Gen-Tie Route 2 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch		
Tule-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
Tule-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
Tule-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	Class III
Tule-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
Tule-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
Tule Wind Alternative 3, Gen-Tie Route 3 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch		
Tule-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
Tule-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
Tule-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	Class III

Table D.6-3 (Continued)

Impact No.	Description	CEQA Classification
Tule-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
Tule-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
Tule Wind Alternative 4, Gen-Tie Route 3 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch		
Tule-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	Class III
Tule-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
Tule-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	Class III
Tule-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
Tule-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
Tule Wind Alternative 5, Reduction in Turbines		
Tule-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
Tule-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
Tule-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	Class III
Tule-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
Tule-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact

D.6.5.1 Tule Wind Alternative 1, Gen-Tie Route 2 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Under this alternative, the Tule Wind Project~~'s~~ collector substation and O&M facility, as well as the temporary concrete batch plant, would be relocated from BLM-~~administered~~managed land in the McCain ~~National Cooperative Land and Wildlife Management~~ Valley ~~A~~area to County of San Diego jurisdictional land on Rough Acres Ranch. Also, the proposed overhead collector line located west of Lost Valley Rock would be relocated to east of Lost Valley Rock and constructed within the proposed Tule Wind Project 138 kV alignment that would be vacated as a result of the O&M facility and collector substation location shift. The relocation of the collector substation and O&M facility to Rough Acres Ranch would result in a shorter proposed 138 kV transmission line route and a longer overhead cable collector system. Lastly, this alternative would consist of

128 turbines, which ~~Proposed turbines~~ would be located in the same location as identified in the proposed Tule Wind Project. ~~The relocation of the collector substation and O&M facility to Rough Acres Ranch would result in a shorter proposed 138 kV transmission line route and a longer overhead cable collector system.~~ Upon exiting the alternate collector substation site, the alternate 138 kV gen-tie line would travel east for approximately 0.5 mile, traversing Rough Acres Ranch and BLM lands. At this point the alternative gen-tie would turn south and follow the same route to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation as the proposed Tule Wind Project 138 kV transmission line. This alternative would reroute the overhead collector line along the proposed 138 kV transmission line alignment and extend the overhead collector cable system ~~from its end point in the proposed Tule Wind Project (near proposed turbine R5)~~ to the relocated collector substation. ~~From turbine R5 to the relocated collector substation~~Under this alternative, the extended overhead collector cable system would traverse BLM-~~administered~~managed land ~~within the~~adjacent to McCain Valley Road and east of the Lark Canyon OHV Area, BLM-~~administered~~managed land ~~south of the Lark Canyon OHV Area~~located west of the In-Ko-Pah ACEC, and finally, private County jurisdictional land ~~(a short segment would traverse Rough Acres Ranch~~ prior to connecting to the collector substation~~)~~.

The relocated collector substation and O&M facility, as well as the temporary concrete batch plant, would be located on land designated General Agriculture and zoned Agriculture (A72). From the collector substation to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, the alternate 138 kV transmission line would traverse land designated General Agriculture and Multiple Rural Use (1 DU/4, 8, 20 acres) and land zoned Agriculture (A72) and General Rural (S92). The extended collector cable system would traverse land designated General Agriculture and zoned Agriculture (A72).

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Under this alternative, Rough Acres Ranch would be affected by the construction of this alternative's components, including the following:

- A 5-acre O&M facility
- A 5-acre collector substation
- A 5-acre temporary concrete batch plant
- Installation of collector cable system poles
- Installation of 138 kV transmission line poles
- Temporary widening of existing dirt roads.

The construction of the O&M facility and collector substation, and activities at the temporary concrete batch plant, would not occur on existing active cattle grazing areas. The installation of permanent poles and temporary widening of existing dirt roads would result in a loss of approximately 5 acres of grazing land on Rough Acres Ranch. This represents less than 1% of the total ranch size of approximately 2,123 acres. ~~.~~

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed Tule Wind Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: Under this alternative, the relocated collector substation and O&M facility would be located on land designated General Agriculture and zoned Agriculture (A72). From the collector substation to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, the alternate 138 kV transmission line would traverse land designated General Agriculture and Multiple Rural Use (1 DU/4, 8, 20 acres) and land zoned Agriculture (A72) and General Rural (S92). The extended collector cable system would traverse land designated General Agriculture and zoned Agriculture (A72). However, these components would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, since transmission lines and the collector cable system would be compatible uses on A72 zoned lands. Identified impacts would represent a greater level of impacts when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project; however, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.5.2 Tule Wind Alternative 2, Gen-Tie Route 2 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Section D.6.5.1 describes the existing setting associated with the relocation of the collector substation and O&M facility, as well as the temporary 5-acre concrete batch plant, to Rough Acres Ranch, and the subsequent shortened 138 kV gen-tie route and extended collector cable system (which includes the relocation of the proposed overhead collector line from west of Lost Valley Rock to east of Lost Valley Rock). Similar to Tule Wind Alternative 1, Gen-Tie Route 2 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility of Rough Acres Ranch (discussed in Section D.6.5.1), this alternative would consist of 128 turbines. Because this alternative would only underground the alternate 138 kV transmission line, the existing setting would be similar to that described in Section D.6.5.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Under this alternative, Rough Acres Ranch would be affected by the construction of this alternative's components, including the following:

- A 5-acre O&M facility
- A 5-acre collector substation
- A 5-acre temporary concrete batch plant
- Installation of collector cable system poles
- Installation/trenching for 138 kV transmission line
- Temporary widening of existing dirt roads.

The construction of the O&M facility and collector substation, as well as the temporary concrete batch plant, would not occur on existing active cattle grazing areas. The installation of permanent poles, temporary widening of existing dirt roads, and temporary installation of the underground 138 kV transmission line would result in a loss of approximately 10 acres of grazing land on Rough Acres Ranch. This represents less than 1% of the total ranch size of approximately 2,123 acres.

Identified impacts would represent a greater level of impacts when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project; however, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed Tule Wind Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: Under this alternative, the relocated collector substation and O&M facility would be located on land designated General Agriculture and zoned Agriculture (A72). From the collector substation to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation, the alternate 138 kV transmission line would traverse land designated General Agriculture and Multiple Rural Use (1 DU/4, 8, 20 acres) and land zoned A72 and General Rural (S92). The extended collector cable system would traverse land designated General Agriculture and zoned A72. These components would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, however, since transmission lines and the collector cable system would be compatible uses on A72 zoned lands and because the impacts would only occur during trenching and backfill operations. No impacts would occur to Williamson Act lands.

Identified impacts would represent a similar level of impacts when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project; they would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.5.3 Tule Wind Alternative 3, Gen-Tie Route 3 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Under this alternative, the Tule Wind Project's collector substation and O&M facility, as well as the temporary concrete batch plant, would be relocated from BLM-administeredmanaged land in the McCain National Cooperative Land and Wildlife Management AValley area to County jurisdictional land on Rough Acres Ranch. Also, the proposed overhead collector line located west of Lost Valley Rock would be relocated to east of Lost Valley Rock and constructed within the proposed Tule Wind Project 138 kV alignment that would be vacated as a result of the O&M facility and collector substation location shift. The relocation of the collector substation and O&M facility to Rough Acres Ranch would result in a shorter proposed 138 kV transmission line route (approximately 5.4 miles) and a longer overhead cable collector system. Lastly, this alternative would consist of 128 turbines that Proposed turbines would be located in the same location as identified in the proposed Tule Wind Project. The relocation of the collector substation and O&M facility to Rough Acres Ranch would result in a shorter proposed 138 kV transmission line route (approximately 5.4 miles) and a longer overhead cable collector system. Upon exiting the alternate collector substation site, the alternate 138 kV transmission line would travel north for approximately 0.15 mile before travelling in a westerly direction to Ribbonwood Road. At Ribbonwood Road, the alternate gen-tie line would turn south primarily adjacent to Ribbonwood Road and would cross Interstate 8 (I-8) prior to entering the community of Boulevard. At the Ribbonwood Road/Old Highway intersection, the alternate gen-tie line would turn east and follow Old Highway 80 to the rebuilt Boulevard Substation.

In addition, tThis alternative would reroute the overhead collector cable system from west of Lost Valley Rock to east of Lost Valley Rock and would then extend the overhead collector cable system along the originally proposed 138 kV transmission line alignment from its end point in the proposed Tule Wind Project (near proposed turbine R5) to the relocated collector substation. Under this reroute,From turbine R5 to the relocated collector substation, the extended overhead collector cable system would no longer traverse BLM-administeredmanaged land within the Lark Canyon OHV Area.; Instead, the overhead collector system would traverse BLM-administeredmanaged land adjacent to McCain Valley Road and east south of the Lark Canyon OHV Area, BLM-managed land located west of the In-Ko-Pah ACEC, and finally, private County jurisdictional land (a short segment would traverse Rough Acres Ranch prior to connecting to the collector substation).

Jurisdictions traversed by or adjoining the alternate 138 kV transmission line route include the County of San Diego, BLM, and Caltrans. The relocated collector substation and O&M facility would be located on land designated General Agriculture, Multiple Rural Use (1 DU/4, 8, 20 acres) and Commercial and Office (along Ribbonwood Road north and south of Interstate 8) and on land zoned Agriculture (A72), General Rural (S92), Limited Control (S87), Open Space (S80)

and Rural Residential (RR). The extended collector cable system would traverse land designated General Agriculture and zoned A72.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Under this alternative, Rough Acres Ranch would be affected by the construction of this alternative's components, including the following:

- A 5-acre O&M facility
- A 5-acre collector substation
- A 5-acre temporary concrete batch plant
- Installation of collector cable system poles
- Installation of 138 kV transmission line poles
- Temporary widening of existing dirt roads.

The construction of the O&M facility and collector substation, as well as activities at the temporary concrete batch plant, would not occur on existing active cattle grazing areas. The installation of permanent poles and the temporary widening of existing dirt roads would result in a loss of approximately 5 acres of grazing land on Rough Acres Ranch. This represents less than 1% of the total ranch size of approximately 2,123 acres.

During construction, temporary disturbance of existing grazing areas between the relocated collector substation and the rebuilt Boulevard Substation would be lesser under this alternative (when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project) because the 138 kV transmission line alignment would be shorter—approximately 5.4 miles long.

Identified impacts due to installation of permanent poles and the temporary widening of existing dirt roads would represent a greater level of impacts when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project; however, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed Tule Wind Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: Under this alternative, the relocated collector substation and O&M facility would be located on land designated General Agriculture and zoned Agriculture (A72). However, these

components would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, since these facilities, transmission lines, and the collector cable system would be compatible uses on A72 zoned lands.

Identified impacts would represent a similar level of impacts when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project; they would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.5.4 Tule Wind Alternative 4, Gen-Tie Route 3 Underground with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch

Implementation of this alternative would not affect the impact conclusions identified in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Section D.6.5.3 describes the environmental setting associated with relocation of the collector substation and O&M facility, as well as the temporary concrete batch plant, to Rough Acres Ranch, and the subsequent shortened 138 kV transmission line route and extended collector cable system (which includes the relocation of the proposed overhead collector line from west of Lost Valley Rock to east of Lost Valley Rock). Similar to Tule Wind Alternative 3, Gen-Tie Route 3 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility on Rough Acres Ranch (discussed in Section D.6.5.3), this alternative would consist of 128 turbines. ~~existing setting associated with the Tule Wind Alternative Gen-Tie Route 3 with Collector Substation/O&M Facility of Rough Acres Ranch.~~ Therefore, ~~B~~because this alternative would only underground the 138 kV transmission line, the existing setting would be the same as described in Section D.6.5.3.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Under this alternative, Rough Acres Ranch would be affected by the construction of this alternative's components, including the following:

- A 5-acre O&M facility
- A 5-acre collector substation
- A 5-acre temporary concrete batch plant
- Installation of collector cable system poles
- Installation/trenching for 138 kV transmission line
- Temporary widening of existing dirt roads.

The construction of the O&M facility and collector substation, and activities at the temporary concrete batch plant, would not occur on existing active cattle grazing areas. The installation of permanent poles, temporary widening of existing dirt roads, and temporary installation of the underground 138 kV transmission line would result in a loss of approximately 15 acres of grazing land on Rough Acres Ranch. This represents less than 1% of the total ranch size of approximately 2,123 acres.

Identified impacts would represent a greater level of impacts when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project; however, impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same impact conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed Tule Wind Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: Under this alternative, the relocated collector substation and O&M facility would be located on land designated General Agriculture and zoned Agriculture (A72). However, these components would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, since these facilities, transmission lines, and the collector cable system would be compatible uses on A72 zoned lands. Identified impacts would represent a similar level of impacts when compared to the proposed Tule Wind Project; they would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.5.5 Tule Wind Alternative 5, Reduction in Turbines

This alternative would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from the implementation of the proposed ECO Substation and ESJ Gen-Tie projects as discussed in Section D.6.3.3.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Under this alternative, the proposed Tule Wind Project would consist of 65 turbines with the removal of 63 specific turbines to include six turbines adjacent to the In-Ko-Pah ACEC being S1, R4, (R8), R8, R9, and R10, and 57 turbines on the western side of the project site, including all turbines in the J, K, L, M, N, P, and Q strings. ~~environmental setting would be the same as described in Section B, Project Description, of this EIR/EIS with the exception that this alternative would remove 62 of the proposed 134 turbines associated with the Tule Wind Project. As proposed, the project would erect 11 turbines adjacent to the BLM In-Ko-Pah Mountains Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), and 51 turbines adjacent to wilderness areas on the western side of the project site. Under this alternative, these turbines would be removed.~~ Therefore, with the exception of removed turbines, the environmental setting for this alternative would be similar to that identified for the proposed Tule Wind Project in Sections D.4.1.3 and D.6.1.3.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: The proposed removal of ~~62~~ 63 wind turbines under this alternative would not change the impact conclusion made for the proposed Tule Wind Project, since no impacts would occur to active agricultural operations under the Tule Wind Project component. Impacts would only occur as a result of implementing the ECO Substation component (No Impact).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed Tule Wind Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: As under the proposed Tule Wind Project, since the proposed use is an allowable use with the General Agriculture zone, the project would not impact zoning for agricultural use.

Identified impacts would not be adverse under NEPA and, under CEQA, would be less than significant (Class III).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed Tule Wind Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.6 ESJ Gen-Tie Project Alternatives

Table D.6-4 summarizes the impacts and classifications of impacts under CEQA that have been identified for the ESJ Gen-Tie Project alternatives. See definitions for Class I, II, III, IV, and No Impact in Section D.1.2.2, CEQA vs. NEPA Criteria of this EIR/EIS. Because this project is being analyzed in an EIS under NEPA, there is no requirement for federal agencies to classify impacts or to determine the significance of impacts; rather, the BLM must take a "hard look" at the impacts of the Proposed PROJECT and its alternatives and determine whether they are adverse. Therefore, while these criteria are used as indicators to frame the analysis of the impacts under NEPA, any determination of significance is a determination under CEQA, not NEPA.

Table D.6-4
Agricultural Resource Impacts Identified for ESJ Gen-Tie Project Alternatives

Impact No.	Description	CEQA Classification
ESJ 230 kV Gen-Tie Underground Alternative		
ESJ-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact

Table D.6-4 (Continued)

Impact No.	Description	CEQA Classification
ESJ-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
ESJ Gen-Tie Overhead Alternative Alignment		
ESJ-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact
ESJ Gen-Tie Underground Alternative Alignment		
ESJ-AG-1	Construction and operation activities would interfere with active agricultural operations.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-2	Operation would permanently convert DOC Farmland to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-3	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or permanently convert Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural use.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-4	Operation would conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.	No Impact
ESJ-AG-5	Operation would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	No Impact

D.6.6.1 ESJ 230 kV Gen-Tie Underground Alternative

This alternative would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from the implementation of the proposed ECO Substation and Tule Wind projects as discussed in Section D.6.3.3.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

Sections D.4.1.4 and D.6.1.4 describe the existing setting associated with the ESJ Gen-Tie Project, which considers both a 500 kV gen-tie and a 230 kV gen-tie option. Because this alternative would select and construct the 230 kV gen-tie underground, the existing land use setting would be the same as described in Sections D.4.1.4 and D.6.1.4.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: This alternative would not change the impact conclusion made for the proposed ESJ-Gen Tie Project, since no impacts would occur to active agricultural operations under the ESJ Gen-Tie Project component (No Impact).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed ESJ-Gen Tie Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: This alternative would not change the impact conclusion made for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, since no conflicts with existing zoning or a Williamson Act contract would occur under the ESJ Gen-Tie Project component (No Impact).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.6.2 ESJ Gen-Tie Overhead Alternative Alignment

This alternative would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from the implementation of the proposed Tule Wind Project as discussed in Section D.6.3.3. This alternative assumes the implementation of the ECO Substation Alternative Site and that the agricultural impacts identified in Section D.6.4.1 (ECO Substation Alternative Site) would occur.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would be similar to the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project (the 500 kV or 230 kV gen-tie options), analyzed in Section D.6.3.3, but will be shifted 700 feet to the east to connect with the ECO Substation Alternative Site (described in Section D.6.4.1). As such, the environmental setting would be similar to that described in Section D.6.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: Impacts resulting from this alternative would reflect impact findings previously discussed in Section D.6.3.3 for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project. This is because the overhead alternative alignment would not be located on land that is actively being farmed (No Impact).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same impact conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: This alternative would not change the impact conclusion made for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project since no conflicts with existing zoning or a Williamson Act contract would occur under this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.6.3 ESJ Gen-Tie Underground Alternative Alignment

This alternative would not affect the impact conclusions resulting from the implementation of the proposed Tule Wind Project as discussed in Section D.6.3.3. This alternative assumes the implementation of the ECO Substation Alternative Site and that the agricultural impacts identified in Section D.6.4.1 (ECO Substation Alternative Site) would occur.

Environmental Setting/Affected Environment

This alternative would result in the underground placement of the 230 kV Gen-Tie Transmission Line to connect with the ECO Substation Alternative Site (described in Section D.6.4.1). As such, the environmental setting would be similar as that described in Section D.6.1.

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Direct and Indirect *(Note: cumulative effects are addressed in Section F of this EIR/EIS)*

Impact AG-1: This alternative would not change the impact conclusion made for the proposed ESJ-Gen Tie Project, since no impacts to active agricultural operations would occur under the ESJ Gen-Tie Project component (No Impact).

Impact AG-2: As under the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would be located on land designated Other Land under the FMMP. Therefore, the same conclusion of no impact determined for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project would apply for this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-3: This alternative would not change the impact conclusion made for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, since no conflicts with existing zoning or a Williamson Act contract would occur under this alternative (No Impact).

Impact AG-4: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land or timberland resources and would not conflict with any such zoning. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production (No Impact).

Impact AG-5: This alternative's components would not be located in an area containing forest land. Consistent with the impact conclusion for the proposed ESJ Gen-Tie Project, this alternative would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (No Impact).

D.6.7 No Project/No Action Alternatives

D.6.7.1 No Project Alternative 1–No ECO Substation, Tule Wind, ESJ Gen-Tie, Campo, Manzanita, or Jordan Wind Energy Projects

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts AG-1 through AG-5: Under the No Project Alternative 1, the ECO Substation, Tule Wind, and ESJ Gen-Tie projects, as well as the Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects, would not be built and the existing conditions would remain at these sites.

Agriculture impacts resulting from the Proposed PROJECT would not occur.

D.6.7.2 No Project Alternative 2–No ECO Substation Project

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts AG-1 through AG-5: Under the No Project Alternative 2, the proposed ECO Substation Project would not be constructed by SDG&E, and the existing energy grid and environment setting for agricultural resources would not be affected at the ECO site. The Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects would be constructed and either would be required to interconnect with an existing substation or a new substation would be constructed. It is assumed that SDG&E would seek to construct a new substation to interconnect planned renewable energy generation in the area.

Under the No Project Alternative 2, the Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects would still be constructed and would be forced to interconnect with an existing substation or with a new substation. Impacts to agricultural resources from expanded substations or a new substation would be unknown, but could be greater due to multiple impact locations and longer gen-tie lines. The location of the ECO Substation Project was selected in part to facilitate the interconnection hub concept; it is located near already planned wind generation projects (CAISO Generation Interconnection Queue) and close to a region with favorable wind potential, as determined by the U.S. Department of Energy's Wind Program and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Impacts associated with the Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects would be expected to be similar to those described in Section D.6.3.3 but could vary depending on the point of interconnection and the resulting gen-tie route and length of the Tule Wind and ESJ Gen-Tie projects.

D.6.7.3 No Project Alternative 3–No Tule Wind Project

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts AG-1 through AG-5: Under No Project Alternative 3, the Tule Wind Project would not be built, and the existing conditions on the project site would not be developed. Fewer agricultural impacts would result since the Tule Wind component conflicts with existing zoning.

D.6.7.4 No Project Alternative 4–No ESJ Gen-Tie Project

Environmental Impacts/Environmental Effects

Impacts AG-1 through AG-5: Under No Project Alternative 4, the ESJ Gen-Tie Project would not be built. If the ESJ Gen-Tie were not built, renewable energy generated in Mexico would not be delivered to the proposed ECO Substation and the U.S. market.

Under this alternative, Sempra could be forced to add new gen-tie facilities elsewhere in order to deliver renewable energy to the U.S. market. The ESJ Wind Phase I Project in Mexico would still be built under No Project Alternative 4 conditions, and the impacts associated with an alternative gen-tie would be expected to be similar to those described in Section D.6.3.3 (i.e., No Impact) but could vary depending on length of gen-tie line and the location pursued.

D.6.8 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting

As described in Sections D.6.3 through D.6.7, no adverse (under NEPA) or significant (under CEQA) impacts were identified for impacts to agricultural resources, and hence, no mitigation measures are provided for impacts to agricultural resources.

The proposed Campo, Manzanita, and Jordan wind energy projects would require preparation of a mitigation monitoring, compliance, and reporting program following project-specific environmental review and evaluation under all applicable environmental regulations once sufficient project-level information has been developed.

D.6.9 Residual Effects

As analyzed in Section D.6.3.3, no CEQA significant impacts would result and no mitigation measures are required; therefore, no residual impacts would occur for the Proposed PROJECT or alternatives. Under NEPA, no adverse impacts would occur.

D.6.10 References

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendix A–L. Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

BLM (Bureau of Land Management). 2008. *Eastern San Diego County Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision*. El Centro Field Office. October 2008.

BLM. 2010. GIS data for farmland mapping and monitoring overview.

California Government Code. Sections 51200–51297.4. The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act), as amended.

County of San Diego. 1995. *County of San Diego General Plan Part XX: Mountain Empire Subregional Plan.* Adopted January 3, 1979, amended January 11, 1995.

County of San Diego. 2002. *County of San Diego General Plan Part I: Open Space Element.* Adopted December 20, 1973, amended April 17, 2002.

County of San Diego. 2003. *County of San Diego General Plan Part II: Regional Land Use Element.* Adopted January 3, 1979, amended December 10, 2003.

County of San Diego. 2005. *County of San Diego General Plan Part XIX: Central Mountain Community Plan.* Adopted January 3, 1979, amended January 12, 2005.

County of San Diego. 2010. Zoning Ordinance, Part 6: General Regulations. Ordinance No. 5281. Adopted October 18, 1978. Effective December 19, 1978. Updated July 2010.

DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2006. *San Diego County Important Farmland 2006. Sheet 2 of 2*. Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. August 2006.

DOC. 2008. *San Diego County Williamson Act Land 2008.* Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program .April 16, 2008.

DOC. 2009a. *FMMP – Prime Farmland Definition*. Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Accessed at http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/overview/Pages/prime_farmland_fmmp.aspx. Site accessed July 10, 2009.

DOC. 2009b. *Williamson Act Questions and Answers*. Division of Land Resource Protection Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Fact Sheet accessed at http://www.conservation.ca.gov/ DLRP/lca/Pages/Index.aspx. Site accessed August 5, 2009.

ENTRIX. 2009. GIS data for ESJ U.S.and Wind Projects.

ENTRIX. 2010. GIS data for ESJ U.S.and Wind Projects.

HDR, Inc. 2010. GIS data for Tule Wind Project.

NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service). 2008. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Fiscal Year 2008 Annual Report.

SanGIS. 2010. GIS data for San Diego County.

SDG&E (San Diego Gas &~~and~~ Electric). 2009. *Proponent's Environmental Assessment for the East County 500/230/138 kV Substation Project*. August 2009.

USFS (U.S. Forest Service). 2010. GIS data.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ECO Substation Project

- Proposed 138 kV Line
- Existing Transmission Line
- Existing Boulevard Substation
- Proposed 138 kV Line Milepost
- Proposed ECO Substation
- Proposed Boulevard Substation Rebuild

Tule Wind Project Components:

- Proposed Wind Turbine
- Proposed Met Tower
- Alternative Met Tower
- Proposed SODAR
- Proposed Tule 138 kV Line Milepost
- Collection-Overhead
- Proposed 138 kV Gen-Tie Line
- Operation and Maintenance Facility
- Collector Substation

Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie (ESJ Gen-Tie):

- ESJ Gen-Tie 500 kV Route
- ESJ Gen-Tie 230 kV Route
- **Campo Wind Energy Project**
- **Manzanita Wind Energy Project**
- **Jordan Wind Energy Project (Padoma)**

Farmland Designations:

- Urban and Built-Up Land
- Grazing Land
- Farmland of Local Importance
- Prime Farmland
- Farmland of Statewide Importance
- Unique Farmland
- Water
- Other Land
- Area Not Mapped

Tule Wind Project

Boulevard Substation Rebuild Site

ECO Substation

ESJ U.S. Gen-Tie Lines

ECO 138 kV Transmission Line

ESJ Wind Phase I

Clover Flat

Campo

Tierra del Sol

Boulevard

Tule Lake

Jacumba

Old Highway 80

County Highway S2

San Diego County

Imperial County

Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)

UNITED STATES

MEXICO

0 1.5 3 Miles

DUDEK

6168-01

SOURCE: BLM; SanGIS; SANDAG; USFS; Tule Wind Project: HDR Engineering 2010;
ESJ U.S. Project: ENTRIX 2009; ESJ Wind Project: ENTRIX 2010;
ECO Substation Project: SDG&E 2009
FMMP: DOC 2006

FIGURE D.6-1A

Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Overview Map

East County Substation/Tule Wind/Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects - EIR/EIS

Z:\Projects\6168\01\MAPDOC\MAPSERIES Figs\Section D\6-Agriculture\Final\Fig D6-1A FMMP.mxd

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ECO Substation Project

- Proposed 138 kV Line
- Existing Transmission Line
- Existing Boulevard Substation
- Proposed 138 kV Line Milepost
- Proposed ECO Substation
- Proposed Boulevard Substation Rebuild

(Note: Figure depicts Tule Wind modified project layout)

- Proposed Wind Turbine
- Proposed Met Tower
- Alternative Met Tower
- Proposed SODAR/LIDAR
- Proposed Tule 138 kV Line Milepost
- Overhead Cable Collection System
- Proposed 138 kV Gen-Tie Line
- Operation and Maintenance Station
- Collector Substation

Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie (ESJ Gen-Tie):

- ESJ Gen-Tie 500 kV Route
- ESJ Gen-Tie 230 kV Route
- **Campo Wind Energy Project**
- **Manzanita Wind Energy Project**
- **Jordan Wind Energy Project (Padoma)**

Farmland Designations:

- Urban and Built-Up Land
- Grazing Land
- Farmland of Local Importance
- Prime Farmland
- Farmland of Statewide Importance
- Unique Farmland
- Water
- Other Land
- Area Not Mapped

Tule Wind Project

Boulevard Substation Rebuild Site

ECO Substation

ESJ U.S. Gen-Tie Lines

ESJ Wind Phase I

ECO 138 kV Transmission Line

Lake Morena

Clover Flat

Campo

Tierra del Sol

Tule Lake

Boulevard

Jacumba

Old Highway 80

County Highway S2

San Diego County

Imperial County

Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)

UNITED STATES

MEXICO

0 1.5 3 Miles

SOURCE: BLM; SanGIS; SANDAG; USFS; Tule Wind Project: HDR Engineering 2010; Iberdrola Renewables 2011
ESJ U.S. Project: ENTRIX 2009; ESJ Wind Project: ENTRIX 2010;
ECO Substation Project: SDG&E 2009
FMMP: DOC 2006

DUDEK

6168-01

FIGURE D.6-1B

Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Overview Map

East County Substation/Tule Wind/Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects - EIR/EIS

Note: Figure depicts the Tule Wind modified project layout

z:\Projects\6168001MAPDOC\MAPS\EIR\EIS Figure\Section D\6-Agriculture\Final\Fig D6.1B FMMP.mxd

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ECO Substation Project

- Proposed 138 kV Line
- Existing Transmission Line
- Existing Boulevard Substation
- Proposed 138 kV Line Milepost
- Proposed ECO Substation
- Proposed Boulevard Substation Rebuild

Tule Wind Project

- Proposed 138 kV Gen-Tie Line
- Proposed Tule 138 kV Line Milepost

Jordan Wind Energy Project (Padoma)

Farmland Designations:

- Urban and Built-Up Land
- Grazing Land
- Farmland of Local Importance
- Prime Farmland
- Farmland of Statewide Importance
- Unique Farmland
- Water
- Other Land
- Area Not Mapped

Boulevard

Boulevard Substation Rebuild Site

Old Highway 80

Jacumba

ECO Substation

ESJ U.S. Gen-Tie Lines

ESJ Wind Phase I

Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)

UNITED STATES

MEXICO

San Diego County

Imperial County

0 0.5 1 Miles

DUDEK

6168-01

SOURCE: BLM; SanGIS; SANDAG; USFS; Tule Wind Project: HDR Engineering 2010;
ESJ U.S. Project: ENTRIX 2009; ESJ Wind Project: ENTRIX 2010;
ECO Substation Project: SDG&E 2009
FMMP: DOC 2006

East County Substation/Tule Wind/Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects - EIR/EIS

FIGURE D.6-2A

Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring ECO Project Components

Z:\Projects\6168\01\MAPDOC\MAPS\EIR\EIS Figs\Section D\6-Agriculture\FinalFig D6-2A ECO-FMMP.mxd

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ECO Substation Project

- Proposed 138 kV Line
- Existing Transmission Line
- Existing Boulevard Substation
- Proposed 138 kV Line Milepost
- Proposed ECO Substation
- Proposed Boulevard Substation Rebuild

Tule Wind Project

- Proposed 138 kV Gen-Tie Line
- Proposed Tule 138 kV Line Milepost

Jordan Wind Energy Project (Padoma)

Farmland Designations:

- Urban and Built-Up Land
- Grazing Land
- Farmland of Local Importance
- Prime Farmland
- Farmland of Statewide Importance
- Unique Farmland
- Water
- Other Land
- Area Not Mapped

Boulevard

Boulevard Substation Rebuild Site

Old Highway 80

Jacumba

ECO Substation

ESJ U.S. Gen-Tie Lines

ESJ Wind Phase I

Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)

UNITED STATES

MEXICO

San Diego County

Imperial County

0 0.5 1 Miles

DUDEK

6168-01

SOURCE: BLM; SanGIS; SANDAG; USFS; Tule Wind Project: HDR Engineering 2010; Iberdrola Renewables 2011
ESJ U.S. Project: ENTRIX 2009; ESJ Wind Project: ENTRIX 2010;
ECO Substation Project: SDG&E 2009
FMMP: DOC 2006

East County Substation/Tule Wind/Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects - EIR/EIS

FIGURE D.6-2B

Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring ECO Project Components

Note: Figure depicts the Tule Wind modified project layout

Z:\Projects\6168\01\MAPDOC\MAPSERIES Figs\Section D\6-Agriculture\Final\Fig D6-2B ECO-FMMP.mxd

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ECO Substation Project

- Proposed 138 kV Line
- Existing Transmission Line
- Existing Boulevard Substation
- Proposed 138 kV Line Milepost
- Proposed ECO Substation
- Proposed Boulevard Substation Rebuild

Tule Wind Project Components:

- Proposed Wind Turbine
- Proposed Met Tower
- Alternative Met Tower
- Proposed SODAR
- Proposed Tule 138 kV Line Milepost
- Collection-Overhead
- Proposed 138 kV Gen-Tie Line
- Operation and Maintenance Facility
- Collector Substation

Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie (ESJ Gen-Tie):

- ESJ Gen-Tie 500 kV Route
- ESJ Gen-Tie 230 kV Route

Campo Wind Energy Project

Manzanita Wind Energy Project

Jordan Wind Energy Project (Padoma)

- Williamson Act - Non-Prime Agriculture Land
- Grazing Allotments
- Bureau of Land Management Ownership

Tule Wind Project

Boulevard Substation Rebuild Site

ECO Substation

ESJ U.S. Gen-Tie Lines

ESJ Wind Phase I

ECO 138 kV Transmission Line

Boulevard

Jacumba

Campo

Clover Flat

Tierra del Sol

Old Highway 80

Old Highway 80

County Highway S2

Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)

UNITED STATES

MEXICO

San Diego County

Imperial County

0 1.5 3 Miles

DUDEK

6168-01

SOURCE: BLM; SanGIS; SANDAG; USFS; Tule Wind Project: HDR Engineering 2010;
ESJ U.S. Project: ENTRIX 2009; ESJ Wind Project: ENTRIX 2010;
ECO Substation Project: SDG&E 2009
Williamson Act: DOConservation 2006

FIGURE D.6-3A

Williamson Act and Grazing Lands

East County Substation/Tule Wind/Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects - EIR/EIS

Z:\Projects\6168\01\MAPDOC\MAPS\EIR\ES Final\Section D\6-Agric\Rural\Final\Fig D6-3A WilliamsonAct-Grazing Lands.mxd

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ECO Substation Project

- Proposed 138 kV Line
- Existing Transmission Line
- Existing Boulevard Substation
- Proposed 138 kV Line Milepost
- Proposed ECO Substation
- Proposed Boulevard Substation Rebuild

(Note: Figure depicts Tule Wind modified project layout)

- Proposed Wind Turbine
- Proposed Met Tower
- Alternative Met Tower
- Proposed SODAR/LIDAR
- Proposed Tule 138 kV Line Milepost
- Overhead Cable Collection System
- Proposed 138 kV Gen-Tie Line
- Operation and Maintenance Station
- Collector Substation

Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie (ESJ Gen-Tie):

- ESJ Gen-Tie 500 kV Route
- ESJ Gen-Tie 230 kV Route

- **Campo Wind Energy Project**
- **Manzanita Wind Energy Project**
- **Jordan Wind Energy Project (Padoma)**
- Williamson Act - Non-Prime Agriculture Land
- Grazing Allotments
- Bureau of Land Management Ownership

Tule Wind Project

Boulevard Substation Rebuild Site

ECO Substation

ESJ U.S. Gen-Tie Lines

ECO 138 kV Transmission Line

ESJ Wind Phase I

County Highway S2

Old Highway 80

Boulevard

Tierra del Sol

Jacumba

Campo

Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)

UNITED STATES

MEXICO

San Diego County

Imperial County

0 1.5 3 Miles

Z:\Projects\6168\01\MAPDOC\MAPSERIES\EIS-FigsSection D\6-Agric\Rural\Final\Fig D6-3B_Williamson Act Grazing Lands.mxd

DUDEK

6168-01

SOURCE: BLM; SanGIS; SANDAG; USFS; Tule Wind Project: HDR Engineering 2010; Iberdrola Renewables 2011
ESJ U.S. Project: ENTRIX 2009; ESJ Wind Project: ENTRIX 2010;
ECO Substation Project: SDG&E 2009
Williamson Act: DOConservation 2006

East County Substation/Tule Wind/Energia Sierra Juarez Gen-Tie Projects - EIR/EIS

FIGURE D.6-3B

Williamson Act and Grazing Lands

Note: Figure depicts the Tule Wind modified project layout

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK