

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

The following provides a discussion of the environmental impacts that are anticipated to occur as a result of constructing and operating the proposed Valley-Rainbow 500 kV Interconnect Project. This section provides a brief explanation for the answers provided in the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist. All of the issues which were determined to have a "potentially significant impact" will be analyzed in the EIR. No determinations have yet been made as to the significance of these potential impacts; such determinations will be made in the EIR after the issues are considered thoroughly. The EIR will present existing conditions, impacts, and mitigation, as appropriate for these issues. The remaining issues generally will not be addressed in the EIR, except as noted otherwise. The issues which were determined to be "less than significant with mitigation incorporated" have mitigation measures (Project protocols) incorporated into the Project to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Project protocols provided by SDG&E as part of the proposed Project are included in *Attachment B* to the Initial Study. These mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring Program to be developed for the Project. All of the issues determined to be "less than significant" or "no impact" are discussed briefly below.

### **1. AESTHETICS**

**a) *Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Implementation of the proposed 500 kV Interconnect transmission line as well as the new 500/230/69 kV Substation would affect visual quality as well as sensitive viewers. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to visual resources.

**b) *Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 1a.

**c) *Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 1a.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- d) ***Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?***

***Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*** Depending upon construction techniques and hours, new sources of light and glare may be present during Project construction. However, due to the short-term nature of construction, any light or glare effects are anticipated to be less than significant. During operation, low wattage lights with a downward focus would be installed around the new Rainbow Substation. However, the lights would only be used during night time service calls and therefore the use of these lights would be a less than significant impact. Potential glare from the poles and conductors (lines) is anticipated to be less than significant with the use of dulled metal finish on poles and non-specular conductors.

## **2. AGRICULTURE**

- a) ***Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?***

***Less than significant impact.*** Placement of transmission towers or poles would occur in some areas of prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance and Williamson Act contracts. However, due to the limited footprint and ground disturbance of the towers or poles and tower, their placement would result in a less than significant impact to prime, unique or farmland of statewide importance.

- b) ***Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?***

***Less than significant impact.*** See response 2a.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- c) ***Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Implementation of the proposed Project may conflict with agricultural operations within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to agricultural operations.

### **3. AIR QUALITY**

- a) ***Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** The construction of the proposed Project would result in short-term emissions of criteria pollutants (for which the United States Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has established ambient air quality standards) thereby contributing to violations of State or Federal air quality standards. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses impacts to air quality.

- b) ***Would the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 3a.

- c) ***Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 3a.

- d) ***Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 3a.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- e) ***Would the Project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

***Less than Significant Impact.*** Construction of the substation may produce odors; however, perception of the odor would be short-term in nature and not considered a significant impact. Operation of the substation will not produce noticeable odors.

### **4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- a) ***Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Construction and operation of the proposed Project could result in impacts to plant and animal life including but not limited to endangered, threatened or rare species and/or their habitats. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to biological resources, including impacts to locally designated species and natural communities, wetland habitat and wildlife corridors.

- b) ***Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 4a.

- c) ***Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 4a.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- d) ***Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 4a.

- e) ***Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 4a.

- f) ***Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Project impacts will be evaluated in the context of ongoing large-scale regional conservation planning efforts in Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and the County of San Diego's northern segment to Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP).

## **5. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

- a) ***Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** The Project passes near known archaeological sites. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to archaeological resources.

- b) ***Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 5a.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- c) ***Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

***Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.*** Several alluvial and sedimentary deposits, ranging from late Pleistocene to late Pliocene in origin, underlie valley floors in the Project area. These formations exhibit a moderate to high potential for the occurrence of significant fossil resources. Due to the limited area to be disturbed by construction activities, the potential for impacting important paleontological resources is considered low. However, because impact significance cannot be determined prior to excavation, a qualified paleontologist will be consulted during final design studies to define the areas where fossils would most likely be found, and to develop, if needed, a program for monitoring excavation in those areas. Geologic formations which are sedimentary in origin have the potential to contain paleontological resources. If fossils are discovered during construction activities, the fossils will then be deposited in a scientific institution with paleontological collections. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce potential paleontological impacts to below a level of significance.

- d) ***Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 5a.

## **6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

- a) ***Would the Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:***

i. ***Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

ii. ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

**iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**iv. Landslides?**

**Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.** The Project would be located in an area that would expose structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. However, Project elements would be located away from traces of active faults and designed to withstand strong shaking and seismic-related ground failure.

As part of the final engineering design for the Project and prior to construction, soils and geologic conditions will be mapped and analyzed for the study area. Locales with geologic conditions prone to hazards such as slope instability or faults or erosion will be identified and appropriate measures will be incorporated into final Project design. Construction methods and facility design will be tailored to route requirements. Project facilities will adhere to all California Uniform Building Code, SDG&E's General Conditions and Standard Specifications and CPUC's General Order for seismic standards. As a result, Project impacts related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, subsidence of the land and expansive soils are expected to be less than significant.

**b) Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Potentially significant impact.** See response 8a.

**c) Would the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in, on or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.** The Project would be located in areas that have unstable soil that could potentially result in on or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. However, Project elements would be located away from these areas and designed to withstand unstable geologic or soil conditions. See response 6a.

# ATTACHMENT A

## DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

---

---

- d) ***Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks of life or property?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** The Project would be located in areas that have expansive soil. However, Project elements would be located away from these areas to minimize or eliminate the potential risk and designed to withstand expansive soil conditions. See response 6a.

- e) ***Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?***

***No impact.*** The Project will not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

## 7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a) ***Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** The Project does not involve the use of hazardous materials beyond petroleum products and other similar products used for construction and construction vehicles. Project protocols will be in place to ensure the lawful and proper storage and use of these materials. All transport, handling, use, and disposal of substances such as petroleum products, solvents, and paints related to construction, operation, and maintenance of the substation shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials.

The only hazardous material that would be used in operation of the substation is transformer oil. Aboveground, concrete containment basins would be constructed around the transformers, designed to contain 100 percent of the oil in the event of a spill. Transformer oil would not be stored onsite, but at SDG&E's central maintenance facility in San Diego. Used oil and oil saturated materials generated from maintenance and operation activities would be transported to SDG&E's central maintenance facility for disposal. All use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes would be in compliance with state



# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

Title 22 and federal Title 40 requirements, including the oil spill control and countermeasure plan (SCCP) required by Title 40 CFR Section 112.7. No extraordinary risk of accidental explosion or the release of hazardous substances is anticipated with development and implementation of the proposed substation.

- b) *Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** No extraordinary risk of accidental explosion or the release of hazardous substance is anticipated to result during the construction or operational phase of the proposed Project. Please refer to response 7a.

- c) *Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** See response 7a and 7b.

- d) *Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

***Less than significant impact.*** No hazardous material sites are recorded in the Project area that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Proper siting of the Project components would avoid, eliminate or reduce potential impacts of hazardous materials to a level of less than significant.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- e) ***For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?***

***Potentially significant Impact.*** There are no public airports within two miles of the Project. However, the French Valley Airport is approximately three miles from the Project and therefore could result in a safety hazard. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to air travel.

- f) ***For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?***

***Potentially significant Impact.*** There are several private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project. See response 7e.

- g) ***Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

***Less than significant impact.*** The Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h) ***Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** During construction, there is a risk of wildfire from construction equipment; however, Project protocols would prevent or minimize this risk. During Project operation, there is a risk of flashovers or that a conducting object could come into close contact with the transmission line, a live line or conductor falling to the ground igniting a wildfire. However, it is anticipated that regular trimming of trees and other regular maintenance of the right-of-way, transmission structures and lines would reduce this potential risk to a less than significant level.

# ATTACHMENT A

## DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

---

---

### 8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a) ***Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** During construction grading, there is the potential for some short-term erosion to occur and discharge of pollutants, especially during wet weather seasons. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to water quality.

- b) ***Would the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of a local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

***Less than significant impact.*** Short-term water provision would be required during project construction for dust suppression and possibly for landscaping and restoration activities. Short-term water provision may come from nearby wells or by water trucks. Short-term water needs during construction would not substantially affect groundwater supplies, the production rate of existing wells, or regional water supply. Operation of the Project would not require the use of water. The additional impervious area developed by the Project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge.

- c) ***Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Construction of the substations, transmission towers or poles and access roads would alter existing drainage patterns, runoff characteristics and storm water volume and therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses project impacts to surface water drainage and erosion.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- d) ***Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite?***

***Less than significant impact.*** Construction of the substations, transmission towers or poles and access roads would not substantially increase the rate of runoff in a manner which would result in flooding. Because most of the Project area would remain unpaved, rainfall would either infiltrate or sheet flow to unpaved areas.

- e) ***Would the Project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** The Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage system. Substation design will include storm water control systems.

- f) ***Would the Project otherwise degrade water quality?***

***Less than significant impact.*** No other degradation of water quality would result from Project implementation.

- g) ***Would the Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

***No impact.*** No housing is proposed by the Project.

- h) ***Would the Project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

***Less than significant impact.*** The Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. No structures would impede or redirect flood flows as a result of the proposed Project's implementation.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- i) ***Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

***Less than significant impact.*** See response 8h.

- j) ***Would the Project be susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

***No impact.*** Hydrologic and topographic conditions of the Project site and surrounding area do not lend themselves to these conditions. The proposed Project is not near any water body that would potentially be effected by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. It is not anticipated that the proposed Project would be susceptible to any of the above stated natural phenomena.

### **9. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

- a) ***Would the Project physically divide an established community?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Implementation of the Project may impact established communities including existing residential, school, business and recreational uses. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses any instances of potential disruption of existing as well as planned land uses.

- b) ***Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Implementation of the Project may conflict with general plan and zoning designations. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses whether or not the proposed Project is (in)consistent with any elements of adopted community plans, policies or goals.

# ATTACHMENT A

## DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

---

---

- c) ***Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Implementation of the Project may conflict with adopted environmental plans. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to adopted environmental plans or policies.

### 10. MINERAL RESOURCES

- a) ***Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***

***No Impact.*** No known mineral resources are known for the Project site.

- b) ***Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

***No Impact.*** See response 10a.

### 11. NOISE

- a) ***Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** Construction and operation activities have the potential to increase noise levels for adjoining areas. Exposing people to noise levels that exceed local noise ordinances would be a significant impact. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses Project impacts to noise.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- b) ***Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 11a.

- c) ***Would the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 11a.

- d) ***Would the Project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 11a.

- e) ***For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 11a.

- f) ***For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 11a.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

### **12. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

- a) ***Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** The EIR will address Project growth inducement effects.

- b) ***Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** The Project will result in the displacement of one residence. This impact is considered significant and will be addressed in the EIR under land use. This impact however would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing.

- c) ***Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated .*** See response 12b.

### **13. PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) ***Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:***

- i. ***Fire protection?***

***Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.*** See response 7h.



# ATTACHMENT A

## DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

---

---

**ii. Police protection?**

**No impact.** The Project will not provide additional long-term employment opportunities. No residences are proposed as part of the proposed Project, and therefore, the proposed Project would not generate additional population or generate new demand for police protection.

**iii. Schools?**

**No impact.** As discussed under response 13a-ii, the proposed Project would not generate population growth; therefore, no new demand would be placed on schools.

**iv. Parks?**

**No Impact.** The proposed substation would be an unmanned facility and no population increase would result with Project implementation. There would be no increase in the demand for parks or other recreational facilities.

**v. Other public facilities?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** As discussed under response 13a-ii, the proposed Project would not generate population growth; therefore, no new demand would be placed on public facilities. Heavy trucks used during construction and maintenance of Project facilities may result in a minimal increase in the need for roadway maintenance.

## 14. RECREATION

**a) *Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

**No Impact.** No population would be generated by the proposed Project. Therefore, no demand for recreational facilities would occur.

# ATTACHMENT A

## DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

---

---

- b) ***Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

**No impact.** No recreational facilities are included or would be required as part of the proposed Project.

### 15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- a) ***Would the Project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

**Potentially significant impact.** Construction traffic for the proposed Project would not create a substantial impact on traffic volumes. However, construction may temporarily affect traffic patterns and result in temporary traffic congestion and associated traffic hazards. Therefore, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses traffic and circulation, specifically impacts to the following:

- Closing access to any individual property; hazards/barriers for pedestrians or bicycles
- Closing a road and not providing an alternative route
- Routing construction vehicles (heavy trucks) along residential streets; construction crew parking

- b) ***Would the Project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** See response 15a-and 15d. Short-term and limited construction-related traffic would not create a substantial impact on traffic volumes nor change traffic patterns in such a way as to affect the level of service (LOS) or vehicle to congestion ratio on study area roadways.

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- c) ***Would the Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 7e and 7f.

- d) ***Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 15a.

- e) ***Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 15a.

- f) ***Would the Project result in inadequate parking capacity?***

***Potentially significant impact.*** See response 15a.

- g) ***Would the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

***No impact.*** Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies or involve elimination of facilities supporting alternative transportation such as bus turnouts or bicycle racks.

### **16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

- a) ***Would the Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

***No impact.*** Project implementation would not impact wastewater treatment. Sewer is not required nor part of the proposed Project.

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

- b) **Would the Project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?**

**No impact.** Operation of the Project would not require the use of water or generate wastewater.

- c) **Would the Project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less than significant impact.** Development of the Project would not significantly increase impervious areas within the local drainage basin. Drainage improvements would be engineered to accommodate minor flows from the Project and impacts would not be significant so as to require or alter offsite drainage systems.

- d) **Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Less than significant impact.** See response 8-b.

- e) **Would the Project result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand in addition to the provider/s existing commitments?**

**No impact.** No wastewater treatment would be required by the proposed unmanned substation.

- f) **Would the Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less than significant impact.** The Project will generate a limited amount of solid waste during construction. It is anticipated that the solid waste generated by Project construction

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

---

---

would have a less than significant impact on local solid waste facilities. No regular solid waste disposal is proposed as part of the substation Project. Wastes produced at the substation by maintenance and repair activities would be transported back to the central SDG&E maintenance facility in San Diego for disposal. The amount of solid waste generated by the proposed substation would not be substantial or interfere with the sufficient permitted capacity of nearby landfills.

**g) *Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

**No impact.** See response 16f. All solid waste will be disposed of in an approved site in compliance with federal, state and county regulations.

### **17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

**a) *Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

**Potentially significant impact.** Based on the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist, the CPUC has determined that the proposed Project may have a number of potentially significant environmental effects. Therefore, CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared to fully analyze the existing environmental setting, the potential impacts resulting from Project implementation, and potential mitigation measures, if necessary, in the following areas: *biological resources, cultural resources, land use, visual quality, public health, safety and nuisance, traffic, noise, air quality, and hydrology/water quality.*

**b) *Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)?***

**Potentially significant impact.** Based on the analysis of all the above questions, it has been determined that the Project may contribute incrementally to regional impacts to visual resources, biological resources, cultural resources, land use, public safety, traffic, noise, air quality and hydrology and water quality. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA, the CPUC has determined that an EIR be prepared that addresses cumulative impacts to these environmental impact categories.

- c) **Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Potentially significant impact.** Based on the analysis of all the above questions, it has been determined that the Project may significantly affect land use, noise, air and public safety and therefore could directly affect human beings. See responses 3a, 7b, 7e, 7f, 9a and 11a.