Reviewer(s):	Kelly Hobbs/Anne Surdzial	_									
Initial Review Date:	9/29/2025										
		_									
PEA Checklist Section:	4. Description of Alternatives										
ECORP Project	i. Description of Attendances	_									
Number:	2020-196.03	_ Door th	o DEA inc	lude this		CDIIC 2n	nd Review			CPUC 3	rd Pavis
Item #	Item Description	Does th	item?	Notes	Applicant Response		esolved?	Notes	Applicant 2nd Response	Item R	
		Yes	No	N/A	Date:	Yes	No		Date:	Yes	No
4.1	Alternatives Considered. Identify alternatives to the Proposed Project. Include the following:										
	a) All alternatives to the proposed project that were suggested, considered, or studied by the CAISO or by CAISO stakeholders										
	b) Alternatives suggested by the public or agencies during public outreach efforts conducted by the Applicant										
	c) Reduced footprint alternatives, including, e.g., smaller diameter pipelines										
	and space for fewer electric transformers			0							
	d) Project phasing options (e.g., evaluate the full build out for environmental clearance but consider an initial, smaller buildout that would only be expanded [in phases] if needed)										
	e) Alternative facility and construction activity sites (e.g., substation, compressor station, drilling sites, well-head sites, staging areas)										
	f) Renewable, energy conservation, energy efficiency, demand response, distributed energy resources, and energy storage										
	alternatives										
	g) Alternatives that would avoid or limit the construction of new transmission-voltage facilities or new gas transmission pipelines										
	h) Other technological alternatives (e.g., conductor type)										
	i) Route alternatives and route variations			0							
	j) Alternative engineering or technological approaches (e.g., alternative types of facilities, or materials, or configurations)			0			0				0
	k) Assign an identification label and brief, descriptive title to each alternative	2									
	described in this PEA chapter (e.g., Alternative A: No Project; Alterative B: Reduced Footprint 500/115-kV Substation; Alternative C: Ringo Hills 16-inch	_					_			_	
	Pipeline Alignment; Alternative D1: Lincoln Street Route Variation; etc.). Each alternative will be easily identifiable by reading the brief title.										
	Provide a description of each alternative. The description of each alternative will discuss to what extent it would be potentially feasible, meet the project's underlying purpose, meet most of the basic project objectives, and avoid or reduce one or more potentially significant impacts. If the Applicant believes that an alternative is infeasible or the implementation is remote and	s									
	speculative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(3), clearly explain why.										
	If significant environmental effects are possible without mitigation,										
	alternatives will be provided in the PEA that are capable of avoiding or reducing any potentially significant environmental effects, even if the										
	alternative(s) substantially impede the attainment of some project objectives or are costlier.	s 🔽									
	CPUC CEQA Unit Staff will determine whether an alternative could substantially reduce one or more potentially significant										
	impacts of the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125.5). Applicants are strongly advised to provide more rather than less alternatives										
	for CPUC's consideration or as determined during Pre-filing.										
4.2	No Project Alternative. Include a thorough description of the No Project										
	Alternative. The No Project Alternative needs to describe the range of actions that are reasonably foreseeable if the Proposed Project is not										
	approved. The No Project Alternative will be described to meet the										
	requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section15126.6(e).										

Project Name: Horizon West Transmission's Ironwood Transmission Line

PEA Checklist									
ection:	4. Description of Alternatives								
CORP Project		_							
Number:	2020-196.03	_							
			Does the PEA include this			Applicant Response		d Review	
Item #	Item Description		item?		Notes			esolved?	Notes
		Yes	No	N/A		Date:	Yes	No	
4.3	Rejected Alternatives. Provide a detailed discussion of all alternatives considered by the Applicant that were not selected by the Applicant for a full description in the PEA and analysis in PEA Chapter 5. The								
	detailed discussion will include the following:								
	a) Description of the alternative and its components								
	b) Map of any alternative sites or routes								
	c) Discussion about the extent to which the alternative would meet the underlying purpose of the project and its basic objectives								
	d) Discussion about the feasibility of implementing the alternative								
	e) Discussion of whether the alternative would reduce or avoid any significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project								
	f) Discussion of any new significant impacts that could occur from implementation of the alternative			0					
	g) Description of why the alternative was rejected								
	h) Any comments from the public or agencies about the alternative during PEA preparation			0					
For Natural Gas	Storage Projects:								
4.4	Natural Gas Storage Alternatives. In addition to the requirements included above, alternatives to be considered for proposed natural gas								

storage projects include the following, where applicable:

field locations and other potential storage areas
b) Alternative pipelines, road, and utility siting

a) Alternative reservoir locations considered for gas storage including other

c) Alternative suction gas requirements, and injection/withdrawal options

 \checkmark

 \checkmark

 \checkmark

CPUC 3rd Review

Item Resolved?

Yes

Applicant 2nd Response

Date: