

**5.1 INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 et seq.), this section presents an analysis of cumulative impacts that may result from construction and operation of the proposed Project. As defined in Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. In compliance with CEQA, this section of the PEA examines incremental impacts of the proposed Project in combination with effects of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. The analysis considers the potential for both short-term and long-term cumulative impacts. Short-term impacts are those related primarily to project construction, and long-term impacts are those related primarily to permanent project features or operation of the project.

**5.2 TECHNICAL METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

The cumulative analysis is based on a list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects that may be constructed or commence operation during the timeframe of activity associated with the proposed Project. These include larger scale projects located within 5 miles of the proposed Project.

The cumulative projects were identified based on data obtained from SCE, local jurisdictions, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse Reports, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA document review logs, and environmental documents. The analyses of cumulative effects for each issue area utilize this information to estimate the potential for combined effects of the proposed Project and other projects in the vicinity. However, the geographic scope of analysis and the range of projects vary for each environmental issue area.

According to the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which provides CEQA Guidelines in Section 15355, cumulative impacts refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time. When the combined cumulative impact associated with the project's incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, the discussion shall briefly indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed in further detail.

CEQA Guidelines provide the following guidance regarding cumulative impact significance:

*“Projects can cause significant impacts by direct changes to the environment or by triggering reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes. Physical changes*

*caused by a project can contribute incrementally to cumulative effects that are significant, even if individual changes resulting from a project are limited. You must determine whether the cumulative impact is significant, as well as whether an individual effect is “cumulatively considerable” ...*

*When considering the relationship between the cumulative condition and the incremental effect of an individual project, keep in mind “The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed Project’s incremental effects are cumulatively considerable” (Guidelines Section 15064(h)(4)) (Note: emphasis added).*

### 5.3 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

Over 180 past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects have been identified within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Project (Figure 5.3-1). These projects include large-scale wind farms, large-scale planned residential communities, small-scale residential projects, infill and redevelopment, commercial, industrial, public services, transportation, one oil and gas pipeline conversion, recreational projects, and two resource management projects on the Angeles National Forest (ANF). These projects are summarized in Table 5.3-1 and listed individually in Table 5.3-2 (note: due to its length, Table 5.3-2 is presented at the end of this section). The project summary indicates that cumulative project areas total more than 167,000 acres of land, the majority of which are associated with large-scale planned communities (57 percent) and wind-energy related projects (27 percent).

Large-scale planned developments would collectively result in the construction of more than 60,000 homes and associated commercial developments, schools, recreational facilities, road networks, and public utilities on more than 95,000 acres. The largest residential projects concentrate in the Antelope Valley north of the ANF but substantial residential developments also occur south of the ANF in the vicinity of Duarte and Azusa, unincorporated land near Brea and Yorba Linda, and in Chino and Ontario (see Figure 5.3-1). These follow a similar pattern of development in that they primarily target undeveloped land adjacent to established urban areas. Small-scale residential projects are also proposed throughout the proposed Project area north and south of the ANF. Collectively, these residential projects reflect California’s growing need for affordable housing and the availability of relatively inexpensive land in the Antelope Valley and the Inland Empire.

Energy-related projects account for another 47,000 acres of the total acreage associated with cumulative projects. Virtually all of this acreage reflects the construction of large wind energy “farms” that would be developed in the Tehachapi area in Kern County (see Figure 5.3-1). Because the TRTP is designed in part to provide interconnection for proposed wind energy projects, they are described in more detail below.

**TABLE 5.3-1  
SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE PROJECTS<sup>1</sup>**

General Project Type and Description		Estimated Acreage	Numbers of Projects	General Project Locations	Regional Occurrence/Characterization
Large-scale Planned Community	Large-scale residential developments (>100 units) with associated public use facilities and substantial commercial, recreational, and educational developments	95,197	48	Kern County (12), Lancaster (8), Brea (5), Palmdale (6), County of Riverside (5), Chino (4), Azusa (2), Duarte (1), Ontario (2), Chino Hills (1), County of Los Angeles (1)	These large-scale planned residential projects occur throughout the proposed Project area and occur in areas having high projected population and housing growth.
Energy	Electric power generation and transmission-related projects	47,659	11	Kern County (5), Regional (2), Ontario (1), Palmdale (1) may change	Most energy projects are wind farms in the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area in Kern County.
Industrial	Industrial developments	10,423	14	County of San Bernardino (4), Azusa (3), Irwindale (3), Arcadia (1), Lancaster (1), Pasadena (1), County of Kern (1)	Industrial developments are not as numerous as residential and commercial projects and generally much smaller. The high estimated acreage primarily reflects two large projects. Industrial projects were identified throughout the proposed Project area, with localized concentrations in the east portion of Los Angeles County and within San Bernardino County.
Resource Management	Resource management projects refer to ANF projects dedicated to the management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources	8,500	2	ANF (2)	A fuels management project and a restoration project
Commercial	Commercial and retail-related developments	1,752	28	Pasadena (8), Arcadia (3), Azusa (3), Irwindale (3), Chino (2), Lancaster (2), Palmdale (2), Chino Hills (1), El Monte (1), Temple City (1), Whittier (1), County of San Bernardino (1)	Commercial projects occur throughout the proposed Project area, as consistent with the region's continual development and growth. The highest concentration of commercial developments occur in the City of Pasadena, which focuses commercial activity on the east and west portions of the City.

**TABLE 5.3-1 (CONTINUED)<sup>1</sup>**  
**SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE PROJECTS**

General Project Type and Description		Estimated Acreage	Numbers of Projects	General Project Locations	Regional Occurrence/Characterization
Infill/Redevelopment	Development (typically mixed-use) within established and oftentimes built-out city areas	2,345	28	Pasadena (7), Lancaster (4), San Gabriel (4), Azusa (2), Arcadia (1), Chino (1), Chino Hills (1), El Monte (1), Irwindale (1), La Cañada Flintridge (1), Montebello (1), Monterey Park (1), Sierra Madre (1)	Infill and redevelopment projects occur in areas with existing development, and oftentimes have the purpose of revitalizing and stimulating the local economy.
Public Services	Projects involving public uses and general commodities such as libraries, water (occurrences identified), education, and security	700	12	Azusa (4), Lancaster (2), Pasadena (2), Ontario (1), Palmdale (1), County of Orange (1), Regional - Kern/Los Angeles counties (1)	The number of specific public services projects appear relatively few in comparison with other development projects, such as residential and planned community developments; however, it is worth noting that in many cases, residential and planned community projects include provisions for public services.
Small-scale Residential	Residential use developments	265 (estimate)	22	Lancaster (5), Pasadena (5), Azusa (3), Duarte (3), Diamond Bar (2), Arcadia (1), Bradbury (1), County of Kern (1), County of Los Angeles (1)	Small-scale residential projects occur throughout the proposed Project area, and reflect the general growth of the region. The concentration of residential projects in the City of Lancaster are indicative of the high growth trends.
Recreation	Recreation-related projects, mostly residential uses on the ANF	--	11	ANF (10), County of Los Angeles (1)	Recreation-related projects occur predominantly within the ANF.
Transportation	Transportation infrastructure-related projects	--	5	Regional (3), City of Arcadia (1), Kern County (1)	The majority of transportation-related projects identified within the proposed Project area are large-scale regional projects involving linear mass transportation networks.
Oil & Gas	Petroleum-related projects	--	1	Regional (1)	One oil and gas project involves conversion of an existing oil line into a natural gas line.
<b>Totals</b>		<b>167,571</b>	<b>183</b>		

<sup>1</sup> Sources: See Section 5.2.

### 5.3.1 Energy and Transmission Projects

#### 5.3.1.1 Proposed Wind Generation Facilities

SCE is obligated to interconnect power generation facilities, including wind farms, into its electrical system, per Section 210 and 212 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. § 824 [i] and [k]) and Sections 24 and 25 of the California Independent System Operator's (CAISO) Tariff. There are wind generation facilities currently in the ISO Interconnection Queue for the Tehachapi area (CAISO, 2007). Most of these Tehachapi-area wind facilities are currently in the planning stage and information about these potential projects is limited at this time. Despite this limitation, the general environmental effects of wind energy projects are known because there are many operating wind energy facilities in California. In addition, the characteristics of the latest generation of wind turbine technology are known, including descriptions of their physical components and operation. Further, environmental impact analysis has been conducted for recent wind energy proposals, including the Pine Tree Wind Project being planned by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) north of Mojave, California. This information can be used to estimate the environmental effects of future wind energy facilities in the Tehachapi region for the purposes of cumulative impact analysis.

As listed above, the May 2007 CAISO Interconnection Queue lists wind generation facilities anticipated to be constructed in the Tehachapi area. The following is a discussion of proposed Projects in the Interconnection Queue for which preliminary planning information is available. These projects are listed in Table 5.3-2 and identified on Figure 5.3-1.

LADWP proposes to build the Pine Tree Wind Project, an 8,000-acre wind farm development located about 12 miles north of Mohave. While outside the 5-mile radius of the proposed Project, the Pine Tree Wind Project is discussed here because of its similarity to other wind projects considered in this discussion. The project would have 120 megawatts (MW) of total generation capacity and would include construction of 80 wind turbines, several meteorological towers, a substation, an 8-mile-long transmission line, switching station, operations and maintenance (O&M) building, and access roads. The Pine Tree Wind Project EIR/EA was approved by the United States Department of the Interior (USDI) Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and LADWP in 2006 and the Project will be interconnected to the LADWP transmission system.

The PdV Wind Energy Project is proposed by Southwest Power Partners, LLC and would be located on a 6,275-acre site in the south Tehachapi Mountains. The PdV project would be capable of generating approximately 300 MW, and would include onsite and offsite access roads, control cables, subsurface feeder line corridors located outside the project area, a 20-acre interconnection yard/switching station known as the Cottonwind Substation, an O&M building, and temporary construction laydown area. The project filed a Notice of Preparation

(NOP) with Kern County in June 2006 for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The Alta Wind Energy Center is being developed by Alta Innovative Power Co, LLC, which is a joint venture between Allco Wind Energy and Oak Creek Energy Systems. The project encompasses a 50 square mile area (32,000 acres) located between Mohave and Tehachapi. The project is anticipated to generate up to 1,500 MW. Allco Wind Energy signed a 20-year Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) with SCE in December 2006 for the electric output from this wind farm. Construction is expected to occur between 2009 and 2014, with operation planned in October 2007. The Windridge Operating Wind Farm, which is proposed by Aero Energy, LLC (Western Wind Energy Corporation), involves the development of a 192-acre wind farm near Tehachapi-Willow Springs Road with a 4.5 MW generation capacity and future expansion to 12 MW. Windridge Operating Wind Farm has a PPA with SCE to supply output no later than 2014.

The WindStar Project, which is another Aero Energy, LLC (Western Wind Energy Corporation) development, is planned to generate 120 MW on a 1,062-acre site within the Tehachapi Pass Wind Park. The Windstar Project signed a PPA with SCE to supply output no later than December 31, 2008.

#### **5.3.1.2 Antelope Transmission Project**

Wind farm development is concentrated approximately 25 miles north of SCE's Antelope Substation, in the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area. The Antelope Transmission Project is an approved project that will provide a portion of the infrastructure necessary to interconnect wind power generation in the Tehachapi area for delivery to southern California customers.

The Antelope Project consists of three segments. Segment 1 of the Antelope Transmission Project involves construction of a new 26-mile 500-kV transmission line between SCE's existing Antelope and Pardee substations located in the City of Lancaster and the City of Santa Clarita, respectively. Segment 1 is estimated to begin construction in November 2007 and commence operations in December 2008. Segments 2 and 3 of the Antelope Transmission Project will include approximately 56 miles of new 500/220 kV transmission lines and related facilities that will bring electricity from the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area in southern Kern County to the existing Antelope Substation in the City of Lancaster, then farther south to the existing Vincent Substation near Acton in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Construction of Segments 2 and 3 is scheduled to begin in March 2008 and end in April 2009.

### **5.4 POPULATION GROWTH FORECAST**

In addition to the list of cumulative projects presented in Table 5.3-2, general growth trends forecasted by SCAG and the Kern County Council of Governments (COG) were utilized to

characterize anticipated population and employment growth in Kern County, Los Angeles County, and San Bernardino County, as presented in Table 5.4-1. This information provides a general understanding of the types of physical changes expected in the area and the potential for impacts that could combine with the impacts of the proposed TRTP. As a regional planning agency, SCAG forecasts growth projections up to 25 years into the future and Kern County COG forecasts growth projections up to 50 years by incorporating recently available information from international, federal, and State statistical agencies, along with subregions and local jurisdictions (SCAG, 2004a; COG, 2006).

**TABLE 5.4-1  
REGIONAL GROWTH PROJECTIONS<sup>1</sup>**

Year	Los Angeles County		Kern County		San Bernardino County	
	Population	Employment	Population	Employment	Population	Employment
2000	9,580,028	4,453,477	661,653	232,461	1,709,434	594,923
2010	10,718,007	5,022,215	808,808	N/A <sup>2</sup>	2,059,420	770,877
2020	11,501,884	5,366,865	950,112	N/A	2,397,709	972,243
2030	12,221,799	5,660,992	1,114,878	N/A	2,713,149	1,178,890
Change from 2000 to 2010	1,137,979 (11.9%)	568,738 (12.8%)	144,114 (22.2%)		349,986 (20.5%)	175,954 (29.6%)
Change from 2010 to 2020	783,877 (7.3%)	344,650 (6.9%)	141,304 (17.5%)		338,289 (16.4%)	201,366 (26.1%)
Change from 2020 to 2030	719,915 (6.3%)	294,127 (5.6%)	164,766 (17.3%)		315,440 (13.2%)	206,647 (21.3%)
Change from 2000 to 2030	2,641,771 (27.6%)	1,207,515 (27.1%)	453,225 (68.5%)		1,003,715 (58.7%)	583,967 (98.2%)

<sup>1</sup> Sources: SCAG, 2004a; SCAG, 2004b; COG 2006.

<sup>2</sup> N/A: Data is unavailable.

As shown in Table 5.4-1, the three counties in the TRTP study area are expected to experience substantial population growth between 2000 and 2030, with a 68.5 percent population increase in Kern County, a 27.6 percent increase in Los Angeles County, and a 58.7 percent increase in San Bernardino County. Population growth of this magnitude directly affects the demand for jobs and housing and contributes to cumulative impacts as public and private sector decision makers respond by increasing the number of residential commercial, industrial, public service, and transportation projects to accommodate larger populations.

## 5.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS BY ISSUE AREA

### 5.5.1 Aesthetics

The geographic extent for the analysis of cumulative impacts to Visual Quality is defined as a 10-mile-wide corridor that follows the center line (5 miles on either side) of the proposed Project route. Although views can and do extend beyond 5 miles, the 5-mile distance was chosen because it would include the foreground and middleground distance zones and would be a useful distance to gauge cumulative impacts within the Antelope Valley, the San Gabriel Mountains/ANF, and the San Gabriel Valley and Inland Empire landscape regions.

The locations of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within 5 miles of the proposed Project are indicated on Figure 5.3-1 and these projects are identified and briefly described in Tables 5.3-1 and 5.3-2. These data indicate that more than 165,000 acres of land within the cumulative impact corridor are likely to be developed over the next several decades. Much of the proposed development consists of large-scale residential and commercial projects that would collectively result in the construction of more than 60,000 homes. Many of the areas along the proposed Project route have experienced significant growth and visual change in recent years, and the apparent continuation of development along and near the route will continue to change the visual characteristics of the landscape in a number of specific areas.

#### 5.5.1.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The paragraphs that follow evaluate whether the proposed Project has the potential to cause cumulative impacts to the visual resources of the project area. More specifically, the analysis considers whether the cumulative projects and the TRTP would have a cumulatively significant impact on the area's aesthetics and whether the TRTP's contribution to those impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

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

The only scenic vistas identified in the proposed Project area are the views from the viewing points designated along the trail system in the Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve from which Segment 4 would be visible 1.4 miles in the distance. Because analysis of the proposed Project's aesthetic impacts on these views has established that the impacts would be negligible, the TRTP's incremental contribution to any cumulative impact that might occur in the area seen from these viewpoints would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts related to effects on the views from these scenic vistas are required.

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

The only adopted state scenic highways that would be crossed by the proposed Project are the Angeles Crest Highway in the ANF that would be crossed by Segments 6 and 11, and the portion of Highway 57 between Brea and Diamond Bar in the South of the ANF region that would be crossed by Segment 8. Because no projects are proposed in the vicinity of Segment 6 and 11 crossings of the Angeles Crest Highway, or the Segment 8 crossing of Highway 57, there would be no cumulative impacts and, therefore, mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts related to state scenic highways are not required.

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

As review of Figure 5.3-1 suggests, the cumulative impacts can be described in terms of three fairly distinct geographic areas that exhibit different geographic and jurisdictional characteristics that affect the nature, type, and intensity of development. These three areas include the lands north of the ANF, the lands on the ANF, and the lands south of the ANF. The impacts on visual character and quality are evaluated in terms of the proposed Project's effects in these three regions.

**5.5.1.1.1 North of the ANF.** Recent growth throughout the Antelope Valley and in the portion of the Tehachapi Mountains immediately north of the proposed Project route has resulted in changes to the natural landscape character. Major visual changes have occurred in the Tehachapi Mountains (particularly in the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area) as a result of the development of wind farms, substations, transmission lines, roads, and maintenance facilities. Parts of natural-appearing mountain landscapes have been changed into landscapes in which large infrastructure facilities are a part of the landscape pattern. The development of industrial manufacturing facilities at Cal Cement and Monolith in the valley floor just south of the Tehachapi Mountains have changed the character of the area from natural to partially industrial. The presence of existing transmission corridors that pass through Kern and Los Angeles counties have also played a part in altering the natural landscape character of parts of the Antelope Valley. Farther south along the proposed Project route, near the cities of Palmdale and Lancaster, the natural character of the landscape has been converted from natural or agricultural in many locations to suburban residential as a result of the development of numerous large-scale residential subdivisions.

Proposed future projects will continue to change the character of the landscape along the proposed Project route. Proposed projects include at least five wind energy projects in the Tehachapi area, the largest of which include the 32,000-acre Alta Wind Energy Center Project, the 8,000-acre Pine Tree Wind Project, and the 6,400-acre PdV Wind Energy Project. All of these projects would require additional substation and transmission capacity,

some of which will be provided by the approved but not yet developed Antelope Transmission Projects (Segment 1, and Segments 2 and 3). As a part of the Antelope Transmission Project Segment 1 (Antelope-Pardee) 500 kV transmission project, a major expansion of the Antelope Substation has been approved. Figure 5.5-1 presents a simulation that depicts a view of this substation as it would appear with the expansion approved as a part of the Antelope Transmission Project Segment 1 as well as the further expansion proposed as a part of TRTP.

In the central and southern portions of the Antelope Valley, other potential future large-scale projects include more large residential subdivisions (that would construct up to 29,000 residential units), commercial developments, and associated infrastructure. These developments would occur on approximately 24,000 acres (Table 5.3-2). The proposed Projects would replace open, largely natural and agricultural appearing landscapes with subdivisions and other features that would have more developed character. The largest example of this type of new development is the Ritter Ranch Master Planned Community located in the hills above Palmdale. This extensive development would impact approximately 11,520 acres of undeveloped land and eventually will include over 7,000 homes, 7 schools, 1 golf course, and approximately 75 acres of commercial development. The landscape character of this large area would change over time from natural to suburban residential.

The cumulative developments described in the Antelope Valley landscape unit are expected to substantially alter the visual character and quality of the landscape in this area, creating an impact that would be considered to be cumulatively significant. While the TRTP will create some changes to visual character and quality, these would be small to moderate, localized in nature, and less than significant. Because the visual changes brought about by TRTP would be incrementally negligible, the TRTP's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact on the character and quality of the landscape in the Antelope Valley area would not be cumulatively considerable. As a consequence, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts on visual character and quality in this area are required.

**5.5.1.1.2 The ANF.** Segments 6 and 11 traverse the San Gabriel Mountain range, which lies within the boundaries of the ANF. In this area, the proposed routes travel across rugged, mountainous terrain with deeply incised drainages and canyons. There are relatively few developed areas along the routes through which the two segments would pass and there are relatively few planned actions that would change the character of the landscape across which the segments would be constructed. Several resource management projects are planned that would have minor affects on visual character or on consistency with the Forest Plan's visual resource objectives. They include a fuels management project to reduce the risk of fire in Devil's Canyon and a restoration and reconstruction project to restore and recover hydrological, biological, cultural, recreational and other values in Rubio Canyon. The ANF may issue Special Use Permits for up to 495 recreational residential units currently or

formerly located on 18 tracts of forest land. Many of these residences were destroyed by wildfires in 2002.

Because the changes to visual character and quality likely to be brought about by the recent and future cumulative projects located in the portions of the ANF within 5 miles of Segments 6 and 11 will be relatively minor, there would be no cumulative impact to the character and quality of the landscape in this area. As a consequence, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts to visual resources in the ANF are required.

**5.5.1.1.3 South of the ANF.** In the area south of the ANF, the proposed Project segments travel across the San Gabriel Valley, along the ridgeline that defines the valley's southern end, and extends into the western edge of the Inland Empire. For the most part, the valley floor and hillside areas in this region are covered by urban development that includes neighborhoods of single-family housing on the hillsides, and on the valley floors, a mix of freeways, rail corridors, transmission corridors, gravel extraction areas, industrial areas, commercial uses, other housing of varying densities, and open space areas that serve both flood control and recreation purposes. Because the area south of the ANF is, to a large degree, already built out, there are only two areas where there are concentrations of proposed change that might affect the visual character and quality of the setting. In the Duarte-Irwindale-Azusa area just south of the ANF, a large number of small- to medium-sized residential, commercial, and industrial developments are proposed that would add new visual elements to the setting and intensify the perceived level of urbanization. In the vicinity of Brea, Yorba Linda, Chino Hills, and Chino, eight large residential developments are planned on now open and natural-appearing hillside areas that will result in the construction of more than 30,000 homes. Because, for the most part, the proposed residential projects in this area would be located on narrow, steep-sided hills that are more visible than developments located in the relatively level valleys where much of the previous development in this area has occurred, these developments are likely to have a substantial impact on the character and quality of the visual environment in this portion of the proposed Project area.

The cumulative developments described in the Duarte-Irwindale-Azusa area and in the Brea-Yorba Linda-Chino Hills-Chino area are expected to substantially alter the visual character and quality of the landscape in this area, creating an impact that would be considered to be cumulatively significant. While the TRTP will create some visual changes that in a few places would be significant, the impacts will be limited to areas in close proximity to specific transmission structures. Because of the limited area of the impacts and because these areas are not in immediate proximity to the places where the new developments will be taking place, the changes to visual character and quality brought about by TRTP would be incrementally negligible. Because the proposed Project's impacts on visual character and quality in the South of the ANF region would be incrementally negligible, the TRTP's incremental contribution to the cumulative impacts in this area would not be cumulatively

considerable. As a consequence, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts on visual character and quality in the South of the ANF area are required.

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

Because the T/L would not be illuminated, it would not be a source of nighttime light and glare. Additionally, the analysis of the proposed Project's visual resources impacts has established that the T/L would not be a source of daytime glare. Although the development of the Whirlwind Substation and the expansion of the Antelope and Vincent substations will require additional lighting, this lighting will be minimal and shielded and only used when needed, and as a consequence, lighting at these substations will not create significant impacts. Of these three substations, Antelope Substation is the only one located in an area where surrounding proposed development would create light and glare impacts that would have the potential to be cumulatively significant. In this area, the Antelope Substation's light and glare impacts would be incrementally negligible, that is, the substation's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative light and glare impacts are required.

### **5.5.2 Agricultural Resources**

The geographic extent for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with agricultural resources is a 5-mile zone on either side of the proposed Project (e.g., proposed T/L routes and substation locations). Agricultural resources in this 10-mile-wide zone concentrate north of the Antelope Substation in southern Kern County and northern Los Angeles County and in and adjacent to the cities of Chino and Ontario in southwestern San Bernardino County.

#### **5.5.2.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

The following analysis evaluates whether the proposed Project has the potential to cause cumulative impacts to agricultural resources. Specific issues addressed in the analysis include the following:

**Would the proposed Project in combination with other cumulative projects convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract, or involve other changes in the existing environment which could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?**

The cumulative projects listed in Table 5.3-2 have the potential to collectively affect over 165,000 acres of land. These data, coupled with visual examination of the cumulative project location maps (Figure 5.3-1, Sheets 1 and 2) suggest that most development would be located on undeveloped land in southern Kern County and northern Los Angeles County and in the

cities of Chino and Ontario in southwestern San Bernardino County. As discussed in Section 4.3 and illustrated on Figure 4.3-1, these areas include a considerable amount of agricultural resources, including all types of Important Farmland, Williamson Act land and large tracts of Grazing Land. The cumulative developments are expected to continue a long-term trend of converting Southern California's farmlands to residential, commercial and other non-agricultural uses. For example, between 1984 and 2004, the amount of Important Farmlands lost to development was 10.8 percent in Kern County, 50.2 percent in San Bernardino County, and 27.6 percent in Los Angeles County (see land use summary tables in Appendix O). These tables also demonstrate that the rates of conversion are accelerating. Recent trends in the amount of Williamson Act lands are not as severe but also show a substantial and accelerating decline over time.

Cumulative developments thus have converted and are expected to continue to convert substantial amounts of Important Farmland and Williamson Act lands to non-agricultural uses. As per CEQA, this conversion is considered cumulatively significant. While the TRTP would also result in the permanent conversion of such lands, the estimated 21.7 acres of Important Farmland and the 3.4 acres of Williamson Act lands that would be converted as a result of the TRTP are incrementally negligible; that is, the TRTP's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

### **5.5.3 Air Quality**

#### **5.5.3.1 Introduction**

The geographic extent for potential air quality related cumulative impacts includes portions of the following counties: Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties. These counties are located within the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) and South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). In the Project area, air quality is regulated by the following three local air districts: Kern County Air Pollution Control District (KCAPCD), the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AVAQMD) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) as shown on Figure 4.4-1 in Section 4.4.

The MDAB covers more than 20,000 square miles and is bounded by the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains to the south, which serve as the boundary separating the MDAB and the SCAB. The Tehachapi Mountains serve as the northwest boundary separating the MDAB from the San Joaquin Air Basin (SJAB). The majority of the population resides in the southeast area of the MDAB with the remaining population scattered in rural areas. There are approximately 494,000 people residing within the MDAB. Because it is a desert environment consisting of flat terrain, during high wind conditions, a substantial amount of fugitive dust (i.e., particulate matter [PM]) is generated. Air quality in the MDAB is also heavily

influenced by airborne pollutants transported into the region from areas within the SCAB under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD.

The SCAB covers an area of 6,745 square miles and consists of Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. It is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, the north by the San Gabriel Mountains, the east by the San Bernardino Mountains, and the south by the Santa Ana Mountains. The SCAB has over 15 million people with one of the worst air quality conditions (e.g., high concentrations of ozone [O<sub>3</sub>], carbon monoxide [CO], particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns [PM<sub>10</sub>], and PM less than or equal to 2.5 microns [PM<sub>2.5</sub>]) in the nation because of the topographical features that trap anthropogenic air pollutants that are associated with the dense population. Mobile source emissions are a major contributor to overall pollution within the SCAB.

For Air Quality, the potential geographic extent of the cumulative impact area covers the aforementioned air basins and counties/jurisdictions. Cumulative impacts could extend over the entire Project route. However, the identification of cumulative projects for air quality typically ranges from within 1 mile of a proposed project to as far as 6 miles or more from a proposed project. The effect of downwind dispersion eliminates the potential for Project-level significant cumulative air quality impacts over areas larger than a few miles.

Many local air quality jurisdictions provide no guidance regarding the distance for the selection of cumulative projects, as is the case with the AVAQMD and KCAPCD CEQA guidance documents. However, other jurisdictions and agencies use specific radius for specific analysis. The SCAQMD has approved CEQA analyses that have used a 1-mile radius for cumulative project identification, while the California Energy Commission uses a 6-mile radius for operating emissions cumulative impact evaluation for power plants.

Since the proposed Project would have very minor operating emissions, as discussed in Section 4.4, the cumulative impact discussion is focused on construction impacts. Construction impacts are localized and of short duration. The potential for cumulative impacts during construction is limited since the active construction sites are constantly moving along the T/L routes and would not be near other cumulative projects for a long period of time. Additionally, while the proposed Project's construction emissions are significant on the whole due to the numerous concurrently active construction sites and extensive paved and unpaved traffic, the construction emissions at any one construction site at any one time would not be significant. The impacts from each of the proposed Project's construction sites would be reduced significantly with distance. Therefore, only projects within 1 mile of the proposed Project routes, as well as projects that could impact traffic during project construction, are considered projects that could cause cumulative impacts. Additionally, only projects that are scheduled concurrently in the same area as the proposed Project (i.e., construction time frames coinciding with April 2009 through November 2013) are considered as projects that could contribute to cumulative impacts, since significant air

quality cumulative impacts can only occur from emission sources that are active at the same time.

As discussed in Section 5.3, many reasonably foreseeable future projects have been identified within a 5-mile radius of the TRTP and multiple proposed Projects (e.g., large and small scale residential developments, and wind energy developments) are located within several miles of the proposed TRTP.

Past development and population growth within various cities traversed by the proposed TRTP segments (refer to Section 4.10) and adjacent unincorporated areas have increased the possibility that new projects would contribute to increased air emissions within the MDAB and SCAB.

As shown in Table 4.4-3 in Section 4.0, the Project area in the MDAB is currently designated as a moderate non-attainment area for the 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for O<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>. The Project area in the SCAB is currently designated as a severe non-attainment area for the 8-hour NAAQS for O<sub>3</sub>; a serious non-attainment area for CO and PM<sub>10</sub>; and a non-attainment area for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. CARB submitted SCAQMD's request for a redesignation of the CO attainment status of the SCAB from non-attainment to attainment to the USEPA in 2005. As of February 14, 2007, the USEPA had reviewed the request. It was circulated and comments were solicited until March 16, 2007. After receiving, reviewing, and addressing all the comments, USEPA will decide whether to grant or deny the CO redesignation request. Currently it is unknown when USEPA will make this determination. The Project area in the two air basins is in attainment with the NAAQS for the other applicable criteria pollutants.

### **5.5.3.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

The TRTP when considered together with other reasonably foreseeable projects from an air quality perspective has the potential to result in short term air quality impacts that could exacerbate the non-attainment status of the aforementioned applicable pollutants in the Project area.

To determine the potential significance of TRTP-specific air quality impacts associated with the implementation of each proposed TRTP segment, emissions and associated impacts were assessed on a segment-by-segment basis in Sections 4.4.6.1 through 4.4.6.8. To assess the potential significance of air quality impacts within each air basin, daily and annual construction emissions were summed for TRTP segments located in the same air districts and air basin and compared to the applicable air district thresholds. The following discussions address potential cumulative air quality impacts for the proposed TRTP when considered with other reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects that may occur in the same geographic area and have overlapping emissions with the TRTP. It should be noted that the specific

timing and/or air emissions associated with the potential cumulative projects listed in Table 5.3-2 are generally not readily available, thus making cumulative impact assessments necessarily general and qualitative.

**Would the proposed Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

Air quality plans are strategies designed to reduce long-term operational emissions and comply with the federal and State ambient air quality standards. The operation of the TRTP would generate emissions considered to be negligible. Operational emissions are considered to be negligible because the primary source of emissions would be from maintenance vehicles used by workers to visit the substations and patrol the T/L routes. TRTP operation emissions would be negligible and well below the significance thresholds, and would not create significant air quality impacts. Therefore, the operation of the TRTP would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans, and would not have the potential to have considerable incremental effects with cumulative projects relative to conflicts or obstruction of applicable air quality plans. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

To determine whether implementation of the proposed Project would violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, a worst-case scenario approach was taken to ensure that all potential air quality impacts are assessed. As such, emissions occurring during peak construction activities were quantified and used to determine air quality impacts. Overall Project construction emissions (i.e., considering overlapping emissions, by air basin, for all applicable TRTP segments) are presented in Table 4.4-30 in Section 4.0; these emissions and associated air quality effects could be exacerbated by emissions from cumulative projects.

As shown in Table 4.4-30, annual construction emissions for the overall TRTP would exceed the AVAQMD's significance thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> in year 2010 and PM<sub>10</sub> in years 2010, 2011, and 2012 and, therefore, would be considered to have significant air quality impacts. Similarly, the comparison of the peak daily construction emissions with the SCAQMD significance thresholds shows that all pollutants exceed the thresholds with the exception of SO<sub>2</sub>. The implementation of APMs identified in Section 4.4.5 would reduce overall emissions, but air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable during peak year construction in both air basins, although impacts would be short-term. Emissions from the operation of proposed TRTP facilities are considered to be negligible. Hence, the construction of the entire TRTP could potentially contribute to existing violations of O<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> air quality standards. Therefore, the construction of the entire TRTP would have a

significant impact on air quality. Relative to this CEQA air quality criteria, the proposed TRTP could also be considered to considerably contribute to short term significant cumulative impacts. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels.

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

If the Project were to cause annual emissions that exceed the General Conformity Rule (GCR) *DeMinimis* thresholds, SCE would be required to prepare a comprehensive Air Quality Conformity Analysis and Determination. It should be noted that the GCR *DeMinimis* thresholds are for the entire air basins and are not for individual air districts. Therefore, to determine conformity requirements for MDAB, construction emissions generated in Kern County (i.e., KCAPCD jurisdiction) are added to emissions generated in northern Los Angeles County (i.e., AVAQMD jurisdiction). Based on the current proposed Project schedule, the maximum annual construction emissions for the proposed Project would occur in 2010 within the MDAB and in the SCAB. Annual construction emissions for year 2010 in the MDAB and the SCAB were compared to their respective GCR *DeMinimis* thresholds and are provided in Table 4.4-31 in Section 4.0.

The maximum TRTP-specific annual construction emissions generated within the MDAB in year 2010 would be well below the GCR *DeMinimis* thresholds, and are therefore considered to be consistent with the SIP. However, annual emissions generated during the peak construction year within the SCAB exceed the NO<sub>x</sub> thresholds by 9.6 percent and are under the thresholds for all other pollutants. To ensure the proposed Project conformed to the SIP, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions would have to be reduced by a minimum of 9.6 percent. It should be noted that Project-specific construction emissions were estimated based on a worst-case scenario (e.g., all construction activities were assumed to overlap throughout the entire year), which is unlikely. NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are directly correlated with the number and type of equipment used and operating hours. Based on this consideration, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions could be reduced through various methods such as reducing the number of equipment operating at any one time, extending the construction time frame, and/or scheduling of equipment to reduce duplicate equipment operating for the same purpose during the construction phase. The detailed annual emissions calculations and associated assumptions used in the calculations are provided in Appendix G. Given the aforementioned analysis, the proposed TRTP has the potential to result in short-term significant and cumulatively considerable net increases in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions with other projects in the SCAB. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce cumulative impacts to less-than-significant levels.

**Would the proposed Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Construction activities and associated emissions generated during the various TRTP-specific construction phases could potentially affect sensitive receptors located near the construction zones. The use of construction equipment could create air quality impacts, but with the implementation of the APMs provided in Section 4.4.5 (Section 4.0), Project-specific localized air quality impacts would be expected to be minimal and considered to have a less than significant impact. After construction of the entire TRTP was complete (i.e., in 2013), operational emissions would be generated from the operation of maintenance vehicles driven to the TRTP sites, parked for a short duration, then driven off, and, therefore, would be negligible. Hence, the emissions generated from the construction and operation of the proposed TRTP would not be expected to expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The incremental contribution of pollutants from the TRTP on nearby sensitive receptors from a cumulative perspective would not be expected to be considerable or significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial amount of people?**

The use of diesel construction equipment during various construction phases may generate odor that are considered to be a nuisance. Diesel equipment and asphalt paving emit a distinctive odor that may be considered offensive to certain individuals. These odors would be temporary and would not affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, the odor impacts from the proposed TRTP's construction and operation would be less than significant. The proposed TRTP's potential odor impacts would be short term, less than significant, and would not be expected to contribute considerably to any potentially significant cumulative odor related impacts in the Project area. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4 Biological Resources**

The potential for biological impacts of the proposed Project to combine with the effects of other projects within the geographic scope of the cumulative analysis are described below.

**5.5.4.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

**5.5.4.1.1 North of ANF.** Based on initial assessments of Segments 4, 5, 9, and 10 of the TRTP, the proposed Project would potentially impact sensitive biological resources north of the ANF, including one sensitive habitat, federal- and state-listed and special-status plant and wildlife species (see Sections 4.5.6.1, 4.4.6.2, 4.5.6.6, and 4.5.6.7). These impacts would all

be mitigated below a level of significance by incorporating the APMs and biological mitigation measures as described in Section 4.5.5.

Impacts of the cumulative projects on biological resources north of the ANF would occur primarily in undeveloped open space areas and agricultural lands. These projects include wind energy projects, large residential developments, commercial establishments, and associated infrastructure. Those developments and others have the potential to reduce riparian habitat, a community considered to be sensitive by the CDFG, that exist above the Antelope Valley floor in the foothills of the Tehachapi and San Gabriel Mountains. By removal of native plant communities, the projects developed in the uplands and on the Antelope Valley floor would also have the potential to affect 10 special status plants and 23 wildlife species (Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4) located within the TRTP study area. These species are distributed within 11 natural plant communities that commonly occur throughout much of the Antelope Valley Region. These projects could cumulatively cause a decline in the abundance of these special-status species, riparian communities, and related sensitive plant and wildlife species supported by these communities resulting in a significant cumulative impact. Most of these projects would independently pass through the CEQA regulatory approval process and would be required to mitigate for significant impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Many of these projects would have potential impacts on the same species as shown in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4 for the TRTP because the plant communities are common to most of the Antelope Valley region. Implementation of the TRTP may potentially affect the special-status species by ground disturbances required for construction of transmission towers, creation of marshalling areas, and clearing of substation sites. Preconstruction or focused surveys would be conducted by the TRTP so that these areas can be avoided to the extent feasible. The TRTP Biological APMs and biological mitigation measures proposed by SCE are expected to reduce impacts to a level below significance for sensitive biological resources in areas north of the ANF. In light of the substantial amount of development expected to occur north of the ANF and based on the wide-spread distribution of the plant communities supporting the sensitive species in the region, any cumulative impacts on these species attributed to the TRTP would be relatively small because of the small amount of ground disturbance that will occur from implementation of the project. The contribution of the TRTP to any cumulative impacts would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.2 ANF.** Based on initial assessments, Segments 6 and 11 of the TRTP would potentially impact sensitive biological resources in the ANF including sensitive habitats, federal- and state-listed and Forest Service Sensitive plant and wildlife species, and wetlands, as described in Sections 4.5.6.3 and 4.5.6.8 impacts for Segments 6 and 11. These impacts could all be mitigated below a level of significance by incorporating the proposed APMs and biological mitigation measures described in Section 4.5.5.

Impacts of the cumulative projects within the ANF are limited and include a small wooden bridge for hikers and a redevelopment project that includes new entrance facilities, a two-mile long entrance road, a multi-use trail, a restroom, a maintenance storage building and other related elements. Several resource management projects are also planned, including a fuels management project to reduce the risk of fire in Devil's Canyon and a restoration and reconstruction project to restore and recover hydrological, biological, cultural, recreational and other values in Rubio Canyon. The ANF may issue Special Use Permits for up to 495 recreational residential units currently or formerly located on 18 tracts of forest land destroyed by wildfires in 2002. The new permits would allow destroyed units to be replaced and existing units to continue to be used for recreational purposes.

The proposed Projects in the ANF could impact sensitive forest, riparian, and wetland habitats and sensitive plant and wildlife species related to those habitats. However, given that the ANF encompasses more than 650,000 acres and based on the protections provided to sensitive resources, regulated and enforced by the USFS, it is unlikely that the cumulative effects of development projects, including the TRTP, would create significant impacts on sensitive biological resources. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.3 South of ANF.** Based on initial assessments of Segments 7, 8, and 11 of the TRTP would potentially impact sensitive biological resources south of the ANF including sensitive habitats, federal- and state-listed and special-status plant and wildlife species, and wetlands, as described in Sections 4.5.6.4, 4.5.6.5, and 4.5.6.8 impacts for Segments 7, 8 and 11. These impacts could all be mitigated below a level of significance by incorporating the APMs and mitigation measures as described in Section 4.5.5.

Impacts of the cumulative projects south of the ANF would occur primarily in developed or disturbed areas with a low potential for biological resources. Projects with a higher potential to affect biological resources include those developments that extend into open space and impact previously undeveloped habitat such as (potentially) the ones in the Brea, Yorba Linda, and Chino Hills area south of Segment 8, the Whittier Narrows Dam Recreation Area along Segments 7 and 8, the Eaton Canyon area along Segment 11, and the San Gabriel River corridor near the cities of Azusa and Duarte along Segment 7. Those developments, and others, have the potential to reduce sensitive habitats including Coastal Sage Scrub, Riversidian Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub, Native Grasslands, Coast Live Oak and Walnut Woodland, riparian, and wetland habitats. These projects could cumulatively cause a decline in the abundance of those habitats and related sensitive plant and wildlife species. Each of those projects will independently pass through the regulatory approval process and will have to mitigate for significant impacts to sensitive biological resources. The mitigation imposed on independent projects, combined with the implementation of minimization and mitigation measures proposed by SCE would make the TRTP unlikely to produce significant cumulative

impacts to sensitive biological resources in areas south of the ANF. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, 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 CDFG or USFWS?**

**5.5.4.1.4 North of ANF.** The Segments of the proposed TRTP north of the ANF would potentially affect riparian habitat at Anaverde Creek and Amargosa Creek in the foothills north of Vincent Substation. No other sensitive riparian or other sensitive naturally community is present north of the ANF.

The proposed TRTP would span the entire extent of the riparian habitat associated with these two creek crossings, and existing public and access roads would be utilized during construction and operations to avoid new ground-disturbing activities at these creek crossings. The Project would not make an incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on riparian or other sensitive natural communities in the region.

**5.5.4.1.5 ANF.** The sections of the proposed TRTP within the ANF would potentially impact riparian habitat within Kentucky Springs Canyon Creek, Aliso Canyon Creek, North Fork Mill Creek, Fall Creek, Lynx Gulch Canyon Creek, Upper Big Tujunga Creek, and Cold Springs Canyon and minor stream channels crossed by Segments 6 and 11. Other sensitive habitats that could be impacted by construction operations on Segments 6 and 11 include Coastal Sage Scrub, Riversidian Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub, and Coast Live Oak Woodland. The cumulative projects may be situated such that there is potential for impact to riparian habitats and other sensitive communities including riparian habitat at Littlerock Creek in Cooper Canyon.

The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities with the implementation of APMs and biological mitigation measures as described in Sections 4.5.5. Because impacts of the proposed Project are not expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and other proposed projects would require the same level of mitigation to below a level of significance, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.6 South of ANF.** The sections of the proposed TRTP south of the ANF would potentially impact riparian habitat in the vicinity of the Whittier Narrows Dam Recreation Area. Other sensitive natural communities that could be impacted by construction operations on Segments 7, 8, and 11 include Coastal Sage Scrub, Riversidian Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub, and Coast Live Oak and Walnut Woodland, and Native Grasslands. The cumulative projects may be situated such that there is potential for impact to riparian and other sensitive habitats.

Riparian habitats occur along Eaton Canyon, San Gabriel River corridor and Whittier Narrows Dam Recreation Area. Riversidian Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub and Coastal Sage Scrub occur within the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains. The Puente/Chino Hills area contains Coastal Sage Scrub, Coast Live Oak and Walnut Woodland, and Native Grasslands.

The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities with the implementation of APMs and mitigation measures as described in Section 4.5.5. Because impacts of this Project would not be expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and other proposed projects would be required to mitigate to below a level of significance, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly 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 CDFG or USFWS?**

**5.5.4.1.7 North of the ANF.** North of the ANF, TRTP Segments 4, 5, 9, and 10 and many cumulative projects could potentially produce adverse cumulative impacts on the 10 special status plants and 23 wildlife species listed in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4. These species naturally occur in 11 plant communities that are commonly distributed throughout the Antelope Valley region. Special-status species potentially occurring north of the ANF include the Desert Tortoise, Mohave Ground Squirrel, and Burrowing Owl. A substantial amount of acreage that would be affected by the cumulative projects is in areas with plant communities that may support these three species. Permanent cumulative impacts on small areas supporting populations of Desert Tortoise, Mohave Ground Squirrel, and nesting Burrowing Owl in the region may occur during implementation of the TRTP. These impacts will be avoided and mitigated by implementation of the APMs and Biological Mitigation Measures.

The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on listed species or Critical Habitat for these species with the implementation of TRTP APMs and biological mitigation measures as described in Sections 4.5.5. Because impacts of this Project are not expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and most other proposed projects would be required to mitigate to below a level of significance, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant. Given the location of the TRTP and the small amount of permanent ground disturbance that would occur by Project implementation, the Project's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact on the plant and wildlife species listed in Tables 4.5-3 and Table 4.5-4, would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.8 On the ANF.** Sections of Segments 6 and 11 within the ANF would potentially impact species Listed as Endangered, Threatened, or Proposed or Critical Habitat for these

species as described in Sections 4.5.6.3 and 4.5.6.8 (Impact sections for Segments 6 and 11). The cumulative projects may be situated such that there is potential for impact to listed species or Critical Habitat for these species. Through the implementation of minimization and mitigation measures, no substantial direct effect on these species or associated Critical Habitat would be expected from construction of Project facilities and infrastructure during implementation of the TRTP. Because impacts of this Project would not be expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and other proposed projects would require the same level of mitigation to below a level of significance, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant.

The sections of the proposed TRTP within the ANF would potentially impact special status species and their habitats, as would other planned projects in the area. Through the implementation of minimization and mitigation measures, no substantial direct effect (directly or through habitat modifications) for these species would be expected from construction of Project facilities and infrastructure during implementation of the TRTP. Because impacts of this Project would not be expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and other proposed projects would require the same level mitigation to below a level of significance, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.9 South of the ANF.** The sections of the proposed TRTP south of the ANF would potentially impact species listed as Endangered, Threatened, or Proposed or Critical Habitat for these species as described in Sections 4.5.6.4, 4.5.6.5, and 4.5.6.8 (Impacts Sections for Segments 7, 8, and 11). The cumulative projects may be situated such that there is potential for impact to listed species or Critical Habitat for these species. Listed species potentially occurring in riparian habitats in the Project area south of the ANF include Least Bell's Vireo, the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, and the Arroyo Toad. Listed species potentially occurring in Riversidian Alluvial Fan and Coastal Sage Scrub communities include the Coastal California Gnatcatcher. Critical Habitat for the Coastal California Gnatcatcher occurs in the Montebello Hills and the Puente/Chino Hills areas. The Coastal California Gnatcatcher potentially occurs in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains and was observed in the Montebello and Puente/Chino Hills areas during investigations for this Project. Removal of riparian or sage scrub communities for this Project and cumulative projects could potentially have a cumulatively significant impact on listed species and Critical Habitats.

The proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on listed species or Critical Habitat for these species with the implementation of APMs and biological mitigation measures as described in Section 4.5.5. Because impacts of the proposed Project would not be expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and other proposed projects would be required to mitigate to below a level of significance, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

The sections of the proposed TRTP south of the ANF would potentially impact special-status species and their habitats as described in Sections 4.5.6.4, 4.5.6.5, and 4.5.6.8 (Impact sections for Segments 7, 8, and 11). The cumulative projects may be situated such that there is potential for impacts to special-status species and their habitats. Special-status species potentially occurring in grassland and disturbed areas south of the ANF include the Burrowing Owl. Special-status species potentially occurring in riparian habitats include the Southwestern Pond Turtle. Special-status species potentially occurring in Oak and Walnut Woodlands and along the existing TRTP tower locations include nesting raptors. Permanent impacts to areas with populations of nesting Burrowing Owl, raptors, and Southwestern Pond Turtle during the proposed Project and cumulative projects could potentially have a cumulatively significant impact on special-status species.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, have a substantial adverse effect on any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**5.5.4.1.10 North of the ANF.** The segments of the proposed TRTP north of the ANF would have no incremental contribution to cumulative impacts to federally protected wetlands. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.11 On the ANF.** The sections of the proposed TRTP within the ANF would potentially impact federally protected wetlands, as would other planned projects in the area. Through the implementation of APMs and mitigation measures, no substantial direct effect on federally protected wetlands would be expected from construction of Project facilities and infrastructure during implementation of the TRTP. Because impacts of this Project are not expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and other proposed Projects would require the same level mitigation to below a level of significance, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.12 South of the ANF.** The sections of the proposed TRTP south of the ANF and the other cumulative projects would potentially impact federally protected wetlands. Through the implementation of APMs and biological mitigation measures as described in Section 4.5.5, no substantial direct effect on federally protected wetlands would be expected from construction of Project facilities and infrastructure during implementation of the TRTP. Because impacts of this Project would not be expected to have a substantial adverse effect, and other proposed projects would be required to mitigate to below a level of significance by federal and state regulations, the cumulative effect of this and other projects would not be expected to be significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, 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?**

**5.5.4.1.13 North of the ANF.** The cumulative projects are distributed within the various common plant communities of the region. Because the number of identified projects is large, and because many of them are large in scale, some of the projects in the region are reasonably expected to incrementally cause significant cumulative impacts on movements of wildlife by removal of plant communities that support daily and seasonal movements of wildlife and plant populations. The TRTP transmission corridor would, however, provide unimpeded open space across the Antelope Valley floor between the Vincent Substation and the terminus of both Segments 4 and 10. The TRTP would not block movement of native resident or migratory species in any cardinal direction, nor would it impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Any interruption of native wildlife movement during construction activities would be temporary and minor in extent. Given the non-intrusive nature of the TRTP facilities (towers and substations), the proposed Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory species. The TRTP would have a less than considerable cumulative impact on the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.14 On the ANF.** The sections of the proposed TRTP within the ANF and the cumulative projects would not be expected to significantly impact wildlife movement and would not significantly add to the cumulative impacts in the region. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.15 South of the ANF.** The sections of the proposed TRTP south of the ANF and the cumulative projects would not be expected to significantly impact wildlife movement and would not significantly add to the cumulative impacts in the region. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**5.5.4.1.16 North of the ANF.** The proposed TRTP corridor crosses two Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) that are designated to protect a suite of plant communities and species. CPUC General Order 131-D preempts local jurisdictions from regulating electric power line projects. However, any areas of the TRTP passing through the SEAs where there may be protected candidate, sensitive, or special-status species would be avoided to the extent feasible. If any special-status species is located in areas that cannot be avoided during construction, the implementation of APMs and biological mitigation

measures outlined in Section 4.5.5 would ensure that this impact would not conflict or have an adverse cumulative effect on the biological resources protected by the SEAs. Other cumulative projects that may be built in the SEAs generally would be subjected to a CEQA-level review by the Significant Ecological Areas Technical Advisory Committee prior to their implementation, and would be mitigated to a level below significance. The TRTP APMs and mitigation measures are consistent with SEA policies and ordinances protecting biological resources within the SEAs. The TRTP would make a less than considerable incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.17 On the ANF.** The proposed Project and the cumulative projects would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The Project mitigation measures are consistent with USFS policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. Significant cumulative impacts would therefore not occur. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.18 South of the ANF.** The proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as local Oak and Walnut Woodland ordinances. The proposed Project mitigation measures are consistent with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, significant cumulative impacts would not occur. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

**5.5.4.1.19 North of the ANF.** The TRTP north of the ANF passes through the western-most portion of the West Mojave Plan (WMP), a federally-approved Habitat Conservation Plan to conserve and protect the Mohave Ground Squirrel and Desert Tortoise, plus 100 other sensitive species. The WMP applies only to projects under federal jurisdictions, and is not applicable to private lands on which the TRTP is proposed. Projects developed in the area west of Highway 14 may have an adverse incremental cumulative impact on Desert Tortoise and Mohave Ground Squirrels. These two species are considered to be present in very low densities west of Highway 14 (1 to 20 individuals per square mile). The northern half of the NPPSA passes through a WMP “Survey Area” that designates preconstruction clearance surveys for Desert Tortoises in areas where Project ground disturbances may occur. The southern half of the NPPSA is within a “No Survey” area. The range of the Mohave Ground Squirrel occurs on the Antelope Valley floor to the east of the TRTP, approaching within 3 miles of the TRTP transmission corridor at its closest, where no habitat for the species is present along the transmission corridor. The Mohave Ground Squirrel habitat is 5 miles east of the northern terminus of Segment 10, and does not require CDFG surveys at that distance

from the currently documented boundary. The TRTP would conduct preconstruction surveys for the Desert Tortoise and Mohave Ground Squirrel. If any Desert Tortoise or Mohave Ground Squirrels are located in areas where TRTP ground disturbances would occur, the implementation of APMs and biological mitigation measures outlined in Section 4.5.5 would ensure that any Project-related disturbances will not have a substantial adverse effect on these species. Given the location of the TRTP and the small amount of permanent ground disturbance that would occur by Project implementation, the Project's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact on Desert Tortoise and Mohave Ground Squirrel would be less than considerable. Further, given that there is not an adopted HCP or NCCP within the private lands traversed by the TRTP, implementation of the TRTP would have no incremental contribution to cumulative impacts to provisions in an adopted HCP or NCCP. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.20 On the ANF.** This section of the proposed Project and the cumulative projects lie within the ANF and there is not an adopted HCP or NCCP within the Project area, therefore, cumulative impacts related to an adopted HCP or NCCP would not occur. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.4.1.21 South of the ANF.** There is not an adopted HCP or NCCP within this section of the proposed Project, and cumulative impacts would not occur. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

### **5.5.5 Cultural Resources**

The geographic extent for the analysis of cumulative impacts to Cultural Resources is defined generally as a 10-mile-wide corridor with the proposed Project T/L route(s) at the center. Patterns of development illustrated on Figure 5.3-1 and summarized in Tables 5.3-1 and 5.3-2 indicate that more than 165,000 acres of land within the corridor are likely to be developed over the next several decades. Much of the development would consist of large-scale residential and commercial projects that would collectively result in the construction of more than 60,000 homes. The spatial pattern of development indicates that cumulative impacts can be described in terms of three fairly distinct areas that exhibit different geographic and jurisdictional characteristics that affect the nature, type and intensity of development. These three areas include lands north of the ANF, the ANF, and lands south of the ANF (see Figure 5.3-1).

#### **5.5.5.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

This section evaluates the potential for the TRTP to have cumulative impacts to archeological and historical resources. Issues related to unique geological features and paleontological resources are addressed in Sections 5.5.6 and 5.5.17, respectively. Cultural resource issues of concern relative to potential cumulative impacts are addressed below.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, an archaeological resource, a historic property, or disturb any human remains?**

The following discussion, as indicated above, is organized geographically.

**5.5.5.1.1 North of the ANF.** The area north of the ANF is located within the western portion of the Mojave Desert and is roughly bounded on the north by the Tehachapi Mountains and on the south by the Transverse Ranges. In between lays the large, relatively flat landform known as the Antelope Valley. Much of this area is undeveloped, available, and relatively inexpensive. As a result, many past, current and future projects in this area are large in scale. These include at least five wind energy projects in the Tehachapi area, the largest of which include the 32,000-acre Alta Wind Energy Center Project, the 8,000-acre Pine Tree Wind Project, and the 6,400-acre PdV Wind Energy Project. Other large projects in the Antelope Valley include large residential developments that would construct up to 29,000 residential units, commercial establishments, and associated infrastructure on approximately 24,000 acres of land in southern Kern County and in undeveloped portions of Lancaster and Palmdale in northern Los Angeles County (see Figure 5.3-1). The largest example of this type of development is the Ritter Ranch Master Planned Community located in the hills above Palmdale. This large development would impact approximately 11,520 acres of undeveloped land and eventually will include over 7,000 homes, seven schools, a golf course, and approximately 75 acres of commercial development.

Grading and other ground-disturbing activities associated with cumulative developments in this northern area would be expected to disturb and destroy cultural resources. Although the total number of cultural resources that may be impacted as a result of development is unknown, a rough order of magnitude estimate can be derived from intensive surveys conducted for the TRTP and the Pine Tree Wind Energy Project. Intensive survey of the 8,000-acre Pine Tree Project site yielded 90 prehistoric and historic sites (LADWP and BLM, 2004) while the intensive cultural resource survey of TRTP Segments 4, 5 and 10 located a total 34 sites. Site densities in the four survey areas varied from 5.0 to 23.6 sites per square mile and averaged 8 sites per square mile. In terms of size, cumulative projects in undeveloped areas are dominated by wind farms (48,000 acres) and large-scale planned residential developments (24,000 acres) near Mojave, Palmdale, and Lancaster. Some areas have been affected by agriculture but most of these 72,000 acres have not been previously developed and could contain cultural resources. Based on an average of 8 sites per square mile, the wind farms and planned residential development project areas could include approximately 900 cultural resources. How many would be directly affected by development is unknown but the scale and nature of the projects can be used to generate an order of magnitude estimate. Large-scale residential and commercial developments, for example, would be expected to disturb or destroy a relatively high proportion of sites within their development footprint, perhaps as high as 90 percent. In contrast, wind farms might be

expected to affect lower proportions due to some flexibility in turbine placement. The Pine Tree Wind Development Project, for example, is expected to affect only 22 percent of the sites within its footprint (LADWP and BLM, 2004: 3.8-11).

Based on such figures, development of wind farms and large-scale residential developments north of the ANF could disturb or destroy on the order of 400 cultural resource sites, some, if not many, of which would be expected to meet criteria as unique archaeological resources, historical resources or as historic properties. An unknown but relatively small number would have a reasonable potential to contain human remains. The 400-site figure does not take into consideration that some of the lands have been previously disturbed but, on the other hand, the figure also does not include estimated impacts from other types of development expected to occur in the area. As a result, the estimate that roughly 400 sites could be affected by cumulative development north of the ANF is considered a reasonable approximation.

The vast majority of the cumulative projects would likely undergo CEQA and/or NEPA review and unavoidable sites would be tested to evaluate significance and significant sites would be subject to historical documentation or data recovery excavations to mitigate impacts. Although these measures would reduce most individual site impacts to less than significant levels, archaeological excavation and analysis cannot recover all the scientific values of a site. Based on the above, the cumulative loss of approximately 400 archaeological and historical sites in the Antelope Valley and adjacent areas is considered a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels. However, intensive survey of TRTP proposed Segments 4, 5, and 10 indicates that the TRTP's contribution to this cumulative impact would not be "considerable." Although a total of 34 sites were identified in the TRTP T/L right-of-way (R-O-W), the nature of the Project suggests that most of these sites could be avoided by proper siting of towers, access and spur roads, staging areas, and other project components. Sites avoided by the TRTP would also be protected from other projects as well, since SCE does not allow other project construction within its T/L R-O-Ws. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.5.1.2 On the ANF.** TRTP Segments 6 and 11 traverse rugged, mountainous terrain and deeply incised drainages and canyons as they cross the ANF. Not surprisingly, development on the forest is limited and includes only a few scattered construction projects. These include a small wooden bridge for hikers and a redevelopment project that includes new entrance facilities, a 2-mile long entrance road, a multi-use trail, a restroom, a maintenance storage building and other related elements. Several resource management projects are also planned, including a fuel management project to reduce the risk of fire in Devil's Canyon and a restoration and reconstruction project to restore and recover hydrological, biological, cultural, recreational and other values in Rubio Canyon. Finally, the ANF may issue Special Use Permits for up to 495 recreational residential units currently or formerly located on 18 tracts of forest land. Many of these residences were destroyed by wildfires in 2002. The new permits would allow destroyed units to be replaced and existing units to continue to be used

for recreational purposes. Given that the ANF encompasses more than 650,000 acres, cultural resource impacts from the TRTP and the projects noted above would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.5.1.3 South of the ANF.** Most cumulative projects in the area south of the ANF would occur in urbanized areas with a low potential for cultural resources. Projects with a higher potential to affect cultural resources include several relatively small planned residential developments in the Duarte-Azusa area just south of the ANF and eight large planned residential developments in the vicinity of Brea, Yorba Linda, and Chino. The Duarte-Azusa developments are relatively small-scale and are not located in areas of high cultural resource sensitivity (survey of Segment 7 identified only one small prehistoric lithic scatter, a historic dirt road and a historic dam). The eight other planned developments are much larger and would encompass more than 19,000 acres and result in the construction of more than 30,000 homes. For the most part these project areas consist of narrow, steep-sided hills that would not be expected to contain many sites and cumulative impacts south of the ANF are not expected to be considerable. The TRTP survey of Segment 8 located only six sites, which represents an archaeological density of only 1.4 sites per square mile. This low figure undoubtedly reflects that urban development has destroyed most of the archaeological resources in this area. In terms of impacts, most if not all of these sites can be expected to be avoided. In sum, neither the TRTP nor other developments south of the ANF are likely to have a considerable cumulative impact on the regional archaeological record. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.5.1.4 Summary.** Cumulative development north of the ANF is expected to have a significant, unmitigatable impact on cultural resources in the region. However, as a result of implementation of SCE Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs), the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts to cultural resources would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

## **5.5.6 Geology and Soils**

The geographic extent for considering cumulative impacts to geology and soils is limited to the immediate vicinity of the TRTP T/L R-O-Ws, and substation construction and expansion areas (Whirlwind, Antelope, and Vincent substations). The "immediate vicinity" includes the area physically within the R-O-W, as well as areas outside the R-O-W which may be occupied during construction or operation of the Project for project-related uses. This geographic extent is appropriate for the geology and soils issue area because any potential impacts of the proposed Project would be site-specific.

### 5.5.6.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Past and ongoing development throughout the proposed TRTP Project area has resulted in substantial alterations to the natural landscape. In order to be cumulatively considerable, impacts to geology and soils would have to occur at the same time and in the same location as the proposed Project. Seismic impacts (ground shaking, earthquake-induced ground failure, and fault rupture) from the numerous local and regional faults comprise an impact of the geologic environment on individual projects and would not introduce cumulatively considerable impacts. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

The discussion below considers whether the cumulative projects and the TRTP would have a cumulatively significant impact on geology and soils and whether the TRTP's contribution to those impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving rupture of a known earthquake fault?**

The proposed Project would not increase the exposure of people to earthquake faults. Structures associated with the proposed Project would cross known earthquake faults along Segments 5, 6, 7, and 8. However, SCE proposes to conduct a geotechnical study, which would identify site-specific geologic conditions and potential geologic hazards. Results of the study would be incorporated into final design. Such design parameters would minimize potential effects resulting from the proposed Project in the event of the rupture of a known fault.

It is not expected that impacts of any other projects would combine with potential impacts of the proposed Project in a way that would increase the potential for Project T/Ls to be damaged by these forces. There would be no cumulative impact and therefore, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in cumulative impacts from fault ruptures, seismic events, landslides, earth flows, debris slides, ground shaking, or corrosive soils?**

It is not expected that impacts of any other projects could combine with potential impacts of the proposed Project in a way that would increase the potential for Project T/Ls to be damaged by these forces. There would be no cumulative impact and therefore, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

Portions of all of the Segments within the TRTP route are underlain by soils classified as having moderate to severe hazard of erosion on roads and trails. Areas of greatest soil erosion potential are present in the steeply sloping terrain of the Transverse Ranges in Segments 6, 7, and 11 on and immediately south of the ANF. Construction of the proposed Project and other cumulative projects could trigger or accelerate soil erosion through land disturbance activities. These impacts of the proposed Project would be minimized through implementation of APM GEO-3, which specifies preparation and implementation of a Construction SWPPP. A Construction SWPPP would be required for all construction projects that disturb one or more acre of ground surface. Therefore, any other project which could potentially introduce similar erosion events also would be required to minimize such impacts through compliance with a Construction SWPPP.

Finally, it is not expected that other projects would be constructed in the same places and at the same times as the proposed Project. As a result, there would be no cumulative impact, and therefore, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, 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 onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?**

Due to the presence of landslide-prone geologic units in the Project area, slope instability could potentially be caused if excavation or grading for another project occurs immediately near (in distance and time) similar activities for the proposed Project. However, in accordance with TRTP APM GEO-2, SCE would conduct geotechnical studies to avoid and minimize potential impacts from geologic hazards or soil conditions. Also, SCE generally does not allow other projects to construct in its R-O-Ws and would not allow activity that could threaten the TRTP T/L. Because excavation and grading for multiple projects are not expected to occur in the exact location at the exact same time as the TRTP, there would be no cumulative impact, and therefore, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, be located on expansive soil and create substantial risks to life or property?**

While the likelihood of expansive soils occurring would not be high, given the geologic conditions along the proposed Project area, such soils could still be encountered in localized areas. As previously discussed, APM GEO-2 would identify site-specific geologic conditions and hazards such as expansive soils and provide engineering design and construction

recommendations to avoid and minimize potential impacts. Because excavation and grading for multiple projects are not expected to occur in the exact location at the exact same time as the TRTP, there would be no cumulative impact, and therefore, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

The proposed Project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. As a result, there would be no cumulative impact, and therefore, no mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

### **5.5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The geographic extent for the analysis of cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, including impacts to soil and groundwater, is limited to the immediate vicinity surrounding the TRTP R-O-Ws and substations. The potential release of hazardous materials resulting from the proposed Project activities would be site-specific to the actual release location or location of impacted soil or groundwater. The potential of a release to migrate offsite would be addressed by compliance with appropriate federal, State, and local regulations as discussed in Section 4.8 and Appendix K.

The area along the proposed Project T/L alignments north of the ANF primarily consists of undeveloped and open space land, scattered rural residences, and new residential developments. No known impacted soils or groundwater exist along the proposed Project alignment. The project routes on the ANF are restricted to existing utility corridors are also unlikely to have impacts to soil or groundwater. Based on this mix of non-hazardous land uses along the Project alignment, there is a low likelihood of significant existing unknown impacts to soil or groundwater in these areas. The TRTP routes south of the ANF include a mix of highly urbanized areas and previously undeveloped and/or vacant lands and have a higher potential to contain impacted soil or groundwater. There is a possibility that impacts to soil or groundwater may exist at properties located within the immediate vicinity or adjacent to the proposed Project R-O-W. Phase I Environmental Site Assessments as described in APM HAZ-1 would likely identify these properties prior to construction or operation or the proposed Project. Therefore, the potential for offsite facilities to directly affect the proposed Project is low.

#### **5.5.7.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

The following analysis evaluates whether the proposed Project has the potential to cause cumulative impacts to hazards and hazardous materials. Specific issues addressed in the analysis include the following:

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative project, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

A wide variety of regulatory controls exist to ensure safe handling, storage, transport, disposal, and treatment of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in California (see Section 4.8 and Appendix K). In accordance with these regulatory controls, SCE has identified APMs that would minimize the potential creation of hazards or release of hazardous materials such that the proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact. These APMs include HAZ-1 (conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments), HAZ-2 (implement a series of actions designed to appropriately manage hazardous materials and hazardous waste, including the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP), HAZ-3 (preparation of a Soil Management Plan to ensure proper handling, onsite management, and disposal of impacted soil that may be encountered), HAZ-4 (implement Fire Management Plan), and HAZ-5 (prepare or update a Spill Prevention, Countermeasure, and Control Plan [SPCC] and a Hazardous Materials Business Plan for applicable substations in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code and Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations).

Cumulative impacts would only be considered significant if concurrent construction of the proposed Project and other local projects would result in the use and/or transport of large volumes of hazardous materials thereby creating a potential hazard, or if significant volumes of impacted soil would be generated requiring offsite treatment. Construction and operation of the proposed TRTP would involve only minor quantities of hazardous materials (e.g., fuel, lubricants, paint, etc.) and no cumulative projects have been identified that would involve the use or transport of large quantities of hazardous materials. Based on the largely rural character of the ANF and Project areas to the north, no significant quantities of impacted soil are expected to be encountered or generated during construction of the proposed Project. Moreover, other projects would be subject to the same regulatory controls as SCE and are expected to implement measures similar to the TRTP APMs. Therefore, no cumulative impacts involving hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are expected. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials in the environment?**

As discussed above, a wide variety of regulatory controls exist to ensure safe handling, storage, transport, disposal, and treatment of hazardous materials and hazardous waste in California (see Section 4.8 and Appendix K). In accordance with these regulatory controls, SCE has identified APM HAZ-2 for hazardous materials and waste handling management and APM HAZ-5 for implementation of SPCC Plans and Hazardous Materials Plans where

applicable, to prevent releases of hazardous materials. If in the case of a potential release, procedures implemented through the SPCC, Hazardous Material Business Plans, and Emergency Release Response Procedures (APM HAZ-2) would manage, control, and minimize the release to the extent that the TRTP's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

The proposed Project would not involve the use or emission of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. For this reason, the proposed Project would have no cumulative impact with respect to such releases. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, and as a result, in combination with other cumulative projects, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Soil and groundwater in the area of the proposed Project have the potential to be adversely impacted by hazardous materials and wastes from past activities at properties within, adjacent, or near the proposed Project. If impact solid or groundwater were encountered and were not properly managed, this could potentially result in exposure of construction workers and the community to potential health hazards and further degradation of the environment. As a result, SCE proposes to implement APM HAZ-1 to conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to identify potential contaminated areas and APM-HAZ-3 to prepare and implement a Soil Management Plan, which would provide guidance on proper handling, onsite management, and disposal of impacted soil which may be encountered during construction. Appropriately trained professionals would be onsite during preparation, grading, and related earthwork activities to monitor soil conditions. In this way, the proposed Project's implementation of APM HAZ-1 and APM HAZ-3 would minimize the potential incremental contribution of hazards to the public and environment, and the TRTP's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required

**Would the proposed Project, be 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 or a private airstrip, such that the project, in combination with other cumulative projects, would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

The proposed Project is located within areas covered by airport land use plans and within 2 miles of public airports, but would not result in a safety hazard because SCE would be required to consult with the FAA and conform to all applicable FAA safety standards and guidelines. As a result, the proposed Project would have no cumulative impact on airport safety. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

During construction, all activity would occur on the proposed Project site; however, in the event an activity is planned that could potentially affect implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, SCE would consult with local agencies including Caltrans, in order to determine an acceptable traffic system or alternative route, if needed. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. In addition, other cumulative projects are expected to implement similar measures and no significant cumulative impacts are expected. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, 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?**

During construction, the risk of fire danger from a project would be related to smoking, refueling and operating vehicles and other equipment off roadways. T/Ls may pose a low risk of if a conducting object comes in close proximity of a line or if a line falls to the ground.

SCE proposes APM HAZ-4 to develop and implement a Fire Management Plan (included as Appendix D in this PEA). The Fire Management Plan addresses construction activities for the Project, and establishes standards and practices that will minimize the risk of fire danger, and in the case of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. Areas of highest sensitivity are located on the ANF where future cumulative developments are relatively small scale and few in number. The ANF and other jurisdictions would require the cumulative projects to implement appropriate procedures to avoid and minimize the potential for wildland fires, and, as a result, the potential for cumulative projects to cause significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildfire during construction is considered low. For these reasons, the cumulative impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required

During operation, T/Ls may pose a low risk of fire if a conducting object comes in close proximity of a line or if a line falls to the ground. However, T/L structures used to support

overhead T/Ls must meet the requirements of the California Public Utility Commission, General Order No. 95, Rules for Overhead Electric Line Construction and other applicable regulations, including the National Electric Safety Code. Because the proposed Project incorporates system protection features designed to safeguard the public and Project components, and all other cumulative projects are expected to comply with existing safety codes and regulations, the cumulative potential to cause significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildfire due to design-related problems is considered low. Given that the cumulative projects are not expected to pose a significant risk of fire, and given that SCE is committed to implementing its Fire Management Plan, the TRTP's contribution to regional fire risk would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Maintenance vehicles may pose as a fire risk if sparks from the exhaust ignite nearby brush. However, SCE will maintain appropriate vegetation clearance during construction and operation of the Project to reduce the fire hazard potential. Additionally, APM HAZ-4 mentioned above, also consists of an operation component, which addresses operation and maintenance-related standards and practices which will minimize the risk of fire danger, and in the case of fire, provide for immediate suppression and notification. With implementation of the measures presented in APM-HAZ-4, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to wildfire hazards from maintenance activities would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

### **5.5.8 Hydrology and Water Quality**

The geographic scope of cumulative effects for hydrology and water quality includes the area encompassed by the combined boundaries of the 14 Hydrologic Sub-Areas (HSAs) traversed by the proposed Project. HSAs are typically similar in geology and hydrology. HSA boundaries are appropriate to represent the geographic extent of this cumulative effects analysis because their combined area includes all major hydrologic features that could be directly affected by the proposed Project.

#### **5.5.8.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

Hydrological and water quality impacts of the TRTP would be less than significant with implementation of the APMs detailed in Section 4.9 (see Table 4.9-1). These include APM HYD-1 (Develop and Implement a Construction SWPPP), APM HYD-2 (Conduct an Environmental Training Program), APM HYD-3 (Establish Accidental Spill Control Procedures), APM HYD-4 (Establish Non-storm Water and Waste Management Pollution Controls), APM HYD-5 (Conduct Phase 1 ESAs), APM HYD-6 (Implement Construction Site Dewatering Procedures), APM HYD-7 (Design and Site Structures to Avoid and Minimize Flood Damage), and APM HYD-8 (Operation Storm Water Management Plan).

The paragraphs that follow summarize Project impacts and assess whether they would be considerable when combined with other past, present and foreseeable projects.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

Soil disturbance during the construction of any project can result in soil erosion and sedimentation that can affect water quality. Most soil disturbance by the TRTP would occur during construction of temporary and permanent roads, as well as substation construction (Whirlwind) and expansions (Antelope and Vincent). These activities involve soil disturbance and stockpiling of earth that could potentially accelerate erosion that could wash into waterways and downstream tributaries. Implementation of APM HYD-1 (Develop and Implement a Construction SWPPP) and APM HYD-2 (Conduct an Environmental Training Program) would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. Moreover, projects that would disturb one or more acres of ground surface also would need to implement a Construction SWPPP to control erosion. Although proposed Project impacts could combine with other construction projects in the same watersheds, the incremental contribution of the proposed Project would not be considerable when compared to the scale of the cumulative projects. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Water quality can also be affected by accidental release of hazardous materials during any construction project. Such materials include: diesel fuel, gasoline, lubricant oils, hydraulic fluid, antifreeze, transmission fluid, lubricant grease, and other fluids. The preparation and pouring of concrete and the use of motorized equipment are examples of construction activities that would specifically involve the use of potentially harmful materials. The release of one or more hazardous materials could occur at tower installation locations, site laydown and preparation areas, substations, and other locations where construction activities would occur. Accidentally spilled hazardous materials could pollute surface water through direct runoff into nearby waterways or water bodies, including ephemeral streams and desert washes. These materials could also pollute groundwater through soil infiltration or direct runoff, if the groundwater table is exposed during excavation activities and such activities coincide with the occurrence of an accidental spill. Any of the waterways traversed by the proposed Project could be affected by this impact. In addition, tributaries of these waterways could also be affected, depending on the severity of the spill.

To reduce potential impacts to water quality from accidental releases of hazardous materials, SCE would implement APM HYD-1 through APM HYD-4, which consists of: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan(s) (SWPPP), Environmental Training Program, Accidental Spill Control Procedures, and Non-Storm Water and Waste Management Pollution Controls. Such measures would manage, control, and minimize potential water contamination such that the proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?**

The TRTP has the potential to encounter groundwater during drilling and excavation of footing for LSTs and TSPs. The small size of each footing and the dispersed spatial distribution of the footings indicate the proposed Project would not substantially deplete or impact groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with recharge. The TRTP would introduce only minor amounts of new permanent impervious areas. Compared with cumulative residential developments that would greatly increase water use and create thousands of acres of new impermeable surfaces throughout the Antelope Valley, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to the cumulative impact would not be considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite?**

The LSTs and TSPs would not be located in a streambed or riverbed and therefore there would be little or no potential for the proposed Project to alter the course of such watercourses. Scraping and grading for the towers and new spur and access roads would remove vegetation and disturb the soil surface, which would result in a negligible reduction in the infiltration and absorption capacity of surface soils within the impacted area. The potential impacts from spur roads and access roads would be localized and temporary. In addition, the SWPPP required by APM HYD-1 would include an erosion control plan to minimize any potential increase in surface water runoff resulting from new or improved roads. As a result, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to these cumulative impacts would not be considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, 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?**

The potential runoff from towers is expected to be negligible due to the small surface area of each footing. In addition, towers would be designed and engineered to facilitate natural drainage patterns. As a result, the proposed Project's incremental contribution with respect to runoff would be less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area?**

The proposed Project does not involve housing construction and would have no cumulative impact in this regard. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

The proposed Project would locate some LSTs within some FEMA-designated Flood Hazard Areas. Development is permitted in Flood Hazard Areas, provided that the development complies with local floodplain management ordinances. Due to the relatively small size of LSTs and TSPs and their dispersed siting, placement of towers in Flood Hazard Areas is not expected to cause diversion of flows or increased flood risk for adjacent property. All applicable floodplain management ordinances would be fully complied with in accordance with FEMA's regulations on development in Flood Hazard Areas. As a result, and in light of the scale of future cumulative developments, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to placing structures within Flood Hazard Areas would not be considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

None of the infrastructure associated with the proposed Project would be situated within a watercourse. Although the proposed route does span multiple waterways, structures would be located on nearby hillsides and other land areas and would be engineered to withstand stresses resulting from their proximity to the waterways. Implementation of APM HYD-7 would reduce potential impacts resulting from the placement of transmission towers in a Flood Hazard Area to less than considerable level. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, 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?**

The proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding because: a) the project would comply with all FEMA regulations on development in Flood Hazard Areas; b) no people or structures would be situated within a watercourse; c) construction activities do not have the potential to cause the failure of a levee or dam.; and d) Implementation of APM HYD-7 (Design and Site Structures to Avoid and Minimize Flood Damage) would reduce the proposed Project's susceptibility to flood damage. The proposed Project's incremental contribution of cumulative risks from flooding would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in or be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

Because no large water bodies exist in the vicinity of the proposed Project, there would be no potential impact from tsunamis and seiches. Portions of the TRTP would be located in areas of steep unstable slopes that are potentially susceptible to mud flows and other erosion forces. Implementation of APM HYD-1 and APM HYD-7 and appropriate Geology and Soils APMs would minimize potential impacts such that the proposed Project's incremental contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.9 Land Use**

The geographic scope for the cumulative impact analysis associated with land use encompasses the ANF and communities that would be traversed by the proposed Project. These include the following cities and unincorporated communities in Kern County, Los Angeles County, and San Bernardino County:

- Lancaster
- Palmdale
- Pasadena
- La Canada Flintridge
- Duarte
- Monrovia
- Irwindale
- San Gabriel
- Baldwin Park
- Ontario
- Rosemead
- Monterey Park
- Industry
- Avocado Heights
- South El Monte
- Chino
- Montebello
- Whittier
- Chino Hills
- Pico Rivera
- Whittier
- La Habra Heights
- Hacienda Heights
- Rowland Heights

**5.5.9.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

Rapid development and population growth has been ongoing within incorporated areas (such as in the Cities of Lancaster, Palmdale, and Ontario) and the unincorporated area of Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties. Less development has been noted in the unincorporated areas of Kern County that would be traversed by or adjacent to the Project.

Past and ongoing development can result in a permanent change in land uses, and therefore have an impact on existing land uses. The siting of new projects and development is often located in existing open space areas, and has also extended across existing agricultural uses, especially in northern Los Angeles County (see Section 5.5.2 for a discussion of cumulative impacts to agricultural lands). Past development within Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and

Kern counties has already altered existing land uses and permanently precluded some land uses such as open space and agriculture. Consequently, the impacts of projects listed in Table 5.3-2 that encroach and permanently alter existing land uses could be cumulatively considerable.

The potential for land use impacts of the proposed Project to combine with the effects of other projects within the geographic scope of the cumulative analysis are described below.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, physically divide an established community?**

The proposed Project would take place primarily in existing and expanded T/L R-O-W and at substation locations, with temporary construction staging areas located on vacant land. The proposed Project is not expected to contribute to cumulative impacts resulting from dividing an established community. Segments 5, 6, 7, and most of 11 would be constructed within an existing T/L R-O-W, and since T/Ls already exist along these Segments, there would be no additional division of communities. Segments 4, 8, 10, and 11, as well as new and expanded substations included in Segment 9, would require acquisition of additional land and/or R-O-W. These segments would not divide established communities, as the additional R-O-W will be acquired adjacent to the existing T/L corridor and where the current land use is vacant, agricultural, or open space. A portion of acquired R-O-W along Segment 8 would traverse proposed Specific Plan areas. However, development of the Specific Plans would not be affected by the proposed Project, as the existing T/L corridor was considered in the design of these plans. No cumulative impacts are expected. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

As proposed, the Project would not create impacts to planned developments within the Specific Plan areas identified in this PEA. No current or future projects have been proposed in the vicinity of the Project that would contribute to a cumulative impact to planned development within these communities. As such, no cumulative impacts to planned developments would be anticipated to occur. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not require removal of any existing residential, commercial, or industrial structures. No impacts are anticipated. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Though the proposed Project could potentially conflict with some land use plans, policies, and regulations, the impacts are less than significant due to the CPUC's jurisdiction over electric power line projects and substations pursuant to General Order No. 131-D. As noted,

the CPUC requires that public utilities consult with local agencies and consider local regulations in locating these projects. The relevant policies are related to protecting the environment and avoiding impacts. In this way, the proposed Project has been designed to minimize or avoid impacts where possible. As a result, the incremental contribution of the proposed Project with respect to conflicts with applicable plans, policies, or regulations would be less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural conservation plan?**

The proposed Project is not expected to have significant effects due to conflicts with local Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) and Sensitive Environmental Areas (SEAs). Segments 4, 5, and 10, and the Whirlwind, Antelope, and Vincent substations (which are components of Segment 9) are entirely within the West Mojave Plan (WMP) (BLM, 2006). A portion of Segments 6 and 11 are also within the WMP. However, the WMP is currently applicable to federal lands only. Segments 4, 5, 6, 10, 11 and the Whirlwind, Antelope, and Vincent Substations would not be located on federal lands. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with the WMP. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

A portion of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species HCP (MSHCP) is located within the 0.5-mile buffer from the Mira Loma Substation and Segment 8, but does not intersect Segment 8. No impacts are expected. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives.

No cumulative impacts resulting from a conflict with an HCP, SEA, or HCCP are expected to occur. No mitigation measures are required. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.10 Mineral Resources**

The proposed Project is not expected to have any adverse impacts to Mineral Resources and, therefore, would not incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

### 5.5.11 Noise

#### 5.5.11.2 Introduction

This section assesses the proposed TRTP with regard to whether a particular impact of the proposed Project could combine with similar effects of other projects to create cumulative noise impacts. The TRTP when considered together with other reasonably foreseeable projects from a noise perspective has the potential to result in short term noise impacts during the construction phase of the TRTP (i.e., between April 2009 and November 2003) in the Project area.

The proposed TRTP T/L routes traverse a wide variety of land uses, including open desert areas, mountainous open and forested areas, residential communities, commercial, and industrial areas. Past development and population growth within the various cities traversed by the TRTP segments and in adjacent unincorporated areas have expanded the potential for man-made noise, mainly due to roadway traffic, air traffic, and ongoing construction projects. Due to the multiple types of land uses that have developed, a wide range of noise sources occur in the geographic area and will continue to occur in the cumulative baseline.

Future baseline noise levels within the geographic area described above are expected to be incrementally higher than the levels in the present regional setting where increased urbanization, population growth, or human activity occurs. This is particularly true for the areas where large-scale residential development projects are currently under construction and for open areas that currently have relatively low ambient noise levels. Approved and pending projects (future), listed in Tables 5.3-1 and 5.3-2 and shown on Figure 5.3-1 include multiple residential development projects. These projects would add to the future noise levels of the geographic area.

#### 5.5.11.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Potential cumulative construction and operations phase noise impacts associated with the TRTP are addressed below. As discussed in Section 4.12.5 (Applicant Proposed Measures [APMs]) SCE has incorporated four APMs into the Project design to avoid or reduce potential Project-related noise effects.

**Would the Project result in the 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?**

Construction noise impacts are usually sporadic and occur during daytime hours. For this reason, they rarely have a significant influence on 24-hour noise descriptions such as Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or a Day-night Average Noise Level ( $L_{dn}$ ). Thus, measured by the standards used in most Noise Elements, TRTP construction noise

would not be considered a significant impact. Construction noise is potentially significant, but short-term in nature and minimized by limiting the hours of construction, which is built into the proposed TRTP design. TRTP specific construction phase impacts would be expected to be less than significant. The proposed TRTP's potential construction noise impacts would be short term, temporary, less than significant, and would not be expected to contribute considerably to any significant cumulative noise impacts in the Project area that would exceed applicable noise standards.

Operational phase corona discharge noise from 500 kV and 220 kV T/Ls as well as noise from substation transformers are normally below applicable standards at the edge of the T/L R-O-Ws and at substation boundaries; therefore, operational phase noise impacts would be expected to be less than significant. Operational phase TRTP noise impacts would not be expected to contribute considerably to any cumulative exceedance of applicable noise standards in the Project area.

**Would the Project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels?**

Construction and operation of proposed TRTP facilities would not involve activities with the potential to generate excessive groundbourne vibration or noise levels. Potential cumulative impacts related to groundbourne vibration and/or noise would be less than significant.

**Would the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the Project?**

Operation of proposed TRTP facilities (e.g., T/Ls and substations) would not result in substantial increases in noise levels in the Project vicinity due to T/L related corona noise (estimated at 40 to 50 dBA at the edge of the T/L R-O-Ws) or substation transformers (estimated at 50 to 60 dBA at 100 feet from the source). TRTP operational noise impacts would be expected to be less than significant and would not contribute considerably to any significant cumulative increase in ambient noise levels in the Project area.

**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?**

The proposed TRTP would not result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity with the possible exception of helicopter generated noise during construction and infrequent maintenance operations (e.g., once per year T/L inspection). Impacts would be short-term, transient, less than significant, and would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative increases in ambient noise levels existing without the Project.

**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?**

The proposed TRTP would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to long-term excessive noise levels regardless of the location with respect to airports. Therefore, there would be no impact and no potential to contribute to cumulative impacts.

**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?**

The proposed TRTP would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels regardless of the location with respect to private airstrips. Therefore, there would be no impact and no potential to contribute to cumulative impacts.

With implementation of APMs for TRTP noise (see Section 4.14.5), significant cumulative noise impacts would not be expected to occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary to reduce cumulative noise impacts.

### **5.5.12 Population and Housing**

The following section analyzes the proposed Project with respect to whether a particular impact of the proposed Project would combine with similar effects of other projects to create cumulative population or housing impacts. The geographic extent for the analysis of includes Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties.

#### **5.5.12.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

The three counties within the Project geographic extent are marked with substantial past and ongoing development and population growth, particularly in Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties. Section 4.13 Population and Housing provides existing population, housing, and employment conditions within the geographic scope area.

As shown in population forecasts in Table 5.4-1, the three-county region is projected to undergo rapid population growth. In this way, as the population increases through an indirect and direct influence of development, housing demands and workforce pools expand to serve the growing population and development needs. In addition, continued development creates more infrastructure and development affecting employment opportunities.

Projects listed in Table 5.3-2 support the rapid population growth projections, with the dominant majority of projects relating to residential development (large-scale planned communities, small-scale residential, and infill and redevelopment). These projects are located in both developed and undeveloped areas, which reflect the ongoing and continuing

expansion and build-out. Cumulatively considerable impacts are those which would result in the potential impacts to residential structures from displacement issues and increased housing demand.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?**

Construction and operation of the proposed Project does not involve constructing or proposing new homes and businesses; therefore, the proposed Project would not directly contribute to population growth. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

The workforce required for the proposed Project construction would be drawn from regional and non-regional labor pools. Within the context of the construction workforce required for the cumulative projects, the labor force needed to construct the proposed Project would be a negligible fraction of the available labor pool. Furthermore, given that construction needs are temporary, few, if any, non-local construction workers are expected to permanently relocate to the area. Any contribution to growth would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

As discussed in Section 7.0, Growth-Inducing Impacts, the proposed Project would not induce growth, but instead is being developed to accommodate both existing and forecast load demand. In addition, one of the purposes of the proposed Project is to interconnect and deliver energy from planned alternative energy projects (owned by independent power producers) to SCE's load centers. While the proposed Project improves the overall system capability to adequately serve the existing and forecasted load demand, it is not intended to supply power related to potential growth for any one particular development. Those projects do not depend on the proposed Project to be built. Any contribution to growth would be less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, displace substantial numbers of housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

Construction and operation of the proposed Project and would not require the removal of existing housing. Therefore, the proposed Project would have no cumulative contribution to impacts associated with the removal and replacement of housing. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

The proposed Project would not remove any housing or otherwise displace any people. It would not contribute to any cumulative impact associated with the need to construct new replacement housing. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

### **5.5.13 Public Services and Utilities**

The geographic scope for the cumulative impact analysis associated with public services and utilities encompasses the ANF and communities that would be traversed by the proposed Project. These communities include the following cities and unincorporated areas in Kern County, Los Angeles County, and San Bernardino County:

- Lancaster
- Palmdale
- Pasadena
- La Cañada Flintridge
- Duarte
- Monrovia
- Irwindale
- San Gabriel
- Baldwin Park
- Ontario
- Rosemead
- Monterey Park
- Industry
- South El Monte
- Avocado Heights
- Chino
- Montebello
- Whittier
- Chino Hills
- Pico Rivera
- Whittier
- La Habra Heights
- Hacienda Heights
- Rowland Heights

#### **5.5.13.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

Public services are provided by county and municipal fire and police services to incorporated, unincorporated, and ANF jurisdictions. The utilities and service systems are supplied by both service providers and municipal entities to the cumulative impact area. Section 4.14 describes the existing public services and utilities systems within the geographic scope of this cumulative analysis.

Past development and ongoing population growth within the communities identified above place demands on capacities and capabilities of public services and utilities systems and, therefore, can affect existing public services and utilities systems. As the population increases through an indirect and direct influence of development, public services and utilities systems need to expand to serve the growing population. Cumulatively considerable impacts are those which would result in the potential significant impacts affecting capacities and capabilities of existing public services and utilities systems.

The cumulative impact analysis below discusses the potential for the utilities and service systems impacts of the proposed Project (see Section 4.14) to combine with the effects of past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future projects listed in Table 5.3-2.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities for fire and police protection?**

As a result of the temporary nature of the construction work, few, if any workers would be expected to permanently relocate to the Project area. As a result, the proposed Project would not increase demands on police protection and, hence, would have no impact that would require new or expanded police protection facilities. No mitigation measures are warranted.

Temporary construction activities could potentially increase fire risks, due to accidents or negligence by the construction personnel or equipment. As a result, SCE proposes to implement APM PUB-1, SCE Fire Plan (see Appendix D), which addresses fire prevention practices and emergency contingency procedures that would be implemented in the event of such an incident. Implementation of the Plan is expected to prevent potential fire incidents, and provide quick response and effective suppression of any fires that may occur. In this way, potential fire risks during construction of the proposed Project would be minimized and the incremental contribution to the cumulative demand for fire protection would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Because the USDA Forest Service provides fire suppression service exclusively for National Forest Service lands, only development projects on NFS lands would potentially contribute to a cumulative impact on USDA Forest Service fire fighting facilities. As a result of the fire management practices (Appendix D) described above, in addition to the ANF's network of fire protection services and multiple response resources, as discussed in Section 4.14, potential fire risks during construction of the proposed Project within the ANF would result in a less than considerable contribution to the cumulative demand for fire protection. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

Potential fire risks during Project operation would typically result from inadequate brush or foliage clearance in the R-O-W, or problems with the T/L support structures. SCE's operation and maintenance procedures for the proposed T/Ls involve periodic inspection (e.g., at least once per year) via helicopter and truck where accessible, maintenance of the T/L corridors and access roads, and maintenance on the T/L on an as-needed basis. Such practices would also apply to Project areas within ANF lands. In this way, potential fire risks during Project operation would be minimized such that the incremental contribution to the cumulative demand for fire protection would be less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures are required.

Operation of the proposed Project is expected to result in a negligible number of worker relocations to the Project area; consequently, the Project operation would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to police protection services. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities for schools or parks?**

As a result of the temporary and transient nature of the construction work, few, if any workers would be expected to permanently relocate to the Project area. Operation of the proposed Project would be conducted by SCE's existing workforce and if additional personnel were needed, it is likely they would be drawn from the large regional workforce. Furthermore, the proposed Project would not contribute to regional population growth (see Section 7.0, Growth-Inducing Impacts). Because construction and operation of the proposed Project is expected to result in a negligible number of worker relocations to the Project area, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on schools and parks would be not be considerable. No mitigation measures are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in provision of other new or physically altered governmental public facilities?**

Numerous major hospitals along the Project route have capabilities and facilities to treat medical emergencies. The peak construction workforce is estimated to number approximately 350 workers over a large geographic area. Relative to the number of major medical facilities along and within the Project area, any medical emergencies that may arise during construction would not be expected to place an undue burden on local hospitals and new or expanded facilities would be required. No impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

As discussed above, operation of the proposed Project would result in a negligible, if any, relocation of new workers to the Project area, and the Project not result in a direct increase in the local population (Section 7.0, Growth-Inducing Impacts). As a result, the proposed Project would not increase any demands on other public facilities and hence, would result in no cumulatively considerable effects on other public facilities. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?**

Construction of the proposed Project does not involve wastewater treatment systems subject to Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality limits. Operation of the new, expanded, or upgraded substations may potentially generate stormwater runoff subject to Regional Water Quality Control Board water quality standards. As a result, SCE would prepare and implement Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure plans where applicable to prevent and manage potential introductions of hazardous materials into storm water discharges (see Section 4.8). Operation of the proposed Project therefore would not be

expected to violate Regional Water Quality Control Board stormwater quality limits, and therefore the proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution that leads to an exceedance of applicable water quality standards. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?**

The proposed Project area is currently served by multiple water and wastewater treatment facilities (identified for each jurisdiction in Section 4.14) which currently provide large-scale service capabilities to the Project area. Water consumed during construction of the proposed Project consists of that used for fugitive dust mitigation and worker consumption, and would be considered a minimal quantity with respect to available supplies. Wastewater generated during construction of the proposed Project would be limited to quantities generated by the workforce, which at any one time is expected to average approximately 155 workers. It is expected that construction personnel would utilize portable toilets and would not cause direct discharges to sanitary sewer systems. The quantity of wastewater generated from these workers would be a negligible contribution to the existing and projected wastewater load. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not result in a considerable cumulative impact to water and wastewater treatment facilities. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Operation of the proposed Project is expected to be conducted by SCE's existing workforce, with few, if any, new employee additions. As a result, the proposed Project would not result in the need for new water or wastewater facilities. Any contribution would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?**

The proposed Project includes construction and expansion of storm water drainage facilities. SCE's construction practices include preparation and implementation of a construction SWPPP that would avoid and minimize potential sources of storm water contamination and other environmental impacts to less than significant levels. Operation of the proposed Project also would not require additional provision for storm water drainage facilities. As a result, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources?**

During construction of the proposed Project, water would be required for dust suppression and domestic uses for the workers. As discussed above, the quantity of water needed represents a small and temporary demand of relative to regional water availability. During operation, the proposed Project would require negligible amounts of water for maintenance activities and would not substantially change the demands placed on water suppliers. The proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts to water supplies would not be considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

While ANF lands include watersheds necessary for the health and availability of water supply within the area, it is not anticipated that these lands would be affected by new or expanded water entitlements or resource facilities. Additionally, because the nature of projects on ANF lands are largely recreational or infrastructure related to maintaining or improving the natural conditions within the Forest, and are not utility intensive projects such as residential, commercial, or industrial projects, the past, ongoing, and future projects on ANF lands combined with the proposed Project would not substantially affect water supplies. Consequently, the proposed Project would result in no cumulatively considerable impacts on the ANF. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitment?**

As previously mentioned, the proposed Project area is currently served by multiple wastewater treatment facilities (identified for each jurisdiction in Section 4.14) which currently provide large-scale service capabilities to the Project area. Wastewater generated during construction of the proposed Project would be limited to quantities generated by Project personnel and would be accommodated by portable restrooms brought to the staging areas. The portable toilets would be pumped into septic tanks or municipal sewage systems, as appropriate.

The Project construction would reach a peak workforce of 350 personnel. While a portion of these workers may originate from non-regional labor pools, the quantity of wastewater generated from these workers is expected to contribute negligible amounts to the existing wastewater load. Within a cumulative context, the additional wastewater generation represents minimal and temporary fractions. In this way, construction of the proposed Project would contribute no cumulatively considerable impacts to wastewater treatment facilities, capacities. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Operation of the proposed Project is expected to be conducted by SCE's existing workforce, with few, if any, new employee additions. As a result, the proposed Project would be expected to generate only minimal wastewater quantities, which would contribute no cumulatively considerable impacts to wastewater treatment facility capacities. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

As described above in Section 4.14, solid waste generated during proposed Project construction would be within the capacities of local landfills for the proposed Project. Additionally, SCE's recycling efforts would minimize the amount of solid waste disposal.

Project operations would generate minimal amounts of solid waste, which would generally consist of brush material cleared from the R-O-W. To the extent practical, SCE would allocate the solid waste to waste facilities incorporating waste diversion processes, which would minimize the potential impact on existing landfill capacities. In this way, the incremental contribution of the proposed Project to the solid waste stream would be less than cumulatively considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, violate federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

SCE would recycle waste materials to the maximum extent practical, and expects to recycle at least 50 percent of the construction and demolition waste materials such as steel from LSTs. Solid waste generated during the proposed Project operation would be essentially limited to trash from the substations which would be diverted into local waste processes that would comply with solid waste requirements. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to violate applicable statutes and regulations relating to solid waste and hence, would not contribute to cumulative impacts. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

#### **5.5.14 Recreation**

The geographic area considered for the evaluation of cumulative effects on recreation is the linear extent of the overall proposed Project (Segments 4-11) and a width of 1 mile from the edge of the R-O-W or substation property (i.e., a study area 2 miles wide, centered on the project). Many of the projects considered in the cumulative projects list extend beyond this distance, but the effects of the proposed TRTP Project on recreational resources would be limited just to the T/L R-O-W and substation properties and their immediate vicinity.

**5.5.14.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, increase the use of existing Neighborhood and regional parks of other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

Ongoing land development projects that provide new residences to accommodate population growth throughout the regions crossed by the proposed Project will affect recreational facilities. As populations increase, the demand for parks, sports fields, and other recreational areas and programs will also increase. As the population increases, there will be greater demand placed on open space areas, trails, and natural park areas. These effects would be greatest in those areas experiencing the most rapid population growth and increases in new land development. In general terms, these are areas where incorporated cities have considerable vacant land suitable for development. Palmdale and Lancaster are typical of such areas, but other cities and unincorporated areas along the various project segments continue to experience new development as well. In all of these areas, parkland is dedicated at the time subdivisions are approved (or in lieu fees are paid for this purpose). Local city and county governments are responsible for planning and developing parks and recreational facilities to serve their populations.

At the same time, regional recreational facilities are developed by higher levels of governments, including the Federal Government (U.S. Forest Service), State of California (Parks and Recreation Department and Department of Fish and Game), and county governments. These provide special and unique recreational opportunities for people over a very large area.

The increased demand for recreational facilities caused by the increase in population is met through regional and local government planning, with implementation using a variety of techniques. These include the exactions of parkland in the subdivision process mentioned above, and the use of general fund money, user fees, grants, and cooperative efforts among governments or with non-profit organizations.

The TRTP itself would neither increase nor decrease the demand for recreational facilities. Thus, it would have no project specific effect and it would not contribute towards cumulative demands for recreational facilities. The only effect of the Project on any recreational uses would be the temporary restriction of access to some recreational facilities during periods of construction. These effects would be very limited in terms of the areas affected and in terms of the length of time for the effect. Only those recreational facilities directly within existing R-O-Ws or immediately adjacent to them would be affected. As construction moved along any given project segment, the length of time that access might be restricted would vary from a few hours to a few days. In all cases, SCE would coordinate with the appropriate government agency/entity. Thus, the Project's contribution towards cumulative demand for,

or use of, recreational facilities would be less than considerable. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

The proposed TRTP does not involve the construction of new recreational facilities. Cumulative growth and development in the region does include the construction of new recreational facilities. In most cases, new recreational facilities are neighborhood or community parks that are developed within subdivisions to serve new or existing neighborhoods. Larger regional recreational facilities, such as those along the San Gabriel River, are also planned and developed by local, county, state, and federal government agencies.

The only potential effects of the TRTP on recreational facilities may be the temporary and limited restriction of access to those facilities located directly within the R-O-W or immediately adjacent to it. In all cases where this would occur, alternate access is available using existing roadways and trails so no new recreational facilities or access would have to be constructed. The proposed Project would, therefore, have no effect in terms of constructing new recreational facilities that might involve physical changes. It would not contribute towards cumulative effects related to the construction of new recreational facilities. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

### **5.5.15 Transportation and Traffic**

#### **5.5.15.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?**

Potential transportation and traffic-related cumulative impacts would be limited to the construction phase because routine Project operations involve only periodic (e.g., annual) maintenance visits. Impacts would thus be temporary and primarily involve a small increase in traffic on roadways and a small number of temporary lane closures or and/or road closures where T/L conductor stringing activities would cross roadways. A maximum of approximately 155 construction workers would be working along the TRTP at any one point in time. These workers would be traveling to and from construction staging areas in 7-8 person-capacity vehicles. Given the size of local populations, the temporary addition of a small number of construction workers to area roadways would not result in a considerable cumulative impact. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, exceed a level of service (LOS) standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Construction of the proposed Project would be short-term, generally linear in nature, and would involve a relatively small construction workforce. Road closures would require intermittent traffic detours or controlled continuous traffic breaks which would temporarily disrupt traffic flow. Such closures and detours are routinely conducted by Caltrans, local agencies and public utilities in all urban areas, and lane or road closures necessary for construction would be conducted in accordance with SCE APMs designed to avoid and minimize Project impacts on local streets, highways and rail lines. These include: APM TRA-1 (minimize use of or work on local streets); APM TRA-2 (obtain encroachment permits or similar authorizations wherever local streets must be used for more than normal street operations); APM TRA-3 (use guard poles, netting and other means of protecting moving traffic and structures when stringing or other Project construction activities require crossing streets, highways or rail lines. If necessary on state highways, provide continuous traffic breaks operated by the California Highway Patrol [CHP]); and APM TRA-4 (prepare traffic control and other management plans). In addition, any Project construction related damage to local streets would be addressed by APM TRA-5 (repair any Project-related damage to local streets).

Implementation of these APMs would reduce potential incremental contributions to cumulative impacts on roadway LOS to less than considerable levels, particularly when compared to the scale of impacts that may occur from the construction of future foreseeable projects. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, 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?**

Several TRTP segments are near small airfields and airports and some towers could exceed Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) height restrictions. SCE would be required to consult and coordinate with FAA in accordance Title 14 FAR 77 and SCE would be required to conform to all relevant FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines. This impact is not expected to combine with impacts of other projects and cumulative impacts are not expected. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses?**

The proposed Project would not involve, create, or increase hazards at applicable transportation-related facilities in the Project area and would not involve activities or features that would create incompatibility with existing land uses such as farming operations. As a result, the proposed

Project would not be expected to contribute to cumulative effects. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?**

With implementation of APM TRA-1 through APM TRA-4, the proposed TRTP would not significantly affect emergency response along any of the roadways traversed by the proposed T/L route. For example, APM TRA-3 requires the use of guard poles, netting, or similar means at T/L roadway crossings to protect moving traffic, and APM TRA-4 requires use of traffic control and other traffic management techniques, where necessary, to minimize project impacts on traffic flow and access. As a result, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, result in inadequate parking capacity?**

Construction of the proposed TRTP would not create a significant demand for offsite parking facilities, as construction workers would park in designated areas such as marshalling yards and would not utilize offsite parking facilities. As a result, construction of the proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative effects. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

Operation of the proposed TRTP involves routine visual inspection of Project facilities at least one per year and occasional maintenance work as needed along the T/L, and periodic maintenance visits within minimal trip-making to the substation facilities. Parking would take place within the Project Area, and would not utilize offsite parking facilities. As a result, the proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative effects. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?**

The proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation facilities or strategies. As a result, the proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**5.5.16 Paleontological Resources****5.5.16.1 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

**Would the proposed Project, in combination with other projects, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?**

The cumulative projects could affect paleontological resources but the fossil-bearing strata that could be affected are wide-spread in the region, and most if not all projects would undergo CEQA review, and impacts to paleontological resources would likely be subject to avoidance and minimization measures similar to SCE's APMs. As a result, no significant cumulative impacts to paleontological resources are anticipated. Even in combination with other past, current, and future projects in the area, the proposed Project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on paleontological resources. No mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts are required.

**TABLE 5.3-2  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST<sup>1</sup>**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
◇	Energy	Alta Wind Energy Center	Planned wind farm with up to 1,500 MW generation capacity.	32,000	Kern County	Construction is expected to occur between 2009-2014	Project encompasses a 50 square mile area between Mohave and Tehachapi, and extends into the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area.	Alta Windpower Development, LLC
ATP 1	Energy	Antelope-Pardee 500 kV Transmission Line Project, Segment 1	Construction of a new 25.6 mile 500 kV transmission line from SCE's existing Antelope and Pardee Substations, partially traversing the ANF.	--	Regional	Construction estimated to begin March 2008	Project route traverses through the City of Lancaster, the unincorporated areas of Antelope Valley, the ANF (Santa Clarita/Mojave Rivers Ranger District), and through the City of Santa Clarita.	Southern California Edison
ATP 2 & 3	Energy	Antelope Transmission Project, Segments 2 & 3	Construction of a new transmission line and related infrastructure between the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area through the Antelope Substation, to Vincent Substation.	--	Regional	Construction estimated to begin March 2008	Project route traverses the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area in the unincorporated areas of Kern County, the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, the City of Lancaster, and the City of Palmdale.	Southern California Edison
◇	Energy	PdV Wind Energy	Project consists of a facility including: up to 300 wind turbines not to exceed 400 feet in height, with capacities from 1 MW to 2.8 MW each (up to 300 MW total generation capacity); on-site and off-site project access roads, control cables,	6,400	Kern County	Notice of Preparation, June 2006	Project is located about 15 mi west of State Hwy. 14, and is generally bounded north and west by the Tehachapi Mountains and to the south by the Los Angeles Aqueduct.	Southwest Power Partners, LLC

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			subsurface feederline corridors located outside of project area, and transmission lines necessary to serve the project; a project substation; a 20-acre interconnection yard/switching station; an O&M building of 4,800 sq ft; and temporary construction yards and concrete batch plants.					
◇	Energy	Pine Tree Wind Development Project	80 wind turbines (total capacity: 120 MW) and: several meteorological towers, a substation, transmission line (1.1 miles), switching station, O&M bldg, and access roads	8,000	Kern County	EPC RFP issued Mar 07; FONSI (Jan. 24, 2006)	1.1 miles of transmission lines on BLM lands within Pine Tree Canyon.	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
◇	Energy	Windridge	Development of 192 acre wind farm with a capacity of 4.5 MW. Future plans to increase capacity to 9MW and then to 12 MW.	192	Kern County	Power Purchase Agreement (with SCE) expiring in 2014 to deliver output		Aero Energy, LLC (Western Wind Energy Corp)
◇	Energy	Windstar 120 MW	Development of a 1,062 acre wind farm (with contract to purchase an additional 20	1,062	Kern County	Power Purchase Agreement (with SCE) to supply output no	Project is located within the Tehachapi Pass Wind Park.	Aero Energy, LLC (Western Wind Energy Corp)

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			acres) with a capacity of 120 MW.			later than Dec. 31, 2008		
1	Transportation	California High-Speed Train System	Construction of a 700-mile high speed train system serving Sacramento, the San Francisco Bay area, Central Valley, Los Angeles, Inland Empire, Orange County, and San Diego		Regional	Completion by 2020	Project route traverses through San Diego, Orange, Los Angeles, and Kern counties, through the Central Valley, Bay Area, and Northern and Southern Mountain Crossings.	California High-Speed Rail Authority
2	Oil & Gas	El Paso Line 1903 Pipeline Conversion Project	Project involves the conversion of a crude oil pipeline to a natural gas transmission pipeline of an approx 304 mi segment, including the installation, replacement, and realignment of certain short segments of pipeline, installation of new valves, metering, and pigging facilities, and installing a new 6.4 mi interconnection between the Cadiz Pump Station and the Mojave Pipeline.		Regional	The start of construction is anticipated to be in the second half of 2005	Pipeline extends from Ehrenberg, Arizona to Wheeler Ridge near Bakersfield.	El Paso Natural Gas Company

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
3	Transportation	Maglev	Construction of a regional MAGLEV system connecting facilities in Los Angeles, Orange County, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The completed systems will connect to the San Diego region and serve as a collection system for the state's proposed high-speed rail system extending to northern California.		Regional	SCAG envisions the system to be in operation by 2010	The California Maglev alternative extends between LAX through Union Station in downtown Los Angeles and through Ontario to the March Air Reserve Base (March Field), covering a distance of approximately 83 miles.	California High Speed Rail Authority
4	Public Services - Water	Antelope Valley Water Bank Project	Project to develop facilities to recharge and store imported surface water beneath properties in the west end of Antelope Valley. Project area spans across approx 640 acres, and requires construction of wells, facilities, and accessory structures for water transportation.	640	Regional	DEIR, April 2006	Area proposed for recharge and recovery facilities is bounded by Rosamond Blvd to the north, Avenue A to the south (Kern/Los Angeles Counties line), 170th Street West to the west, and 100th Street West to the east.	Western Development and Storage, LLC
5	Large-scale Planned Community	Golden Hills Specific Plan	Specific plan authorizing various public facility, residential, commercial, and resource uses on 5,846	5,846	Kern County	Specific plan dated Dec. 1986	The project area is bounded by State Hwy 202 (Cummings Valley Blvd) to the south, Reeves Street and the western border of the	Kern County

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			acres (unincorporated).				Southern Pacific Railroad R-O-W to the east.	
6	Transportation	Route 58 Mojave Alignment Project	Four-lane freeway construction north and east of Mojave to relieve traffic congesting from the existing Route 14/58.		Kern County	Construction scheduled for Summer 2003		Kern COG and Caltrans
7	Industrial	Hyundai Corporation Test Track Facility and Habitat Conservation Plan	Limited development of 4,527 acres for an automotive test track facility and 3,387 acres of habitat conservation area.	4,527	Kern County	Approved Jan. 2004	California City, Kern County.	Hyundai Corporation
8	Large-scale Planned Community	Mojave Specific Plan	Development/redevelopment plan encompassing the Mojave community. The plan provides for land uses, infrastructure, housing, public services and utilities, open space, an airport, industrial, and commercial uses.	31,000	Kern County	Development for next 20 to 40 years	Located in the Antelope Valley area at the 14 and 58 interchange.	Kern County
9	Small-scale Residential	Case ID 10768 & 10769	General plan amendment designating residential zone,		County of Kern	General plan amendment as of	6475 105th Street, Rosamond.	Christene Bower

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			with a maximum of 8 dwellings			2007		
10	Large-scale Planned Community	Willow Springs Specific Plan	Specific plan for mixed use development in Kern County		Kern County	Residential housing subdivision approved as part of specific plan	South Kern County, from Avenue A to Dawn Road and 50th Street West to 190th Street West.	Kern County
11	Large-scale Planned Community	Copa De Oro	Residential development of 1,201-units on more than 600 acres	600	Kern County	Approved by Kern County Board of Supervisors, April 27 (year?). (more detail on level of dev)	Located between Avenue A and Gaskill Road and between 110th and 120th streets west.	
12	Large-scale Planned Community	Case ID 10985 & 10986	General plan amendment designating residential zone, with a maximum of 2400 units on 240 acres.	240	Kern County	General plan amendment as of 2007	Bounded on north by Dawn Road, east by Gillman Avenue/60th Street, south by Favorito Avenue, and west by 70th Street (approximation); (City of Rosamond).	Mojave & Tropico, LLC
13	Large-scale Planned Community	Case ID 10987 & 10988	General plan amendment designating residential zone, with a maximum of 3520 units on 352 acres.	352	Kern County	General plan amendment as of 2007	Bounded on north by Sweetser Road, east by 57th Street (approx), south by Avenue of the Stars, and west by 60th Street; (City of Rosamond).	Mojave & Tropico, LLC

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
14	Large-scale Planned Community	Case ID 11651 & 11652	General plan amendment and zone change to residential zone, for a maximum of 400 dwellings on 40 acres.	40	Kern County	GPA & ZCC as of 2007	Bounded on north by Truman Road, east by 40th Street West. South by Hook Avenue, and east by 43rd Street (approximate); (City of Rosamond).	Rosamond acres, LLC
15	Large-scale Planned Community	Case ID 11630 & 11631	General plan amendment designating residential zone for a maximum of 260 dwellings on 26 acres.	26	Kern County	General plan amendment as of 2007	Bounded on west by Salvatore Street and south by Rosamond Blvd (north and east unnamed), Rosamond.	EK Development/HFM Group
16	Large-scale Planned Community	Rosamond Specific Plan	Specific plan for mixed use development in Kern County		Kern County	Adopted	North of Kern/Los Angeles Counties boundaries, east of SR 14.	Kern County
17	Large-scale Planned Community	Case ID 11273	Zone change to designate low density residential, for 350 dwellings on 35 acres.	35	Kern County	Zoning classification change as of 2007	Bounded on north by Ash Avenue, east by 42nd Street West, south by Brasham Avenue, and west by 44th Street West (approximate), Rosamond.	Rosamond acres, LLC
18	Large-scale Planned Community	Case ID 11149	Zone change to designate residential area, for 200 dwellings on 20 acres	20	Kern County	Zoning classification change as of 2007	Bounded on north by Holiday Avenue, east by 55th Street West, south by Sue Avenue, and west by 57th Street West; (City of Rosamond).	Eisenberg, Donald/Cornerstone
19	Large-scale Planned Community	Case ID 11283 & 11285	Specific plan amendment (SPA) and zone classification change (ZCC) to designate residential	120	Kern County	SPA and ZCC, as of 2007	Bounded on north by Willow Avenue, east by 52nd Street West, south by Buckhorn Avenue, and west by 55th Street West;	Kansemento, LLC by Cornerstone

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			zone, for a maximum of 1200 dwellings on 120 acres.				(City of Rosamond).	
20	Industrial	Fox Field Industrial Corridor Specific Plan	Development of a 5,000-acre master plan industrial complex to encourage the development of major distribution centers in Lancaster.	5,000	City of Lancaster	Adopted in 1996; ongoing development, as of 2006 Development Summary	Bordered on north by Avenue K (southern border is halfway towards Avenue L), on the west by Division Street (east border is halfway to 10th E Street).	City of Lancaster
21	Public Services	Lancaster Landfill Expansion	Expansion of existing Class III non-hazardous solid waste landfill and recycling center, increasing allowable intake from 1,700 tons per day (tpd) to 3,000 tpd. No new improvements or modifications are proposed to the existing facility.		City of Lancaster	CUP currently being drafted	600 East Avenue F, Lancaster.	Waste Management Inc.
22	Large-scale Planned Community	TTM 46250 and 66241	645-880 acre area designated as a recreational planning district for 1,925-2,469 single family lots, and potentially 1 commercial lot and 2 school lots.	880	City of Lancaster	Approved CUP	Property located between 92nd and 105th Street West and Avenues G & H.	Standard Pacific Corporation, Westlake

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
23	Large-scale Planned Community	Del Sur Ranch Development	Development of 880 acres for 2,469 single family lots, 1 park, 1 commercial lot, and 2 school lots.	880	City of Lancaster	--	Located in the far northwest corner of Lancaster near Avenue G and 90th Street West.	Larwin Company
24	Large-scale Planned Community	TTM 47583 and 47771 (related) (CUP 02-04, SP 95-01)	40-80 acre area for 136-289 single family lots and 3 open space lots.	60	City of Lancaster	Approved tentative tract map	Southeast corner of 90th Street West and Avenue I.	Forecast Homes, Lomita
25	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, Hughs Lake	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Location designated shows recreation residences at Hughs Lake.		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision issued for each tract by Dec. 06	The Hughs Lake recreation residences are located in the northeastern portion of the ANF, within the Santa Clara Ranger District.	ANF
26	Large-scale Planned Community	TTM 53229	Development of 483 acres for 1,594 single family lots, 1 school, and 1 park.	483	City of Lancaster	Approved tentative tract map	Located at 70th Street West and Avenue K.	Lancaster 563, LLC, Newport Beach
27	Large-Scale Planned Community	TTM 49526	147 acres for 339 single family lots.	147	City of Lancaster	Approved tentative tract map	Between 40th and 48th Street West, Avenue J-6 and K.	Pacific Communities, Newport Beach
28	Infill/ Redevelopment	Northeast Gateway Corridors Plan	The primary objectives of the NGCP are to: facilitate the transition and		City of Lancaster	FEIR certified, ~ Jan. 07	This area is generally bounded by 10th Street West, West Avenue H-8, Challenger Way and Avenue	City of Lancaster

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			redevelopment of the existing Antelope Valley Fairgrounds site; enhance the aesthetics of Avenue I, Sierra Highway, Division Street, and other major streets; redevelop specific housing areas; improve the stability of existing neighborhoods; provide subdivision and site planning design guidance for infill development; contribute to the open space and parks goals of the community; ensure adequate infrastructure.				I.	
29	Large-scale Planned Community	North Downtown Transit Village Program	The NDTV involves developing an area of 100 acres with construction of affordable housing, relocation of several social service organizations into one area, improved educational opportunities, and improved retail opportunities for area residents and employees.	100	City of Lancaster		The project area is bounded by Avenue I, Lancaster Boulevard, Sierra Highway and 10th Street West.	City of Lancaster

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			This project will enhance the mix of residential, commercial, educational, religious, and public uses.					
30	Infill/ Redevelopment	Downtown Lancaster Specific Plan	Development of specific plan to create a downtown corridor in Lancaster.		City of Lancaster	Specific Plan to be developed Nov. 06-Feb. 07)	East of Antelope Valley Fwy. 14.	City of Lancaster
31	Infill/ Redevelopment	Lowtree Neighborhood Program (LNP)	The purpose of the LNP is to eliminate blight with the construction of affordable housing and ensure adequate infrastructure.		City of Lancaster	Planning program initiated Sept. 05	The LNP is generally bounded by West Avenue J, 15th Street West, West Avenue J-8 and west of 12th Street West.	
32	Large-scale Planned Community	TTM 060348	Recreational planning district (RPD) for 162 single family lots (8.49 acres).	9	City of Lancaster	Approved CUP; expires 5/08	Northeast corner of 10th Street West and Avenue J-6.	Magnolia LP
33	Infill/ Redevelopment	Central Business District	Development framework in Lancaster to promote the downtown area and attract new businesses, while preventing erosion of the business district.		City of Lancaster	Adopted into ordinance in 1989	West to east: 10th Street West to Sierra Highway; north to south: Jackman Street to Newgrove Street.	City of Lancaster
34	Commercial	Amargosa Creek Specific Plan (Amargosa Creek	Development in Lancaster of up to 1,500,000 sq ft of commercial, retail, and office uses, and 40 acre medical facility; entire plan area	152	City of Lancaster	EIR expected in Jul. 07, SP expected in Aug. 07	Located in urban core of Lancaster, bounded roughly by Avenues K-8 and L and by Fifth and 10th streets west.	City of Lancaster

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
		Improvements Project)	consists of approximately 152 acres.					
35	Small-scale Residential	Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) 60291	39 single family units on 20.64 acres.	20.64	City of Lancaster	FEIR certified Jan. 07	Located south of Avenue K-4 between 30th Street and 40th Street West.	Fieldstone Community
36	Small-scale Residential	VTTM 60664	66 single family units on 8 acres	8	City of Lancaster	FEIR certified Jan. 07	Located between Avenue K and Avenue K-4 and between Buena Vista Way and Alep Street.	Fieldstone Community
37	Commercial	Commercial Center (CUP 89-17)	Lancaster commercial center with 186,338 sq ft gross floor area, on 20 acre property	20	City of Lancaster	Approved CUP; Phases 1 and 2 (of 3) are complete	Northwest corner of 40th Street West and Avenue L.	Wood Investments, Irvine
38	Public Services	Church Facility (CUP 99-06)	Phase 2 of church facility development in Lancaster for 28,040 sq ft building with 2,500 seat auditorium and classrooms	<1	City of Lancaster	Approved CUP	Southeast corner of Avenue L-8 and 40th Street West.	Los Angeles International Church of Christ, Chatsworth
	Large-scale Planned Community	VTTM 46192	Subdivide 130 acres into 631 single family lots and a 1-acre drainage basin	130	City of Lancaster	Approved tentative tract map; expires 10/16/08	Located south of Avenue H between 80th and 90th Street West.	Lancaster Redevelopment Agency
	Small-scale Residential	TTM 62845	Approved tentative tract map for 63 single family lots on 37.02 acres.	37	City of Lancaster	Approved tentative tract map; expires 2/21/08	Located at the northwest corner of 32nd Street West and Avenue M.	Bruce Gale
	Small-scale Residential	TTM 62979	Approved tentative tract map for 88 single family lots located on 20 acres	20	City of Lancaster	Approved tentative tract map; expires 2/21/08	Located at the southwest corner of 45th Street West and Jackman.	Pacific Land Company

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Small-scale Residential	TTM 63031	Approved tentative tract map for 39 single family lots on 10 acres	10	City of Lancaster	Approved tentative tract map; expires 6/19/08	Located at southwest corner of 32nd Street East and Lancaster Boulevard.	Pacific Land Company
39	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, San Francisquito	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Locations designated show recreation residences in San Francisquito.		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision expected by Dec. 06	San Francisquito is located in the eastern portion of the Santa Clara-Mojave River Ranger District.	ANF
40	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, Bouquet Canyon	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Locations designated show recreation residences in Bouquet Canyon.		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision expected by Dec. 06	Bouquet Canyon is located in the eastern portion of the Santa Clara-Mojave River Ranger District.	ANF
41	Large-scale Planned Community	Rancho Vista Development	Master-planned community of over 5,500 homes, including an 18-hole golf course, shopping areas, churches, and parks.		City of Palmdale		Located south of Avenue N, east of 60th Street West; bordered on the east by 30th Street West, on the southwest by the California Aqueduct, and on the south by Rancho Vista Road.	

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
42	Large-scale Planned Community	Joshua Ranch Development	Development of 794 acres in Palmdale for 746 residential units with an equestrian center.	746	City of Palmdale		Project area is bounded by Elizabeth Lake Road on the south and is located on the east side of Segment 5.	
43	Large-scale Planned Community	Ritter Ranch Master Planned Community	Development of 7,200 homes, 7 schools, an 18-hole golf course, and 73 acres of commercial development, comprising a total of 18 square miles.	11,520	City of Palmdale	Approved	Located within the western portion of Palmdale, south of West P Avenue, and on the west side of Segment 5.	Palmdale Hills Property, LLC, owned by SunCal Companies
44	Large-scale Planned Community	Anaverde Master Planned Community	5,200 homes, as well as retail stores, schools, riding and biking trails, parks, and Olympic-sized swimming pool.		City of Palmdale	Under construction	Project area is bounded by Elizabeth Lake Road on the north, and is located on the east side of Segment 5.	Empire Companies and KB Home
45	Public Services	Antelope Valley/Palmdale Landfill Tonnage Increase	Antelope Valley applying to increase daily tonnage intake from 1,800 tpd to 3,600 tpd.		City of Palmdale	Expansion request stalled indefinitely	Facility is located west of 14 on City Ranch Road.	Waste Management, Inc.
46	Commercial	Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan	Planned development for approx 100 acres providing for a wide range of retail, commercial recreation, and public service uses.	100	City of Palmdale	Draft Palmdale Transit Village Specific Plan, 2005	Site is bounded between Technology Boulevard to the north, Avenue Q-3 to the south, Sierra Highway to the east, and 3rd Street East to the west.	City of Palmdale
47	Large-scale	Quail Valley	Master planned residential	1,000	City of	Planned Development	Project site comprised of 2	Palmdale 1000

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Planned Community	Annexation and Development Plan	community on 1000.4 acre site, consisting of 712 dwelling units, (single family and equestrian estate), a 13.7 acre community park, and a 25.4 acre greenbelt and trail system.		Palmdale	Plan submitted to City, Nov. 2006	principle land areas: Area A, located adjacent to Avenue S, and Area B, situated in the higher elevations of the foothills and incorporating a portion of the Sierra Pelona Mt ridgeline.	Associates, LLC
	Energy	Energy Recovery Facility Electrical Transmission	Project consists of installation of a turbine generator into an existing hydroelectric station building at Lake Palmdale and installation of buried transmission conduit within an existing access road located around the lake.		City of Palmdale	Neg Dec adopted by Board Nov. 06	Project site located within fenced area of Lake Palmdale, in Antelope Valley area of unincorporated Los Angeles County, south of City of Palmdale.	Palmdale Water District
48	Small-scale Residential	Tentative Tract Map 47573	Construction of 75 single family residential units, four debris basin lots, three open space lots, and one water tank totaling 83 lots.		County of Los Angeles	Neg Dec submitted June 2006	Project area is located in the unincorporated area of Los Angeles County, north of the eastern portion of the City of Santa Clarita.	
		Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM) 53189			County of Los Angeles	SCAQMD CEQA review list	Project site is bordered on the east by San Francisquito Canyon road, on the north by Lady Linda Lane, and to the south by Lowridge Place.	
	Large-scale	Gorman Ranch	Residential development	2,500	County of		Gorman Post Road, north SR-	

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Planned Community		consisting of 227 single family units on 2,500 acres.		Los Angeles		138, east of I-5.	
	Recreation	San Gabriel Valley Bikeway Master Plan	Development of an expanded 330 mile regional bikeway network within the San Gabriel Valley, providing bicyclists access to all 28 cities, major activity centers, and other portions of the county's bike network.		County of Los Angeles	Adopted in 1995, not in implementation phase.	--	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA)
49	Resource Management	Charlton/Chilao Vegetation Treatment Project	Vegetation treatment to reduce risk of catastrophic fires from Devils Canyon watershed, encompassing an area of approx 8,500 acres.	8,500	ANF	TBD	Project located in portions of T2N, R11W, T3N, R11W, and SMA, adjacent to Angeles Crest Scenic Byway.	Los Angeles River Ranger District
50	Recreation	PCT Bridge at Cooper Canyon	Proposition to build 6'x21' wood bridge spanning north-south bank of creek for hikers and pack animals		ANF	Construction anticipated to take place during Fall 06	Bridge located along Pacific Crest Trail crossing Little Rock Creek in the vicinity of Cooper Canyon.	USFS, ANF, and Santa Clara/Mojave River Ranger District
51	Transportation	Corridor Management Plan - Angeles Crest Scenic Byway, CA State Route 2 Enhancement	Vision and management strategies for maintaining and enhancing the Angeles Crest Scenic Byway		ANF	Draft Corridor Management Plan, 2006	Various, along Angeles Crest Scenic Byway (State Route 2).	Federal Highway Administration, USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region, and California Department of

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
52	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, North Fork San Gabriel	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Location designated show recreation residences in the North Fork San Gabriel Area.		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision issued for each tract by Dec. 06	North Fork San Gabriel recreation residences are located along Highway 39, east of the San Gabriel Wilderness Area, within the San Gabriel River Ranger District.	ANF
53	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, West Fork San Gabriel	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Location designated show recreation residences in the West Fork San Gabriel Area.		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision issued for each tract by Dec. 06	West Fork recreation residences occur within the Los Angeles River Ranger District, and are located south of Highway 2 and west of the San Gabriel Wilderness Area.	ANF

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
54	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, Big Santa Anita	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Location designated show recreation residences in the Big Santa Anita Area.		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision issued for each tract by Dec. 06	Big Santa Anita recreation residences are located in the western portion of the Los Angeles River Ranger District, just above the northern borders of Sierra Madre and Monrovia.	ANF
55	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, West Fork	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Location designated show recreation residences in the West Fork Area.		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision issued for each tract by Dec. 06	West Fork recreation residences are located south of the San Gabriel Wilderness Area, within the San Gabriel River Ranger District.	ANF
56	Large-scale Planned Community	Mountain Cove	328 single family detached homes		City of Azusa	Completed Spring 2004	San Gabriel Canyon Road.	Standard Pacific
57	Small-scale Residential	Specific Plan 02SP 05-01/TTM 062064	Development of 9.14 acres into five (5) lots for future construction of four single-family residential estate dwelling units.	9.14	City of Bradbury	Specific plan approved June 2006	Property (APN: 8527-016-008) located at terminus of Westvale Road south of Susan Brook Lane.	John Sheng, Property Owner

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
58	Small-scale Residential	Andes Duarte Terrace Specific Plan	Housing for very low and low-income seniors (80 units)		City of Duarte	Specific plan approved 2003	1722 Huntington Drive.	City of Duarte
59	Small-scale Residential	Las Brisas Specific Plan	41 detached single family dwelling units		City of Duarte	Specific plan approved 1994	SE corner of Mt. Olive and Huntington Drive.	City of Duarte
60	Commercial	F	Expansion of existing outdoor/indoor storage facility, consisting of 200 additional storage spaces for recreational vehicles.		City of Irwindale	In entitlement process	1500 Crestfield Drive.	Mr. Olive Storage
61	Small-scale Residential	Encanto Parkway Specific Plan	Development plans for 40 units of senior housing		City of Duarte	Specific plan approved 1998	1168 Encanto Parkway.	City of Duarte
62	Large-scale Planned Community	Rancho Verde Specific Plan	Development plan consisting of 55 acres for 238 residential units, a golf course, and park.	55	City of Duarte	Specific plan approved 1992	North of Huntington Dr. between Encanto Parkway and Las Lomas Road.	City of Duarte
63	Commercial	Irwindale Pit #3 (Kincaid North)	Reclamation of an abandoned quarry pit to develop a 211,000 sq ft retail center.	4.8	City of Irwindale	RFP	NE corner of Irwindale Avenue and 210 freeway.	Irwindale Community Redevelopment Agency
64	Industrial	Howard Parcell Industrial Buildings	Construction of two 15,000 sq ft concrete tilt-up industrial buildings on a 27,000 sq ft parcel.	<1	City of Azusa	Project approved by City Council	720 N. Todd Avenue.	Howard Parcell
65	Industrial	Net	Construction of two concrete	<1	City of Azusa	Approved by	1020 10th Street	Net Development

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
		Development Industrial Buildings	tilt-up industrial buildings (totaling 9,500 sq ft) on two separate M-2 parcels.			Commission		
66	Public Services	National Guard Armory	92,021 sq ft National Guard Armory facility on 15 acres	2.1	City of Azusa	Concept plan approved	1201 N. Todd Avenue	Federal government
67	Commercial	Laborers Union Training Facility	29,565 sq ft training facility for construction laborers	<1	City of Azusa	Approved by Commission	1385 Sierra Madre Avenue	Laborers and Retraining Trust Fund of Southern California
68	Large-scale Planned Community	Rosedale Project	Development of a 500 acre nursery site with up to 1,250 homes, a K-8 school, a system of parks, open spaces and trails, and up to 50,000 sq ft of commercial uses adjacent to future Gold Line light rail transit station.	500	City of Azusa	DEIR, Aug 2006	Project site is east of Pasadena Avenue, north of the Metro Rail ROW, west of Yucca Ridge Road and Citrus Avenue, and south of San Gabriel Canyon Road.	Monrovia Nursery Company Azusa Land Partners, LLC
69	Commercial	College Center (Slater Brothers) Remodeling	Architectural remodeling of shopping center façade.		City of Azusa	Under construction	Northwest corner of Alostia Avenue and Barranca Avenue	Ventura Equity, LLC/College Center
70	Public Services	Azusa Pacific University Specific Plan	25 year building program for 1.6 million sq ft of the East Campus, 1.1 million sq ft to the West Campus.	62	City of Azusa	Approved, under construction	901 E. Alostia Avenue	Azusa Pacific University
71	Commercial/	Foothill Center	Plans to redevelop 22.7	22.7	City of Azusa	Developer to submit	Southwest corner of Citrus and	JAR-Commons,

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Industrial	Mixed-Use Development	acres retail shopping center into a mixed-use commercial/residential project.			revised site plans	Alosta.	LLC
72	Public Services	Azusa City Library	Expansion of library by 62,000 GSF and construction of an auditorium (3,000 GSF).	2	City of Azusa	2010	Northeast corner of Dalton Avenue and Foothill Boulevard.	City of Azusa
73	Commercial	Block 36 Mixed-Use Project	Redevelopment of entire block to include retail (30,000 GSF), dining (7,500 GSF), office (29,200 GSF), and apartments (133,300 GSF).	5	City of Azusa	2010	Southeast corner of Azusa Avenue and Foothill Boulevard.	City of Azusa
74	Large-scale Planned Community	Mixed-use development	Development of retail (317,000 GSF) office (44,000 GSF), and 500 condominium units.	8	City of Azusa	2010	North of Foothill Avenue between San Gabriel Avenue and Dalton Avenue.	
75	Infill/Redevelopment	Downtown Azusa Project 1	Downtown development to include dining (3,900 GSF) and three dwelling units (1,035 GSF).	<1	City of Azusa	2010	619-621 N. Azusa Avenue.	
76	Infill/Redevelopment	Downtown Azusa Project 2	Downtown development to include medical offices (3,000 GSF) and three dwelling units (1,200 GSF)	<1	City of Azusa	2010	613-615 N Azusa Avenue.	

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
77	Small-scale Residential	Parkside II	Phase 2 of residential subdivision of 26 small-lot detached homes and a 3-acre park	3	City of Azusa	Construction	South of Zacatecas Park.	Legacy Homes
78	Industrial	D	4 spec. industrial buildings totaling 82,328 sq ft of warehouse, manufacturing office	2	City of Irwindale	Approved	2455 Buena Vista Street.	7th Street Development
79	Public Services	A	29 SFD 16,100 sq ft park	<1	City of Azusa	Approved	846-828 Meridian Street.	Irwindale Community Redevelopment Agency
80	Small-scale Residential	Single Family Homes, 10-Lot Subdivision	Subdivision of 10 single-family lots		City of Arcadia	--	1432-1516 S. Eighth Avenue.	Nevis Construction
81	Industrial	B	3 spec. industrial buildings totaling 75,500 sq ft	2	City of Irwindale	In entitlement process	Southeast corner of Irwindale and Ornelas.	McMahon Development Group
82	Small-scale Residential	Condominium Development of 81 Units	Development of 81 condominium units		City of Azusa	2010	710 S Azusa Avenue.	
83	Small-scale Residential	Condominium Development of 24 Units	Development of 24 condominium units		City of Azusa	2010	740 S Azusa Avenue.	
84	Commercial/Industrial	Mining and Reclamation, City-Wide	Mining and reclamation of mining pits throughout City for commercial and industrial		City of Irwindale	Ongoing	Covers 90% of the city (implements where need arises).	City of Irwindale

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			development					
85	Infill/ Redevelopment	Infill Residential Development	15 detached single family dwellings in 6 scattered vacant/under-utilized lots		City of Irwindale	Under construction	3 blocks south of Parque Del Norte Development.	Irwindale Community Redevelopment Agency
86	Commercial	El Monte Retail Project	Phased demolition of existing 106,550 sq ft warehouse retail and adjacent 36,293 sq ft retail uses and reconstruction of approx 135,000 sq ft warehouse retail (Sam's Club) and a gas station (along Lower Azusa Road)	6	City of El Monte	Neg Dec as of Dec. 2006	(Sam's Club: 4901 Santa Anita Ave.).	
87	Infill/ Redevelopment	El Monte Urban Transit Village	Development encompassing approx 65 acres for residential, community, recreational, commercial, and transportation facilities	65	City of El Monte		Project area is bounded by the Rio Hondo Channel on the west and north, Valley Boulevard on the north, Santa Anita Avenue on the east, and the I-10 freeway on the south.	City of El Monte
88	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, Big Tujunga Area	Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Location		ANF	Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision issued for each tract	Big Tujunga recreation residences located in the southwestern portion of the Los Angeles River Ranger District area.	ANF

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
89	Recreation	Recreation Residence Permit Issuance, Millard Canyon	designated show recreation residences in the Big Tujunga Area. Issuance of 465 new 20-year Recreation Residence Special Use Permits for individual recreation residences located on 18 tracts in the forest. Location designated show recreation residences in the Millard Canyon.		ANF	by Dec. 06 Continuance Determination (including environmental analysis) with decision issued for each tract by Dec. 06	Millard Canyon recreation residences are located near the southern border of the Los Angeles River Ranger District, less than 5 miles east of the Gould Substation.	ANF
90	Resource Management	Rubio Canyon Debris Pile (re EA update)	Project to recover the hydrological ecosystem and biological, recreational, cultural, and aesthetic resources affected by the 1998 waterline construction project.		ANF	TBD	Project area located in Township 2 North, Range 12 West, SW 1/4 Section 35, San Bernardino Meridian.	Los Angeles River Ranger District
91	Infill/ Redevelopment	Downtown Village Specific Plan	Downtown area "main street/town center" development encompassing 4,139,966 sq ft, including commercial retail and offices, civic and public uses, and low density residential uses (approx 55	95	City of La Cañada Flintridge	Ongoing and beyond the next 20 years	Plan area is abounded by the Foothill Freeway (I-210) to the north, Foothill Blvd to the south, La Canada Blvd to the northwest, and Crown Ave to the southeast; area also includes all non-residential properties fronting on the south side of Foothill Blvd.	City of La Canada Flintridge

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			additional units).					
92	Infill/ Redevelopment	Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan	Community plan to provide mixed-use developments integrating non-residential (611,000 sq ft) and residential space with a variety of housing (550 dwelling units), provide restricted light industrial uses that generate employment, and provide infrastructure linkages between Fair Oaks/Orange Grove and Old Pasadena.	14	City of Pasadena	Specific plan adopted Jan. 2002	Plan area extends from north of Montana Street along Fair Oaks Avenue, bordered by Maple Street on the south, and across Orange Grove Blvd. from Lincoln Avenue on the west and just east of Los Robles Avenue.	City of Pasadena
93	Infill/ Redevelopment	North Lake Specific Plan	Mixed-use development plan to buffer residential uses from commercial development on Lake Avenue, by restricting auto-oriented uses encouraging pedestrian-oriented businesses. Lake/Washington Redevelopment Plan will be incorporated into the specific	8	City of Pasadena	Specific plan in development	Plan area is located on North Lake and the frontage of East Washington between Lake and El Molino.	City of Pasadena

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			plan to include 500 new housing units, 175,000 sq ft new non-residential uses, and 175,000 sq ft general commercial uses.					
94	Small-scale Residential	Rose Court	Development project consisting of 52 town homes.		City of Pasadena	Project on hold	1000 Rose Court.	Pasadena Unified School District
95	Infill/ Redevelopment	Downtown Sierra Madre Specific Plan	Development framework to enhance downtown as an economic center (up to 401,639 sq ft commercial use), provide new housing (up to 414 units), include two new parking lots, add a medical office, and expand a church.	9	City of Sierra Madre	SP adopted Jan. 2006	Project area is located north of I-210, and is generally bounded by Montecito Avenue on the north, Mariposa Avenue on the south, Baldwin Avenue on the west, and Lima Avenue on the east.	City of Sierra Madre
96	Transportation	Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Pasadena to Monclair	Certification of FEIR for metro extension from Pasadena to Montclair, including adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, and approval as the project, 'Build LRT to Azusa Alternative.'		Regional	FEIR, Feb. 2007	Full route from Pasadena to Montclair; traversing through Pasadena, Arcadia, Monrovia, Duarte, Irwindale, Azusa, Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont, and Montclair.	Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
97	Transportation	210 Freeway	Widening of third lane for		City of	In design phase	210 Freeway at Baldwin Avenue.	Westfield

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
		Westbound Off-ramp to Baldwin Avenue	right turn only. Part of Westfield Shopping Center mitigation		Arcadia			Development Corporation
98	Infill/ Redevelopment	Mixed-Use Development	26,900 sq ft mixed-use project development featuring eight residential units and 10,767 sq ft of commercial space.	1	City of Arcadia	Project approved, to be submitted for plan check	306-310 S. First Avenue.	Romolo De Paolis
99	Commercial	Santa Anita Park Specific Plan	Development of 304 acre Santa Anita Park property consisting of: 829,250 sq ft (19 acres) commercial, retail, and office center, 1.4 acre landscaped open space, 3.5 acre water feature within a 7.5 acre landscaped open space, and a new wireless trolley traveling on fixed rails.	304	City of Arcadia	FEIR, Sept. 1996	Bounded by Huntington Drive on the south and east, and Westfield Santa Anita Mall on the west, and Colorado Place on the north and east.	Caruso Property Management
100	Commercial	Westfield Shopping Town Expansion	220 sq ft retail expansion with 1220 parking spaces	1	City of Arcadia	Planning	400 S. Baldwin Avenue.	Westfield Development Corporation

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Commercial/ Industrial	Central City Redevelopment Project	Plan to encourage and facilitate the establishment of growth and high quality retail outlets, stores, restaurants, professional office uses, and industrial uses. Plan will also discourage unattractive, incompatible, or unharmonious uses.		City of Arcadia	Adopted	Bounded by I-210 on the north, 5th Avenue on the east, Huntington Drive/Alta Street on the south, and Colorado Boulevard on the west.	City of Arcadia Development Services Department
101	Commercial	Enterprise Zone Designation	Designation carries out state-designated economic development areas created to encourage and stimulate growth, development, and investment in economically depressed areas via tax, hiring, and financial incentives.		City of Pasadena	EIR prepared in response to Apr. 2007 deadline to add new zone for a term extending to Apr. 2022.	Project site consists: Northwest Program area, including an extension of the area along Washington Avenue, from Lewis Avenue to Bellford Avenue, South Fair Oaks Biotech area, Walnut Street corridor, and Foothill Blvd. and Walnut Street corridors.	City of Pasadena
102	Commercial	Pasadena Corporate Park	95,000 sq ft office park with 1107 parking spaces	3	City of Pasadena	Completed	3465 E. Foothill Boulevard.	Kearny Real Estate
103	Commercial	Sierra Madre Villa Tech Camp	350,000 sq ft office R&D and 2000 parking spaces	8	City of Pasadena	Project on hold	3360 E. Foothill Boulevard.	SMV Technology Partners, LLC
104	Public Services - Water	Raymond Basin Conjunctive	Proposed Proposition 13 & planned groundwater conjunctive use project to		City of Pasadena	Notice of preparation and initial study as of	East of the Upper Los Angeles River Area (ULARA), hydraulically connected to the Verdugo and	Pasadena Water and Power

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
		Use Program	store up to 66,000 acre-ft of imported surplus MWD water in the Pasadena subarea of the Raymond Basin.			Dec. 2006	Monk Hill Basins	
105	Commercial	Space Bank	Demolition of 11 buildings and construction of 375,000 sq ft of self-storage.	9	City of Pasadena	Predevelopment Plan Review completed	3202 E. Foothill Boulevard.	Space Bank LTD
106	Infill/ Redevelopment	East Colorado Blvd Specific Plan	Beautification of Colorado Boulevard including streetscape improvements, historic preservation, public transit improvement, bicycle and pedestrian circulation, creation of subdistricts and protection of small independent businesses.		City of Pasadena	Specific plan adopted Nov. 2003	Bordered by Vista Avenue on the west, Colorado Blvd and 210 Freeway on the south, Rosemead Blvd on the east, and extending in parts to Orange Grove Blvd. on the north.	City of Pasadena
107	Commercial/ Industrial	East Pasadena Specific Plan	Plans for expansion and development of existing and new businesses, with industrial and retail areas on both sides of 210 Fwy, and will add 400 new housing units; includes facilitating transit-oriented development near the proposed light rail station.		City of Pasadena (East Pasadena)	Specific plan in development	Planning site resides on areas north and south of Foothill Blvd, bordered on the west by Sierra Madre Blvd and on the east by the Pasadena/Arcadia boundary. (Michillinda Ave).	City of Pasadena

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
108	Small-scale Residential	Artisan Square	52-unit condominium development, consisting of 7 buildings with a total of 90,369 sq ft and 149 parking spaces.	2	City of Pasadena	Building design review, as per Gold Line EIR/S Aug. 05	435 N. Altadena Avenue.	Odyssey Design Services
109	Infill/ Redevelopment	Central District Specific Plan	Specific plan area occupies approx 960 acres, and is Pasadena's urban core. The plan includes a diverse mix of land uses designed to create the primary business, financial, retailing, and government center of the city.	960	City of Pasadena	Plan is in implementation and subject to review every 5 years to ensure plan objectives are being met	The Central District's boundaries are marked to the north and west by the 210 and 710 freeways, two blocks east of Lake Avenue on the east boundary, and California Boulevard on the south.	City of Pasadena
110	Small-scale Residential	Condominium Development of 22 Units	Development of a 22 condominium units		City of Pasadena	Approved, as of Dec 2005	240 E. Del Mar Boulevard.	
111	Small-scale Residential	Residential and Commercial Development of 68 Condominium Units and 17,000 Square Feet Commercial	Development of 68 condominium units, 10,000 sq ft restaurant, and 7,000 sq ft of retail.	<1	City of Pasadena	Approved, as of Dec 2005	240-260 S. Arroyo Parkway.	

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
112	Infill/ Redevelopment	West Gateway Specific Plan	Plan area to focus on the arts, culture, and education by building on the strengths of the Norton Simon Museum and Ambassador Auditorium. The Plan will incorporate existing parks and existing setback requirements, and will preserve and enhance gardens, landscaping, and historic structures. The Plan will also add 75 new housing units, 800,000 sq ft non-residential areas, 350,000 sq ft general commercial use, and 250,000 sq ft institutional use.	32	City of Pasadena	Specific plan in development	Plan area is divided into three subareas adjacent to the 134 and 710 Freeways: Vista Del Arroy, Orange Grove/Colorado, and South De Lacey Corridor.	City of Pasadena
113	Small-scale Residential	Residential and Commercial Development of 34 Condominium Units and 5,000 Square Feet Commercial	Development of 34 condominium units and 5,000 sq ft retail.	1	City of Pasadena	Under construction, as of Dec. 2005	250 S. De Lacey Avenue.	
114	Infill/	Ambassador	Development and renovation	20	City of	FEIR, Dec. 2005	Within the West Gateway SP	City of Pasadena

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Redevelopment	West Project	of approx 19.72 acres for 117 dwelling units, a senior life/care building with 248 units, and school (25,734 sq ft) and office (7,834 sq ft) uses.		Pasadena		area, bounded by Green Street on the north, Orange Grove Blvd on the west, Del Mar on the south, and (Foothill Freeway) on the east.	
115	Commercial	Commercial Development of 54,70 Square Feet	Development of 54,700 sq ft supermarket, 17,100 sq ft drug store, 8,200 sq ft nursery garden center.	2	City of Pasadena	Approved, as of Dec. 2005	451-455 South Arroyo Parkway.	
116	Commercial	Medical office development	Development of 195,000 sq ft medical office	5	City of Pasadena	Pending, as of Dec. 2005	70-100 W California Boulevard.	
117	Public Services	Huntington Memorial Expansion	152,275 sq ft expansion of Huntington Memorial Hospital west wing	4	City of Pasadena	Under construction, as of Dec. 2005	100 W California Boulevard.	
118	Commercial	South Fair Oaks Specific Plan	District plan to emphasize a biomedical and technology-based area operating alongside a mix of community serving retail, medical facilities, and support services. Strategies include building rehabilitations, public improvements, and pursuit of research coalitions.		City of Pasadena	Specific plan adopted April 1998	Planning area includes portions east and west of Fair Oaks Avenue, bordered by California Blvd on the north and the Pasadena/South Pasadena boundary on the south.	City of Pasadena

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Infill/ Redevelopment	SMV/BRE Residential	188 residential units, with 267 space parking structure		City of Pasadena	Design review phase	3360 E. Foothill Boulevard.	SMV Technology Partners, LLC
119	Commercial	Downtown Specific Plan	Development plan to establish six distinct commercial districts within plan area: Gateway Commercial, West Commercial, City Center, Temple City Blvd, Residential Commercial, and East Commercial Districts.		City of Temple City	Downtown Specific Plan, Dec. 2002	The plan area extends along both sides of Las Tunas Drive from Sultana Avenue east to Rowland Avenue. In some cases the specific plan extends beyond the Las Tunas adjacent properties and meets Woodruff Avenue and Workman Avenue.	City of Temple City
120	Infill/ Redevelopment	Mission District Specific Plan	The Specific Plan is a revitalization tool that will create a mixed-use vision for the District to function as a successful village. The plan includes development regulations, architectural standards, standards for preserving sites of cultural significance, and methods of improving traffic and parking issues.		City of San Gabriel	Notice of Preparation for DEIR, June 2003.	The plan area is generally located south of Las Tunas Drive, north of Mission Road, west of Junipero Serra Drive, and east of the Alhambra Wash drainage channel.	City of San Gabriel

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
121	Infill/ Redevelopment	Valley Boulevard Sustainability Plan	Sustainability plan integrating land use development, architectural design and site development, landscape, transportation, parking, and infrastructure.		City of San Gabriel	DEIR submitted June 2006; plan adopted Dec. 2006	The project area encompasses the Valley Boulevard commercial corridor from the City of Alhambra on the west to the City of Rosemead on the east, the north-south arterials of New Avenue, Del Mar Avenue, and San Gabriel Blvd, and the residential neighborhoods south of Valley Blvd to the I-10 freeway and north of Valley Blvd.	City of San Gabriel
	Infill/ Redevelopment	Piet M Mixed Use Development	Construction of six-story building comprised of 54 residential units above the ground-level retail uses. A two-level parking garage will also be constructed below grade.		City of Monterey Park	Neg. Dec. as of Dec. 2006	--	
122	Infill/ Redevelopment	Whittier Blvd Specific Plan	Downtown area improvements to enable mixed-use and corridor character.		City of Montebello	Specific plan in development	Whittier Boulevard traversing two miles through center of Montebello, connecting into Pico Rivera.	City of Montebello

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
123	Commercial	Uptown Whittier Specific Plan	Development strategy across 185 acres to strengthen existing retail, introduce new national-brand retail, create efficient parking, increase housing choice, and transform church property into affordable housing and mixed use development.	185	City of Whittier	Development over the next 20 years	Located in the historic retail core of Whittier, bound on the north by Hadley Street, Painter Avenue to the east, Penn Street to the south, and Pickering Avenue to the west.	City of Whittier
124	Large-scale Planned Community	Tonner Hills Planned Community	Development planned for 795 homes on 838 acres, open space, recreation uses, and ongoing oil operations.	838	City of Brea	Request for Annexation to Local Agency Formation Commission, Nov 2005	Annexation territory located immediately adjacent to City of Brea's northern boundary, extending east and west of Freeway 57. Majority of territory is east of Freeway 57, north of Lambert Road, and west of Valencia Avenue.	Shea Homes/Nuevo Energy
125	Large-scale Planned Community	La Floresta Development (formerly Hartley Center)	Proposed development encompassing approx 119 acres for a range of medium to high density units, a mixed-use "Village Core" (totaling approx 148,800 sq ft) of retail commercial uses, office uses (97,200 sq ft), a hotel (64,800 sq ft), and	119	City of Brea	Initial Study, Dec 2005	Site is bounded by State Rt. 90 on the south, State Rt. 142 on the west, and Rose Drive on the east.	City of Brea with Chevron Land & Development Company as project sponsor

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			recreational uses.					
126	Public Services	Olinda Alpha Landfill Implementation	Proposed Project to vertically and horizontally expand the existing Olinda Alpha Landfill to help meet the County's near term solid waste disposal needs.		County of Orange (Unincorporated)	DEIR, 2004	Project site is within existing Olinda Alpha Landfill property at 1942 North Valencia Avenue in unincorporated Orange County, near the City of Brea.	
127	Large-scale Planned Community	Carbon Canyon Specific Plan (CCSP) Repeal and Hillside Residential Zoning (includes Olinda Village)	Amendment for currently proposed subdivision for 176 single-family home development, which reduces overall potential yield within Carbon Canyon to 279 (1,406 units fewer than previous CCSP, 1986)		City of Brea	Buildout through 2020	CCSP encompasses 1,758 acres in east half of Brea.	City of Brea
128	Large-scale Planned Community	Shell/Aera Residential Development	Development of 3,000 - 3,600 homes on 3,000 acres.	3,000	City of Brea	Application under review as of June 2002	Approx 300 acres in Brea SOI (remainder in Chino Hills State Park)	Aera Energy, LLC
129	Large-scale Planned Community	Canyon Crest	Project encompasses a 367.5 acre development of a maximum of 250 single family residential units, along with associated landscaping, roads, utilities, and 248.4 acres of open space.	368	City of Brea	DEIR as of June 2002; project to be completed in one phase spanning over a 2-3 year period.	Project site is within the Puente-Chino Hills portion of Carbon Canyon, extending around Highway 142, north of Yorba Linda.	Eastbridge Partners

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
130	Transportation	Entrance Road & Facilities Construction	Project consists of constructing approximately 2 miles of a 2-lane asphalt-paved entrance road, a multi-use trail, a new entrance station, a restroom building, a park maintenance storage building, and other park amenities.		Chino Hills State Park	DEIR, Aug. 2004	Project is located within Chino Hills State Park.	Department of Parks and Recreation
131	Large-scale Planned Community	Chino Hills Specific Plan	Specific plan is the primary land use policy document for the 27 square mile area (approximately 60% of the entire city).	17,280	City of Chino Hills	Specific plan approved in 1982	Plan area encompasses the entire upper portion of the city (approximately 60% of the city).	City of Chino Hills
132	Commercial	Majestic Spectrum	Development of a 398.9 acre area into a planned commerce center comprising of regional commercial, office, and commercial manufacturing uses.	399	City of Chino Hills	Majestic Spectrum SP revised Apr. 2001; development was expected to begin in 1993.	The plan area is located in the southwest portion of Chino, adjacent to the Chino Valley Freeway (State Hwy 71), north of Eucalyptus Avenue, south of Schaefer Avenue, and roughly west of Norton Avenue.	City of Chino Hills
133	Commercial	Commons at Chino Hills	Project includes a mixed-use commercial center on a 49 acre site, consisting of one or all of the following: retail, office, restaurant and other retail eateries, personal and	49	City of Chino Hills	DEIR, July 2006	The project site is located on the south side of Chino Hills Parkway, east of Ramona Avenue and north of the Chino Valley Freeway (SR-71).	City of Chino Hills

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
134	Commercial/ Industrial	Eucalyptus Business Park	<p>financial services, hotel, or other related commercial uses</p> <p>The EBPSP area encompasses approx 430 acres of primarily vacant land, which is envisioned to become a mixed-use project consisting of an auto mall (18 acres (5%)), business park (48 acres (11%)), commercial (16 acres (3%)), commercial/office (53 acres (12%)), manufacturing (37 acres (9%)), and general industrial (176 acres (41%)) uses. Other area uses include the 20 acre San Antonio Channel, 35 acre SCE easement, and 27 acres of streets and roadways.</p>	430	City of Chino	EBPSP: revised Oct 2000, adopted Dec. 1990	The specific plan area is located along the east side of the Chino Valley Freeway (71), between Chino Hills Parkway on the south, Eucalyptus Avenue on the north, and west of Central Avenue.	City of Chino
135	Infill/ Redevelopment	Central Ave	Development plan to establish Central Avenue as a vital, active community center serving the cultural, governmental, commercial,		City of Chino	Central Avenue Specific Plan, March 1982	Plan area is bounded on the north by Phillips Avenue, on the south by Schaefer Avenue, and various streets on the east and west boundaries.	City of Chino

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			and residential needs of the city.					
136	Large-scale Planned Community	East Chino	Development to transition from a principally agricultural/dairy land use to suburban residential and commercial use, encompassing an area of approx 972 acres.	972	City of Chino	East Chino Specific Plan, Sept. 2002	The site is generally bounded by Euclid, Riverside, Eucalyptus, and Mountain Avenues.	City of Chino
137	Large-scale Planned Community	The Preserve	Community development encompassing approx 5,435.3 acres, with mixed residential (9,779 units), community and commercial centers, and recreational open space (2,987.6 acres).	5,435	City of Chino	Specific plan adopted in March 2003	The plan area is bound by Euclid Avenue and State Route 71 to the west, Kimball and Merrill Avenues to the north, and the County of Riverside border to the south.	City of Chino
	Large-scale Planned Community	Edgewater Lakeside Communities Project	Construction of approx 1,074 dwelling units on 273 acres	273	City of Chino	Notice of Preparation submitted, 2006	--	City of Chino
	Large-scale Planned Community	Master Plan Phases 1 & 2 Amendment, Master Site	Proposed Project includes construction of 379 residential units		City of Chino	Neg Dec submitted Jun. 2006	--	City of Chino

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
138	Large-scale Planned Community	Approval, Specific Plan Amendment, Tentative Tract Map 17058 Eastvale Specific Plan	Proposed development of 687 acres in the Jurupa Community Plan (JCP) area, to provide for residential, recreational, community, and commercial uses.	687	County of Riverside	EIR compete	Property is generally bounded on the west by Archibald Avenue, on the east by Sumner Avenue, and on the south by Chandler Street.	County of Riverside
139	Large-scale Planned Community	New Colony (currently consisting of Countryside, Edenglen, Parkside, Grand Park, Esperanza, Armstrong Ranch, West Haven, Subarea 18, Subarea 29 (also called Park Place or Hettinga), and	Dedicated area of 8,200 acres to residential neighborhoods, high intensity regional serving centers, employment centers, and an activity core. Currently ten (10) specific plans have been submitted, amounting to a total of 16,930 residential units along with schools, parks, and commercial/light industrial areas, which occupy a total of 3,364 acres.	8,200	City of Ontario	General Plan estimates buildout over 30 years	Bounded by Riverside Drive to the north, Milliken Avenue and Hamner Avenue to the east, the Riverside County line and Merrill Avenue to the south, and Euclid Avenue to the west.	City of Ontario

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
		Rich-Haven Specific Plans)						
140	Large-scale Planned Community	Ontario Downtown Civic Center Project	Project consists of a mixed use development on approx 31 acres. Proposed Project developments include 2,190 housing units, 513,939 sq ft retail, and 1,335,542 sq ft office and academic uses.	31	City of Ontario	FEIR as of Oct. 2004	Site is adjacent to State Hwy 83 (Euclid Ave.) approx 1.5 mi south of the 1-10 Fwy. and approx 2.25 mi north of State Hwy. 60; and is bounded by D Street to the north, Sultana Avenue to the east, Euclid Avenue to the west, and Hold Blvd to the south.	City of Ontario
141	Public Services	Ontario Airport Master Plan Study	Master plan to develop Ontario Airport into an international serving airport. Plan will include acreage and facility expansion requirements and facility layouts.		City of Ontario	Master plan in development; construction expected to take place through 2030	Existing Ontario Airport.	Los Angeles World Airports
142	Energy	Mira Loma Peaker Project	45 MW peaker generating facility consisting of one GE LM6000 CTG, emissions control system, one 10,500 gallon 19 percent ammonium hydroxide storage tank, water storage tanks, transformers, 66 kV transmission tap line, a natural gas-fired black start		City of Ontario	Commercial operation date: July 2007	Facility will be located at 13568 Milliken Avenue, bordered by Milliken Avenue on the east, the existing Mira Loma Substation on the north and west, and commercial/industrial vacant land on the south.	Southern California Edison

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
143	Commercial/ Industrial	Kaiser Commerce Center Specific Plan	generator, and a power control module. Formerly Kaiser Fontana Steel, current property occupies 468+ acres, and is planned for industrial and commercial uses; phase to complete public infrastructure surrounding the net project site, construction of portion of Francis Street and Dupont Avenue, and construction of approx 1,970,150 sq ft of office/industrial space within seven separate buildings.	468	County of San Bernardino	Specific plan revised Apr. 2002; Suppl. EIR, Dec. 2006	Northeast of the San Bernardino (I-10) and Ontario (I-15) freeways; bounded on the north by Napa Street and San Bernardino Avenue, on the east by Valley Boulevard and Mulberry Avenue.	San Bernardino County
144	Infill/ Redevelopment	Shoppes at Chino Hills Retail/Civic Center/Residential/Community Park Specific Plan	Specific plan encompassing approximately 100 acres for mixed use development including a new commercial lifestyle center, civic center campus, multi-family residential units, and new community park.	100	City of Chino Hills	Specific plan, Jan. 2007	Specific plan areas are located at three project sites, west of the 71 freeway, south of Grand Avenue, north of Chino Hills Parkway (general designation), and east of Carbon Canyon Road (general designation).	City of Chino Hills
145	Infill/Redevelopment	Chino College Park Specific Plan	Specific plan to create a walking scale, mixed-use community with a college	710	City of Chino	Specific plan adopted in January 2003	Located in southwestern corner of San Bernardino County, in the City of Chino, generally bounded	City of Chino

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
			town character. The specific plan concept integrates residential, shopping and services, parks, and a college campus.				by Edison Avenue on the north, Central Avenue on the west, Euclid Avenue on the east, in the northern portion of the California Institution for Men property.	
146	Large-scale Planned Community	College Park Specific Plan	Specific plan development of the Palmdale College Campus, including 800 homes	N/A	City of Palmdale	Groundbreaking expected during summer 2006	Located at the southern portion of the City of Palmdale, bounded on the west by 37 <sup>th</sup> Street East, bounded by 50 <sup>th</sup> Street on the east, and south of Barrel Springs Road.	City of Palmdale
147	Energy	Kimball Substation	Proposed new substation with modification of approximately 6.7 miles of the Chino-Corono-Pedley 66 kV subtransmission line.	2	City of Chino	Construction expected to begin April 2008 for operation in June 2009	Segment is routed south from Chino Substation to the south side of Edison Avenue, east in an existing R-O-W, and then south to Kimball Avenue.	SCE
148	Energy	Ritter Ranch Substation	Proposed new substation to serve current and projected demand for electricity and maintain electric system reliability in the southwestern portion of the City of Palmdale and surrounding areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County	3	City of Palmdale	Proposed operation by mid-2009	Located at the northeast portion of the Ritter Ranch Development (Map ID #43), in the City of Palmdale.	SCE
149	Resource Management	Amargosa Creek	Project to reduce the frequency and severity of		City of Palmdale	Construction began in 2006 and is ongoing.	Located within southern portion of the Antelope Valley, within the	

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
		Improvements Project	flooding in developing areas associated with Amargosa Creek. Project includes road improvements, flood control improvements to Amargosa Creek, and provision of utilities, primarily within Elizabeth Lake Road.				City of Palmdale. Road improvements extend southwest from 20 <sup>th</sup> Street West, through Leona Valley along Amargosa Creek, to roughly 0.2 mi west of Godde Hill Road. Downstream portion of project extends northeasterly along Amargosa Creek, from 25 <sup>th</sup> Street West to about 0.75 mi north of the Antelope Valley Freeway.	
N/A	Infill/ Redevelopment	Planning Case No. PL-05-080	Project includes a mixed-use development with approx 18,000 sq ft of commercial space and 159 dwelling units, a four-story mixed-use development with residential uses above one floor of retail uses.	1	City of San Gabriel	DEIR, as of Dec. 2006	--	
N/A	Infill/ Redevelopment	Site C Mixed-Use Project	Four-story mixed-use development		City of San Gabriel		--	
N/A	Small-scale Residential	South Pointe West Specific Plan	The proposed Project consists of a 99-unit single-family residential subdivision, a public park and open space areas on 34.52 acres of land.	35	City of Diamond Bar	DEIR, Aug. 06	Project is located on property south of Larkstone Drive, east of Morning Sun Avenue, west of Brea Canyon Road, and northwest of Peaceful Hills Road.	South Pointe West, LLC

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
N/A	Small-scale Residential	VTTM No. 54081	Proposed Project includes 22-lot subdivision on a site of approximately 12.9 acres for the development of 16 single family detached homes.	13	City of Diamond Bar	Neg Dec Aug.06		
N/A	Industrial	Project Sunfield	The proposed Project includes construction of an approximate 180,000 square-foot concrete building for food processing, ancillary office, and refrigerated warehouse uses, on a 10.3 acre site.	10	County of San Bernardino	Neg Dec as of Nov. 2006	21842 Street "D"	
N/A	Industrial	Project Garden	The proposed Project includes construction of an approximately 208,000 square-foot concrete building for food processing uses, ancillary office areas, and a refrigerated warehouse on a 13.5 acre site.	14	County of San Bernardino		--	
N/A	Industrial	Gateway South Warehouse Facility	Construction of up to 1,450,520 sq ft building space to accommodate a warehouse facility	33	County of San Bernardino	NOP/IS submitted June 2006	--	City of San Bernardino

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
N/A	Industrial	Hillwood Warehouse/Distribution Facility	Construction of five warehouse/distribution buildings totaling 2,059,383 sq ft on 153.9 acres.	154	County of San Bernardino	DEIR submitted June 2006	--	City of San Bernardino
N/A	Large-scale Planned Community	Berger Specific Plan	Construction of approx 2,695 single and multi-family dwelling units, 17.7 acres commercial uses, a 12-acre elementary school, 12 acres of park, and 12.4 acres of open space	54	County of Riverside	Notice of Preparation and Initial Study submitted	--	County of Riverside
N/A	Large-scale Planned Community	La Quinta 628 Specific Plan	Construction of master-planned community consisting of 2,525 residential dwelling units, a community recreation site, an elementary school site, community parks, open space, public infrastructure, and recreational amenities on 622 acres	622	County of Riverside	NOP/IS submitted June 2006	Project boundary defined by SR-86 (Harrison Street) to the west, 62nd Avenue to the north, Tyler Street to the east, and 64th Avenue to the south.	County of Riverside
N/A	Large-scale Planned Community	Specific Plan No. 354	Construction of 1,200 dwelling units on 118 acres	118	County of Riverside	NOP/IS submitted June 2006	--	County of Riverside
N/A	Large-scale Planned	Tentative Tract No. 31194	Project includes the subdivision of 204.7 acres into 486 single family	205	County of Riverside	FEIR, July 2006	--	

**TABLE 5.3-2 (CONTINUED)  
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS LIST**

Map ID <sup>2</sup>	Project Type	Project Name	Description	Estimated Project Acreage	Jurisdiction	Timeframe/Status	Location	Project Proponent
	Community		dwelling units, three parks, natural open space/drainage easement lots, water quality basin lots, and open space/landscape lots.					

N/A = Not found in available data sources. Although not mapped, these projects are identified here to provide additional contextual information regarding cumulative developments in the region.

<sup>1</sup> Sources: see Section 5.2

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Figure 5.3-1 for approximate locations of cumulative projects by Map ID number.

*This page left intentionally blank.*