

**APPENDIX A**

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

*Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

---

This appendix presents a completed California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Initial Study Checklist (From Appendix G, CEQA Guidelines) for the proposed Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project.

*This page left intentionally blank.*

---

**1. Project title:**

Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project

**2. Lead agency name and address:**

California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

**3. Contact person and phone number:**

Susan J. Nelson, AIA  
Southern California Edison  
Regulatory Affairs  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770  
(626) 302-8128

**4. Project location:**

The proposed Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP) extends south from near Tehachapi in Kern County through Los Angeles County to the SCE Mira Loma Substation in southwestern San Bernardino County. The proposed TRTP consists of Segments 4 through 11; Segments 4 through 8, 10, and 11 are proposed transmission line (T/L) right-of-way (R-O-W) while Segment 9 consists of new, expanded, and/or upgraded SCE substation facilities. The location of the proposed TRTP segments are shown on Figure 3.1-1 (Section 3.0 of the PEA) and Figures P.1-2 and P.1-73 (Appendix P).

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

Southern California Edison  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770

**6. General plan designations<sup>1</sup>:**

The proposed Segments 4 thru 11 occur within the general plan areas of Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties, as well as the general plan areas of the cities of Baldwin Park, Chino, Chino Hills, Duarte, Industry, Irwindale, La Canada Flintridge, La Habra Heights, Lancaster, Monrovia, Montebello, Monterey Park, Ontario, Palmdale, Pasadena, Pico Rivera, Rosemead, San Gabriel, South El Monte, and Whittier. In addition, Segments 6 and 11 traverse the Angeles National Forest and, therefore, are within the Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan area.

These planning areas contain numerous general plan land use designations, which are summarized by T/L route mileposts in the PEA in tabular format. General plan land use designations within Segments 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 R-O-W are summarized in Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, 4.10-3, 4.10-4, 4.10-5, and 4.10-15, respectively. General plan land use designations within the Whirlwind, Antelope, Vincent, Gould, Mesa, and Mira Loma substation areas (Segment 9) are summarized in Tables 4.10-6, 4.10-7, 4.10-8, 4.10-9, 4.10-10, and 4.10-11, respectively. General plan land use designations within Segment 10, Alternative 10A, and Alternative 10B R-O-W are summarized in Tables 4.10-12, 4.10-13, and 4.10-14, respectively. An overview of the general plan land use designations along the proposed Project alignment is shown on Figure 4.10-1. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses within a 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project alignment, refer to Appendix L of the PEA, Figure L-1 (sheets 1 through 9).

**7. Zoning<sup>2</sup>:**

Proposed Segments 4 thru 11 traverse jurisdictions with zoning in Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties, as well as the cities of Baldwin Park, Chino, Chino Hills, Duarte, Industry, Irwindale, La Canada Flintridge, La Habra Heights, Lancaster, Monrovia, Montebello, Monterey Park, Ontario, Palmdale, Pasadena, Pico Rivera, Rosemead, San Gabriel, South El Monte, and Whittier.

---

<sup>1</sup> The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General Order (GO) No. 131-D, Section XIV B, clarifies that “local jurisdictions acting pursuant to local authority are preempted from regulating electric power line projects, distribution lines, substations, or electric facilities constructed by public utilities subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction. However, in locating such projects, the public utilities shall consult with local agencies regarding land use matters.” Due to this GO, the public utilities are directed to consider local regulations and consult with local agencies, but the county and city regulations and general plans are not applicable as the county and cities do not have jurisdiction over the proposed Project.

While SCE intends to develop facility designs that are compatible with local plans and zoning to the extent practicable, the TRTP is exempt from local land use and zoning regulations and permitting.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

These cities and counties have a variety of zoning codes within the proposed Project alignment. Zoning within Segments 4 thru 11 R-O-W and within a 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project alignment are summarized by T/L route mileposts in the PEA in tabular format. Zoning within Segments 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Tables 4.10-1, 4.10-2, 4.10-3, 4.10-4, 4.10-5, and 4.10-15, respectively. Zoning within the Whirlwind, Antelope, Vincent, Gould, Mesa, and Mira Loma substation areas (Segment 9) and within a 0.5-mile buffer from the substations are summarized in Tables 4.10-6, 4.10-7, 4.10-8, 4.10-9, 4.10-10, and 4.10-11, respectively. Zoning within Segment 10, Alternative 10A, and Alternative 10B R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Tables 4.10-12, 4.10-13, and 4.10-14, respectively.

## **8. Description of project:**

The purpose of the proposed TRTP is to provide the electrical facilities necessary to interconnect new wind generation in excess of 700 MW and up to approximately 4,500 MW in the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area (TWRA). Under separate applications to the CPUC, SCE has previously requested approval for Segments 1, 2, and 3 of the Antelope Transmission Project<sup>3</sup>, which would also enhance transmission and related infrastructure serving the TWRA. Consequently, the delineation of major components for the TRTP begins with Segment 4. Segments 4 through 8, as well as Segments 10 and 11 of the TRTP are transmission facilities, while Segment 9 addresses the addition and upgrade of substation facilities. A summary of the proposed TRTP's components by segment is provided in Table 3.1-1 of the PEA.

The proposed Project's major components (Segments 4 through 11) include:

- Segment 4 – Two new single-circuit 220 kilovolt (kV) transmission lines traveling approximately 4 miles over new right-of-way (R-O-W) from the Cottonwind Substation to the proposed new Whirlwind Substation.
- Segment 4 – A new single-circuit 500 kV transmission line, initially energized to 220 kV, traveling approximately 16 miles over new R-O-W from the proposed new Whirlwind Substation to the existing Antelope Substation.
- Segment 5 – A rebuild of approximately 18 miles of the existing Antelope – Vincent 220 kV T/L and the existing Antelope – Mesa 220 kV T/L to 500 kV standards over existing R-O-W between the existing Antelope Substation and the existing Vincent Substation.

---

<sup>3</sup> Antelope Transmission Project Segment 1 Application (A.04-12-007) was approved in Decision 07-03-012. Antelope Transmission Project Segments 2&3 Application (A.04-12-008) was approved in Decision 07-03-045.

- Segment 6 – A rebuild of approximately 32 miles of existing 220 kV transmission line to 500 kV standards from existing Vincent Substation to the southern boundary of the Angeles National Forest (ANF). This segment includes the rebuild of approximately 27 miles of the existing Antelope – Mesa 220 kV T/L and approximately 5 miles of the existing Rio Hondo – Vincent 220 No. 2 T/L.
- Segment 7 – A rebuild of approximately 16 miles of existing 220 kV transmission line to 500 kV standards from the southern boundary of the ANF to the existing Mesa Substation. This segment would replace the existing Antelope – Mesa 220 kV T/L.
- Segment 8 – A rebuild of approximately 33 miles of existing 220 kV transmission line to 500 kV standards from a point approximately 2 miles east of the existing Mesa Substation (the “San Gabriel Junction”) to the existing Mira Loma Substation. This segment would also include the rebuild of approximately 7 miles of the existing Chino – Mira Loma No. 1 line from single-circuit to double-circuit 220 kV structures.
- Segment 9 – Whirlwind Substation, a new 500/220 kV substation located approximately 4 to 5 miles south of the Cottonwind Substation near the intersection of 170<sup>th</sup> Street and Holiday Avenue in Kern County near the TWRA.
- Segment 9 – Upgrade of the existing Antelope, Vincent, Mesa, Gould, and Mira Loma Substations to accommodate new transmission line construction and system compensation elements.
- Segment 10 – A new 500 kV transmission line traveling approximately 17 miles over new R-O-W between the Windhub<sup>4</sup> Substation and the proposed new Whirlwind Substation.
- Segment 11 – A rebuild of approximately 19 miles of existing 220 kV transmission line to 500 kV standards between the existing Vincent and Gould Substations. This segment would also include the addition of a new 220 kV circuit on the vacant side of the existing double-circuit structures of the Eagle Rock – Mesa 220 kV T/L, between the existing Gould Substation and the existing Mesa Substation.
- Installation of associated telecommunications infrastructure.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Windhub Substation was included as “Substation One” in SCE’s proposed Antelope Transmission Project Segments 2&3 application (A.04-12-008) submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission for approval in December 2004. The application was amended in September 2005.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:****Segment 4**

The predominant current land use traversed by the proposed Segment 4 R-O-W located between the Cottonwind Substation and the existing Antelope Substation is undeveloped open space, with a few small sections of scattered irrigated agriculture. No residences are located within the proposed R-O-W.

**Segment 5**

The predominant current land use traversed by the proposed Segment 5 R-O-W located between the existing Antelope Substation and the existing Vincent Substation is undeveloped open space, with one small area devoted to an agricultural use. No residences are located within the existing R-O-W.

**Segment 6**

Surrounding land uses for Segment 6 are primarily open space and recreation, with some scattered rural residential uses within unincorporated Los Angeles County areas. The proposed Segment 6 R-O-W located between the existing Vincent Substation to the southern boundary of the ANF is undeveloped open space.

**Segment 7**

The proposed Segment 7 R-O-W is located between the southern boundary of the ANF and the existing Mesa Substation. Areas within the R-O-W or adjacent to it within the northernmost approximate 1.2-mile portion of the segment are used exclusively as undeveloped open space. Areas within the R-O-W or adjacent to it within the southernmost approximate 14.8-mile portion of the segment are in urban and suburban use. Existing permitted secondary land uses within the R-O-W include the following types: plant nurseries, golf course greens, at-grade vehicular parking lots, undeveloped industrial areas and specialty fruit or vegetable crop production.

**Segment 8**

Segment 8 would pass primarily through the urban, suburban, and rural areas of Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties. Approximately 3.25 miles of new R-O-W would need to be acquired. The proposed Segment 8 R-O-W and areas adjacent to it located between the existing Mesa Substation and the existing Mira Loma Substation are under either an undeveloped open space or a suburban use. Existing permitted secondary land uses include

the following types: plant nurseries, specialty fruit or vegetable crop production, park and open space areas, at-grade vehicular parking lots, and undeveloped industrial areas.

**Segment 9*****Whirlwind Substation***

The proposed approximate 65-67-acre Whirlwind Substation to be acquired at either one of three sites selected for study is currently under an open space or an agricultural use. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include residential, vacant, and agricultural uses.

***Antelope Substation***

The proposed approximate 18-acre expansion to the existing Antelope Substation is currently exclusively under an undeveloped open space use. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include agricultural, commercial, vacant, electrical power facilities, and some scattered residential uses.

***Vincent Substation***

The proposed area for the approximate 18-acre expansion to the existing Vincent Substation is currently undeveloped open space. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer of Vincent Substation include vacant, electrical power facilities, and some scattered residential uses.

***Gould Substation***

Existing land uses within a 0.5-mile buffer from this substation include residential, vacant, golf course, and electrical power facility uses.

***Mesa Substation***

Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer from this substation include commercial, utilities, vacant, and some scattered residential uses.

***Mira Loma Substation***

Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include agriculture, residential, commercial, water, and school uses.

**Segment 10**

The proposed R-O-W for Segment 10 and its alternative alignments 10A and 10B located between the previously permitted Windhub Substation and the proposed Whirlwind Substation is currently undeveloped open space.

**Segment 11**

The proposed Segment 11 R-O-W begins at the existing Vincent Substation, connects to the existing Gould Substation, and ends at the existing Mesa Substation. Lands within and adjacent to the R-O-W are under either an undeveloped open space use to the north from the Vincent to Gould substations or a mix of suburban land uses to the south from the Gould to Mesa substations. Existing permitted secondary land uses include the following: plant nurseries, at-grade vehicular parking lots, park and open space areas and mini-storage facilities.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**

A Special Use Permit would be required from the USFS, Angeles National Forest (Segments 6 and 11 only). Encroachment permits, and notifications and letters of permission, may be required for crossings over water-supply features, utility corridors, and transportation corridors. California Department of Fish & Game Section (CDFG) 1600-1616 et seq. notification and permitting (stream and lake alteration agreement), Corps of Engineers Section 404 notification and permitting, and State Water Resources Control Board permitting pursuant to Section 401, respectively, may be required for potential direct affects to State and federal jurisdictional waters. If endangered species issues arise during project implementation, incidental take permitting through coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code incidental take of State-listed species permitting through coordination with the CDFG, may become necessary. Potential approvals, authorizations, and permits that may be required for the TRTP are listed in Appendix M.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist.

- |   |                      |   |                       |   |                |
|---|----------------------|---|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| √ | Aesthetics           | √ | Agriculture Resources | √ | Air Quality    |
| √ | Biological Resources | √ | Cultural Resources    | √ | Geology /Soils |

√ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	√ Hydrology/Water Quality	— Land Use/Planning
— Mineral Resources	√ Noise	— Population/Housing
— Public Services	√ Recreation	√ Transportation/Traffic
— Utilities/Service Systems	√ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

With implementation of the Project design, including implementation of Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) incorporated into the Project design and mitigation measures presented in Section 4.0, only Aesthetics and Air Quality have been determined to have residual significant impacts. To conserve the number of pages needed to present the CEQA environmental evaluations for the Segments 4 through 11 components of the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project, one checklist is included below and entries pertaining to Segment 4 are indicated with a number 4, entries pertaining to Segment 5 are indicated with a number 5, and so on.

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed

adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to

applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**APPENDIX A**

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

*Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			4	5 – 11
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	8		6, 11	4, 5, 7, 9, 10
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	6, 11 (Adverse under NEPA), 7, 8		4, 5, 9, 10	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			9	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			4, 5, 8, 9, 10	6, 7, 11
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			4, 8, 9, 10	5, 6, 7, 11
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			4, 5, 8, 9, 10	6, 7, 11
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to				

**APPENDIX A**

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

*Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			4 – 11	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	7, 8, 11		4, 5, 6, 9, 10	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	6, 7, 8, 9, 11		4, 5, 10	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			4 – 11	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			4 – 11	
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		4 – 11		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		6, 7, 8, 11	4, 5, 9, 10	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		6, 7, 8, 11	5	4, 9, 10

**APPENDIX A**

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

*Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			4 – 11	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		6, 7, 8, 11		4, 5, 9, 10
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		4, 5, 9, 10		6, 7, 8, 11
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?			4 – 11	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?			4 – 11	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			4 – 11	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			4 – 11	
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			5, 6, 7, 8, 11	4, 9, 10
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			4 – 11	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			4 – 11	

**APPENDIX A**

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

*Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
iv) Landslides?			4 – 11	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			4 – 11	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			4 – 11	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			4 – 11	
e) 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?				4 – 11 (does not apply)
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -</b> - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			4 – 11	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				4 – 11
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				4 – 11 (does not apply)
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			4 – 11	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a			7, 8	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11

**APPENDIX A**

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

*Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			4, 5, 10	6, 7, 8, 9, 11
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			4 – 11	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			4 – 11	
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			4 – 11	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			4 – 11	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			4 – 11	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			4 – 11	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide			4 – 11	

**APPENDIX A**

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

*Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				4 – 11
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				4 – 11 (does not apply)
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?			4 – 11	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			4 – 11	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			4 – 11	
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			8	4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10	6,11
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			4 – 11	
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				4 – 11
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				4 – 11

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
<b>XI. NOISE</b> -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			4 – 11	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			4 – 11	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			4 – 11	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			4 – 11	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			4 – 11	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			4 – 11	
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			4 – 11	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				4 – 11
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				4 – 11

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?			4 – 11	
ii) Police protection?				4 – 11
iii) Schools?				4 – 11
iv) Parks?				4 – 11
v) Other public facilities?				4 – 11
<b>XIV. RECREATION --</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			4 – 11	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				4 – 11
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC --</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			4 – 11	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			4 – 11	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			4 – 11	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				4 – 11
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			4 – 11	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			4 – 11	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			5, 7, 8, 11	4, 6, 9, 10
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				4 – 11
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				4 – 11
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			4 – 11	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			4 – 11	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				4 – 11
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			4 – 11	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact*	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				4 – 11
<b>XVII.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	√			
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		√		
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			√	

\* Less than significant impacts include those impacts reduced by implementation of applicant proposed measures that are a part of the proposed Project.

**SOURCES AND EXPLANATIONS OF ANSWERS:**

Sources and explanations of answers in the checklist for both Segment 2 and Segment 3 are included below.

**I. AESTHETICS**

Implementation of APMs identified in PEA Section 4.2 would reduce most aesthetic impacts to less than significant levels; however, exceptions were identified for Segments 6, 7, 8, and 11.

Segment 6 and Segment 11 would be located within existing designated utility corridors that cross the Angeles National Forest (ANF) and subject to NEPA review. The criteria used to

determine significance is whether the implementation of Segment 6 and Segment 11 would be consistent with the ANF Land Management Plan (LMP) Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIOs). These existing designated utility corridors are potentially not consistent with the SIOs. Implementation of Segment 6 and Segment 11 would potentially not be consistent with the SIOs. The ANF could consider the effects resulting from the implementation of Segment 6 and Segment 11 to be adverse under NEPA. The ANF may identify measures to reduce the effects or may choose to amend the LMP as part of the proposed Project's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be prepared at a future date. In addition to the potential inconsistencies with the ANF LMP SIOs, implementation of Segment 11 would result in a significant impact at a Key Observation Point (KOP) along the Pacific Crest Trail when evaluated under CEQA.

The proposed Project also would result in significant aesthetic impacts under CEQA at KOPs along Segments 7 and 8. Most significant impacts would be reduced by implementation of APMs and mitigation measures; however, some would remain significant.

## **II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

Project construction and operation would have less than significant impacts on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, and Grazing Land; zoning for agricultural use; and Williamson Act contracts and would not substantially impair farming and grazing activities. Agricultural resources affected by the proposed Project represent a negligible proportion of existing supplies and APMs would further avoid and minimize impacts to agricultural lands and existing operations. See Section 4.3 of the PEA.

## **III. AIR QUALITY**

As discussed in Section 4.4 (Air Quality), 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. 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 an unavoidable significant impact on air quality. All operational related air quality effects of the proposed TRTP are considered to be less than significant.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Construction of proposed Project segments would result in impacts to riparian habitats, other sensitive native habitats, wetlands, and federal- and state-listed and Forest Service Sensitive plant and wildlife species. With implementation of APMs and biological mitigation measures, these impacts would all be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

With implementation of APMs, Project construction and operation would have a less than significant impact on cultural resources. Due to the nature of the project, careful siting, implementation of APMs and archaeological monitoring during construction are expected to avoid impacts to cultural resources. Any resources that could not be avoided would be subject to testing and data recovery as appropriate.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would have a less than significant impact upon people and structures with implementation of APMs pertaining to the effects of earthquake fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, expansive and collapsible soils, subsidence, and landslides. Such measures include implementation of geotechnical and engineering studies and incorporation of the resultant design recommendations.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

With implementation of APMs, Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would have a less than significant impact pertaining to risks associated with:

- Transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials
- Reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions causing hazardous material release into the environment
- Hazardous emissions and handling of acutely hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school
- Impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan
- Wildland fires and urban interface fires

APMs that would reduce risks to less than significant levels include but are not limited to implementation of a Construction Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and new or modified Spill Pollution Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plans, and through

development and implementation of other plans and programs required under State and federal law. See Section 4.8 of the PEA for more information.

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

With implementation of APMs, Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would have a less than significant impact on hydrology and water quality. See Section 4.9 of the PEA. APMs would avoid or minimize the potential for:

- Violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements
- Substantial erosion or siltation through altering existing drainage patterns and/or streamcourses
- Substantial flooding through altering existing drainage patterns and/or streamcourses
- Generating polluted water or overload stormwater drainage systems
- Otherwise substantially degrading water quality
- Placement of structures within a 100-year floodplain that will impede or redirect floodflows

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

Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would have a less than significant impact pertaining to existing land uses, future planning, and/or land management by the incorporated and unincorporated areas traversed by the TRTP segments in Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties. The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community, nor would it conflict with a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or a Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP). See Section 4.10 of the PEA for more information.

### **X. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would not limit the availability of mineral and energy resources. See Section 4.11 of the PEA for more information.

### **XI. NOISE**

Project construction and operation of the TRTP would result in less than significant noise impacts for all segments. Construction noise is short-term and would be minimized by an APM that would limit the hours of construction in noise sensitive locations. Operational noise would come from two primary sources: corona discharge along the T/Ls and electrical and related equipment at the substations. Corona discharge near the edge of the T/L R-O-Ws

is expected to typically measure about 40 to 50 dBA or less and is not expected to exceed any noise compatibility standards. Similarly, substation noise at the nearest residences is expected to measure less than 55 dBA. These noise levels are considered less than significant impacts. The proposed Project would not result in substantial or periodic increase in ambient noise levels with the possible exception of helicopter noise during construction and infrequent maintenance activities. Such impacts would be less than significant.

## **XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Construction and operation of Segments 4 through 11 would have a less than significant impact on population and housing as it would not induce any substantial immigration of workers or induce population growth. See Section 4.13 of the PEA for more information.

## **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 of the TRTP would not result in any change that would result in capacity constraints to existing public service providers or result in the need for new or altered governmental facilities. Temporary construction activities could potentially increase fire hazards and the Project includes an APM expected to prevent fire incidents and, if necessary, provide for immediate response and fire suppression. See Section 4.14 of the PEA for more information.

## **XIV. RECREATION**

There are no potentially significant impacts for Segments 4 through 11 of the TRTP pertaining to:

- Increasing the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would result no impact
- Recreational facilities being included in the project, or requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse effect on the environment

Although no potentially significant impacts to Recreation resources have been identified, SCE has committed to implement an APM to minimize potential adverse impacts to recreational facilities during the construction phase. See Section 4.15.5 for more information.

## **XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would have a less than significant impact with implementation of APMs that include the development of local traffic

management and detour plans as specified by state and local agencies, and any other SCE plans developed according to Section VII, above.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would have no impacts pertaining to:

- Need for new or physically altered governmental facilities for fire protection, police protection, schools, or other public facilities
- Exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities
- Wastewater treatment provider services
- Complying with federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste disposal.

Project construction and operation for Segments 4 through 11 would have a less than significant impact on water delivery and or wastewater treatment facilities, available water supplies and entitlements, and landfill capacity.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

As noted above and discussed in Sections 4.2 and 5.6, the proposed Project would create unavoidable significant impacts related to aesthetics and air quality. All other potentially significant impacts could be reduced to less than significant impacts through implementation of APMs that would avoid and minimize impacts.

The proposed Project would not achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

For the reasons described in Section 5.0, the proposed Project does not have the potential to cause impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

The Project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

*This page left intentionally blank.*