

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298
Edmund G. Brown Jr. Governor



USDA FOREST SERVICE
CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST
18045 Ranch Bernardo Rd
San Diego, CA 92127-2107
Will Metz, Forest Supervisor



**Notice of Preparation
Notice of Public Scoping Meeting
For
SDG&E Master Special Use Permit and Permit to Construct
Power Line Replacement Projects
Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement**

Application No. A.12-10-009

To: All Interested Parties

A. Introduction

San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E or applicant) is proposing to combine over 70 existing special use permits for SDG&E electric facilities within the Cleveland National Forest (CNF) into one Master Special Use Permit (MSUP) to be issued by the United States Forest Service (Forest Service). SDG&E filed a Standard Form (SF) 299 Application for Transportation and Utilities Systems and Facilities on Federal lands along with a Plan of Development (POD) to initiate this action. As shown in Figure 1, the CNF MSUP study area is located within the Trabuco Ranger District in Orange County, California and the Palomar and Descanso Ranger Districts in unincorporated areas of San Diego County, California.

The Forest Service has reviewed the application and accepted the proposal with modifications to certain actions on National Forest System lands. SDG&E revised the POD in April 2013 to include modifications as requested by the Forest Service. This modified proposal is the Forest Service proposed action described in more detail in Section D.

In addition to requesting Forest Service authorization of the MSUP, SDG&E is proposing to replace certain existing 69 kV power lines and 12 kV distribution lines located within and outside of the CNF. Replacement would primarily include fire hardening along with relocation and undergrounding of certain facilities which will require a Permit to Construct (PTC) from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). As shown in

Figure 1, the power line and distribution facilities proposed to be replaced are located within the central portion of San Diego County approximately 4.5 miles north of the US Mexico Border, 14 miles east of the City of El Cajon, in the vicinity of the unincorporated communities of Descanso, Campo, Pauma Valley, Santa Ysabel, and Warner Springs.

On October 17, 2012 SDG&E filed an application (A.12-10-009) along with the Preliminary POD for a PTC the proposed Power Line Replacement Projects with the CPUC. On June 26, 2013, SDG&E filed an amended PTC application which included modifications to certain actions on National Forest System lands as requested by the Forest Service and described in the Revised POD. The Revised POD is available on the project website at:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/dudek/CNF/DR3Response.htm>.

The CPUC and Forest Service have independent jurisdiction and approval authority for the project. In addition, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and California State Parks (CSP) have independent jurisdiction and approval authority for project segments within their areas of jurisdiction. The CPUC is the lead agency under California law and the Forest Service is the lead federal agency. As joint lead agencies, the CPUC and Forest Service have developed and signed a Memorandum of Understanding (January 2012) that will direct the preparation of a joint Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The joint document will be called the “SDG&E Master Special Use Permit and Permit to Construct Power Line Replacement Projects EIS/EIR”. The BIA and BLM are joining the Forest Service as federal cooperating agencies under NEPA, and the CSP is participating as a responsible agency under CEQA.

As required by CEQA, this Notice of Preparation (NOP) is being sent to interested agencies and members of the public. The purpose of the NOP is to inform recipients that the CPUC is beginning the joint preparation of the EIS/EIR with the Forest Service, and to solicit information that will be helpful in the environmental review process. Information that will be most useful at this time would be descriptions of concerns about the impacts of the proposed project and suggestions for alternatives that should be considered.

As required by NEPA, the Forest Service will publish a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register in conjunction with this NOP for preparation of a joint EIS/EIR. Similar to this NOP, the intent of the NOI is to initiate the public scoping for the EIS/EIR, provide information about the proposed project, and to solicit comments on the scope and content of the EIS/EIR. The NOI also serves as an invitation for other federal agencies or tribes with jurisdiction or special expertise to join as a cooperating agency. This NOP,

prepared jointly with the Forest Service, provides additional information that supplements the NOI.

This NOP includes background information on the project, a description of the applicant's proposal, the Forest Service Proposed Action, a summary of potential project impacts, time and location of the public scoping meeting, and information on how to provide comments to the CPUC and Forest Service. This NOP and the NOI can be viewed on the project website at the following link:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/dudek/CNF/CNF.htm>

B. Background

In 2005, in consultation with the Forest Service, SDG&E submitted an initial application to obtain an MSUP. The purpose of the MSUP was to consolidate SDG&E's rights and responsibilities in connection with the continued operation of its electric lines and other existing facilities located within the CNF. As part of the NEPA review process, the Forest Service circulated an Environmental Assessment (EA) for public comment in 2009. In response to public comments received on that EA, the Forest Service determined that additional fire risk reduction measures within the CNF (including fire hardening) and additional undergrounding should be evaluated as part of the MSUP review process and that, as a result, an environmental impact statement (EIS) was required. SDG&E has expanded the scope of the proposed MSUP to include fire hardening, undergrounding and relocation as proposed in the power line replacement projects discussed in this NOP.

C. Applicant's Proposal

C.1 Applicant's Purpose and Objectives

According to SDG&E, the objectives of the MSUP and PTC are to (1) secure Forest Service authorization to continue to operate and maintain existing SDG&E facilities within National Forest System lands; and (2) increase the fire safety and service reliability of these facilities by replacing five existing 69 kV power line facilities and six existing 12 kV distribution line facilities. SDG&E's stated objectives also include undertaking these activities consistent with CPUC General Orders, North American Electric Reliability Corporation/Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (NERC/FERC) requirements and SDG&E standards; and minimizing potential environmental impacts by locating facilities within previously-disturbed areas where feasible.

C.2 Description of the Applicant's Proposed Project

Master Special Use Permit

SDG&E proposes to combine into one MSUP over 70 previously-issued use permits for 69 kV power line and 12 kV distribution line facilities as well as ancillary and appurtenant facilities within the CNF. The MSUP, if approved, would allow the continued maintenance and operation of SDG&E's existing 69 kV power lines, 12 kV distribution lines, ancillary, and appurtenant facilities as well as approximately 45 miles of existing exclusive use access roads required to operate and maintain SDG&E's existing electric facilities within the administrative boundary of the CNF.

Wood-to-Steel Pole Replacements

The Project would also replace the following existing 69 kV power lines and 12 kV distribution lines located within and outside of the CNF. Replacement would include fire hardening (wood to steel pole replacement), along with removal, relocation, undergrounding and single to double circuit conversion along certain segments.

- The existing 69 kV Power Line (TL) 625 – is approximately 22.5 miles in total length and generally runs from Loveland Substation east to Barrett Tap, from Barrett Tap east to Descanso Substation, and from Barrett Tap south to Barrett Substation. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion along with single circuit to double circuit conversion.
- The existing TL626 – is approximately 18.8 miles in total length and generally runs from Santa Ysabel Substation south to Descanso Substation. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion.
- The existing TL629 – is approximately 29.8 miles in total length and generally runs from Descanso Substation east to Glenclyff Substation, from Glenclyff Substation southeast to Cameron Tap, from Cameron Tap south to Cameron Substation, and from Cameron Tap east to Crestwood Substation. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion, undergrounding and single to double circuit conversion.
- The existing TL682 – is approximately 20.2 miles in total length and generally runs from Rincon Substation east to Warners Substation. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion.
- The existing TL6923 – is approximately 13.4 miles in total length and generally runs from Barrett Substation east to Cameron Substation. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion.

- The existing 12 kV Distribution Line or Circuit (C) 78 – is approximately 1.8 miles in total length and generally runs from east of Viejas Reservation, east along Viejas Grade Road, to Via Arturo Road. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion and overhead relocation.
- The existing C79 – is approximately 2.2 miles in total length and generally runs from Boulder Creek Road east to the Cuyamaca Peak communication site. Proposed replacement includes removal of existing overhead line and replacement with new undergrounding through Cuyamaca Rancho State Park.
- The existing C157 – is approximately 3.5 miles in total length and generally runs from Skye Valley Road, near Lyons Valley Road, east to Skye Valley Ranch. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion. The Applicant's proposal includes replacement and motorized use in the congressionally designated Hauser and Pine Creek Wilderness areas. The Forest Service has determined that this aspect of the Applicant's proposal conflicts with the requirements of the Wilderness Act. The Applicant has requested the Forest Service to include an alternative whereby the Forest Service seeks authority from Congress to approve the fire safety work within the wilderness areas.
- The existing C440 – is approximately 24.0 miles in total length and generally runs from Glencliff Substation northeast to Mount Laguna along Sunrise Highway. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion with some line removal, undergrounding and overhead relocation.
- The existing C442 – is approximately 6.2 miles in total length and generally runs south from Pine Valley Road to Los Pinos Peak Forest Station and along Pine Creek Road south toward the community of Pine Valley. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion.
- The existing C449 – is approximately 6.7 miles in total length and generally runs from Old Highway 80 south along Buckman Springs Road to Oak Drive and southwest along Morena Stokes Valley Road to Camp Morena. Proposed replacement includes wood to steel pole conversion with some line removal and undergrounding.

The Applicant also proposes to install appurtenant facilities on poles and within the right-of-way as needed to continue to operate and maintain the electric system. These appurtenances may include electrical switches, smart grid control devices, weather stations, surveillance cameras, and other equipment necessary or prudent to ensure safe and reliable operation of its electric system.

D. Forest Service Proposed Action

As described in the introduction, the Forest Service reviewed and accepted the application with modifications to certain actions on National Forest System lands. This modified proposal is the federal proposed action that will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR.

D.1 Forest Service Purpose and Need

The Forest Service purpose is to authorize the powerlines and associated facilities needed to continue electric service to a variety of users within and adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest through a Master Special Use Permit in a manner that is consistent with the CNF Land Management Plan (LMP). This action is needed because the 70 individual permits or easements for the existing facilities have expired, and a permit is required for the continued occupancy and use of National Forest System lands.

Permits issued by the Forest Service are required by law to be consistent with the LMP. The LMP identifies suitable uses within various land use zones, describes desired conditions based on the LMP goals and objectives, and sets resource management standards. The Forest Service proposed action is designed to be consistent with the LMP requirements. The Forest Service purpose and need will guide the development of alternatives considered on National Forest System lands.

D.2 Forest Service Proposed Action

The Forest Service proposed action modifies the applicant's proposal in the following areas:

- TL 626 – The Forest Service proposed action is to relocate a section of TL 626 out of the Cedar Creek publically proposed undeveloped area and into a location within the study corridor shown in Figure 1. The section of line that is replaced will be removed and the affected area restored. The relocated section of line would be constructed to the same standard described by the applicant. Construction of access roads will depend on the final location identified in the study corridor. A more detailed location including alignments both on and off of the Inaja Indian Reservation will be identified based on input during scoping and analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR.

The existing powerline access roads are impacting the Cedar Creek riparian area in conflict with the LMP. The steep road gradients prevent effective implementation of erosion control treatments. This area is also being evaluated for recommended wilderness zoning in the LMP. Relocation of the line will avoid riparian impacts and restore the undeveloped character of the landscape.

- C157 – The Forest Service proposed action would relocate the section of C157 out of the Hauser Wilderness and into the area between the Hauser and Pine Creek Wilderness areas as shown in Figure 1. The section of line that is replaced will be removed and the affected area restored consistent with wilderness objectives. The relocated section of line would be constructed to the same standard described by the applicant. Construction in the area between the two designated wilderness areas is consistent with the LMP and the Wilderness Act.
- Appurtenant Facilities – The Forest Service proposes to authorize electrical control devices and weather stations not otherwise specified in the permit, subject to Forest Service review and approval of final design and location. The Forest Service is not proposing to authorize surveillance cameras on National Forest System lands.

The facilities would be authorized by a special use permit. The permit has standard resource protection conditions, along with requirements for various plans to implement those conditions. A sample Master Special Use Permit, draft Operation and Maintenance Plan, and draft Fire Plan are available on the project website.

E. Affected Jurisdictions

As shown in Figure 1, the MSUP/PTC Power line Replacement Projects study area not only traverses National Forest System lands, but due to the patchwork of land ownership in the project study area, also traverses public lands managed by the BLM; tribal lands of the La Jolla, Campo, Inaja, and Viejas Indian Reservations managed by the respective tribes and held in trust by the BIA; Cuyamaca Rancho State Park lands managed by CSP; and private holdings within unincorporated San Diego County amongst others.

F. Potential Environmental Effects

The joint EIS/EIR will evaluate potential environmental effects of the proposed MSUP/PTC Powerline Replacement Projects. The CPUC and Forest Service will propose mitigation measures to reduce or offset any significant or adverse effects identified in the analysis. The EIS/EIR will identify reasonable alternatives, compare the environmental impacts of the alternatives to the proposed action, and propose mitigation to reduce or avoid their effects.

Based on preliminary analysis, the proposed action may have a number of environmental effects. Potential issues and impacts to the existing environment to be analyzed in the EIS/EIR include those listed in Attachment 1. No determinations have yet been made as to the significance of these potential impacts; such determinations will be made in the environmental analysis conducted in the EIS/EIR after the issues are considered

thoroughly. To assist the reader in understanding the range of impacts that could be considered, and to provide a guide for scoping comments, Attachment 2 includes CEQA checklist questions that typically would be evaluated in an EIR.

The EIS/EIR will also address the cumulative environmental consequences of the proposed MSUP/PTC Powerline Replacement Projects in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the area, including known renewable energy and utility projects. This will serve to satisfy CEQA/NEPA requirements regarding regional cumulative effect concerns.

Mitigation Measures

SDG&E has proposed measures that could reduce or eliminate potential impacts of the proposed MSUP/PTC Powerline Replacement Projects. The effectiveness of these measures (called applicant proposed measures or APMs) will be evaluated in the EIR/EIS, and additional measures (mitigation or avoidance measures) will be developed to further reduce or avoid impacts, if required. When the CPUC and Forest Service make their final decision on the proposed project, they will define the mitigation measures to be adopted if the project or an alternative is approved, and the CPUC and Forest Service will require implementation of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

G. Alternatives

In compliance with CEQA and NEPA, the EIS/EIR will describe and evaluate the comparative merits of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Forest Service proposed action and associated MSUP/PTC Powerline Replacement Projects proposed on private lands. In determining the scope of alternatives to be considered, the emphasis is on what is "reasonable" rather than on whether the proponent or applicant likes or is itself capable of carrying out a particular alternative. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense, rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applicant. Reasonable alternatives also attain all or most of the purpose and need and avoid or lessen any of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Alternatives to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS will be developed during the environmental review process and will consider input received during public scoping.

As required by CEQA and NEPA the EIS/EIR will also evaluate the No Project/No Action Alternative. Under the No Project/Action Alternative, no MSUP or PTC would be issued. SDG&E would not be allowed to continue to operate and maintain its facilities on National Forest System lands as the current permits are expired. The permits require SDG&E to remove the facilities upon expiration of the permits. In

addition, the proposed power line replacement projects including fire hardening for fire prevention would not occur.

H. Public Scoping Meeting

The CPUC and Forest Service will conduct two public scoping meetings in the project area, as shown in Table 1. The purpose of these scoping meetings is to present information about the proposed project and the CPUC and Forest Service's decision-making process, and to listen to the views of the public on the range of issues relevant to the scope and content of the EIS/EIR.

Everyone is encouraged to attend one of these meetings to express their concerns about the project and to offer suggestions regarding the project as proposed, including alternatives.

Table 1
Public Scoping Meeting

Location	Day, Date, Time	Directions
Julian Elementary School 1704 Cape Horn Julian, CA 92036	Tuesday, October 22, 2013 5:00 p.m.	From the west: take Highway 78 through Julian. Turn right on 2 nd Street (across from the Post Office and before the library). Turn right onto Cape Horn. The Julian Elementary School is on Cape Horn behind the library and high school. From the east: take Highway 78 west towards Julian. Turn left on 2 nd Street (across from the Post Office and after the library). Turn right onto Cape Horn. The Julian Elementary School is on Cape Horn behind the library and high school. From the south: take Highway 79 north to Highway 78 in Julian. Turn right onto Highway 78. Take the next left onto 2 nd Street (across from the Post Office and before the library). Turn right onto Cape Horn. The Julian Elementary School is on Cape Horn behind the library and high school.
Alpine Community Center 1830 Alpine Boulevard Alpine, CA 91901	Wednesday, October 23, 2013 5:00 p.m.	From the west: take I-8 east and take exit 30 Tavern Road . Turn right onto Tavern Road (south). Turn left onto Alpine Boulevard. Alpine Community Highland Center will be on the left-hand side. From the east: take I-8 west and take exit 30 Tavern Road . Turn left (south) onto Tavern Road. Turn left onto Alpine Boulevard. Alpine Community Center will be on the left-hand side.

I. Scoping Comments

At this time, the CPUC and Forest Service are soliciting information regarding the topics and alternatives that should be included in the EIS/EIR. Suggestions for submitting scoping comments are presented at the end of this section. The NOP will have an extended public review period (45 days) from September 23, 2013 to November 7, 2013. All scoping comments must be received by November 7, 2013. You may submit comments in a variety of ways: (1) by U.S. mail, (2) by electronic mail (e-mail), or (3) by attending the public scoping meeting (see time and location in Table 1) and handing in written comments at the scoping meeting.

By Mail: If you send comments by U.S. mail, please use first-class mail and be sure to include your name and a return address. Please send written comments on the scope and content of the EIS/EIR to:

Lisa Orsaba, California Public Utilities Commission
Will Metz, Forest Supervisor, Cleveland National Forest
c/o Dudek
605 Third Street
Encinitas, California 92024

By Electronic Mail: E-mail communications are welcome; however, please remember to include your name and return address in the e-mail message. E-mail messages should be sent to cnfmsup@dudek.com, with a subject line “SDG&E Master Permit”.

A **Scoping Report** will be prepared, summarizing all comments received. This report will be posted on the project website at:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/dudek/CNF/CNF.htm>;

and copies will be placed in local document repository sites listed in Table 2. In addition, a limited number of copies will be available upon request to the CPUC or Forest Service project managers.

Suggestions for Effective Participation in Scoping

Following are some suggestions for preparing and providing the most useful information for the EIS/EIR scoping process.

- 1. Review the description of the project** (see Sections C and D of this Notice of Preparation and the maps provided). Additional detail on the project description from SDG&E’s POD is available on the project website where the POD may be viewed.

- 2. Review the CEQA impact assessment questions** (see Attachment 2).
- 3. Attend the scoping meeting** to get more information on the project and the environmental review process (see time and date in Table 1).
- 4. Submit written comments** or attend the scoping meeting and **ask questions during the informational meeting**. Explain important issues that the EIS/EIR should cover in written comments.
- 5. Suggest mitigation measures** that could reduce the potential impacts associated with SDG&E's proposed project.
- 6. Suggest alternatives** to SDG&E's proposed project that could avoid or reduce the impacts of the proposed project.

J. For Additional Project Information

Internet Website. Information about this application and the environmental review process will be posted on the Internet at:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/dudek/CNF/CNF.htm>.

This site will be used to post all public documents during the environmental review process and to announce upcoming public meetings. In addition, a copy of SDG&E's POD may be found at this site, and the Draft EIS/EIR will be posted at the site after it is published.

Project Information Hotline. You may request project information by leaving a voice message at 866.467.4727.

Document Repositories. Documents related to the proposed project and the EIS/EIR will be made available at the locations listed in Table 2.

K. Issuance of Notice of Preparation

The CPUC hereby issues this NOP of an EIS/EIR, which can be found at the repository sites listed in Table 2.

Table 2
Repository Sites

Site	Address	Telephone
Alpine Branch Library	2130 Arnold Way Alpine, California 91901	619.445.4221
Campo-Morena Village Branch Library	31356 Highway 94 Campo, California 91906	619.478.5945
Descanso Branch Library	9545 River Drive Descanso, California 91916	619.445-5279

Table 2
Repository Sites

Site	Address	Telephone
Pine Valley Branch Library	28804 Old Hwy. 80 Pine Valley, California 91962	619.473.8022
Julian Branch Library	1850 Highway 78 Julian, California 92036	760.765.0370
Ramona Branch Library	1275 Main Street Ramona, California 92065	760.788.5270
Dudek	605 Third Street Encinitas, California 92024	760.942.5147

Attachment 1

Summary of Potential Impacts: MSUP/PTC Powerline Replacement Projects

The CPUC and Forest Service have determined that the following potential issues and impacts to the existing environment require a detailed analysis in the EIS/EIR. No determinations have yet been made as to the significance of these potential impacts; such determinations will be made in the environmental analysis conducted in the EIS/EIR after the issues are considered thoroughly. This overview is presented to assist the public and agencies in preparing written scoping comments.

Environmental Issue Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction-related activities would result in the temporary degradation of existing visual character and quality in the project study area, including scenic vistas and other designated scenic resources. • Nighttime construction lighting may be used during project construction that could affect the nighttime view. • There may be potential conflicts associated with proposed wood to steel pole replacement with federal, state, and local plans; regulations; or standards applicable to the protection of visual resources.
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project construction will produce short-term air emissions (fugitive dust and vehicle equipment exhaust) and may violate air quality standards during construction.
Biological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project construction and vegetation management activities could result in temporary and permanent loss of native wildlife and/or their habitat. • Loss of habitat for sensitive species designated by state and federal resource agencies. • Conflict with federal, state, or local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction and operation could damage or destroy historic and archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, or areas containing paleontological resources. • Temporary use of staging areas and conductor pull sites could damage or destroy historic and archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, or areas containing paleontological resources.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities would result in greenhouse gas emissions.
Hazards, Hazardous Materials, Fire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaking or spilling of petroleum or hydraulic fluids from construction equipment or other vehicles during project construction, operation, or maintenance could contaminate soils, surface waters, or groundwater. • Fire hazard during construction and operation.
Hydrology and Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project construction and operation and maintenance could affect surface water flow and erosion rates causing subsequent downstream sedimentation and reduced surface water quality.
Land Use and Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction would temporarily disturb ongoing or traditional land uses within the project study area. • Possible conflicts with pending land management plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Environmental Issue Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project construction will produce short-term noise (from helicopters, vehicles and construction equipment) and may violate noise standards during construction.
Public Services and Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction activities could result in increased generation of waste and disposal needs. Fire and emergency services may be required to service the proposed project and project study area during construction and operation.
Wilderness and Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction or operation could cause conflicts with ongoing or traditional recreation uses in the project study area. Construction or operation could cause conflicts with the Wilderness Act of 1964.
Transportation and Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic would be generated by construction worker commute trips and equipment deliveries. Hauling materials, such as poles, concrete, conductor, and excavation spoils, would temporarily increase existing traffic volumes in the project study area. Access roads could increase vehicle trespass into areas where vehicles are not authorized.
Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relocation of certain transmission facilities may result in social and economic effects as well as have disproportionately high or adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.

Environmental resources areas preliminarily determined to have a less than significant impact as a result of the proposed project and to not require further analysis include:

- **Agriculture and Forestry Resources:** Since no land use changes are proposed with the replacement and fire hardening of the existing transmission and distribution lines, the proposed project would not convert existing agriculture or forestry lands to non-agricultural or non-forest uses.
- **Geology, Soils, and Seismicity:** The proposed new steel power line structures would be more structurally sound than the existing wood poles due to improved engineering characteristics, increased material strength, and improved design safety requirements. The proposed project would be built to existing SDG&E design standards. Soil erosion will be addressed under Hydrology and Water Quality.
- **Population and Housing:** The proposed project would not result in population growth in the area because no new homes or businesses are proposed, and no new infrastructure related to population growth is proposed. In addition, no new housing is needed because non-local construction workers would use available temporary housing throughout San Diego County. Further, the workers would be in the area only during construction and are not expected to become permanent residents.
- **Electric Magnetic Field (EMF):** While the proposed project would relocate and underground certain transmission facilities, there will be no increase in the voltage used; therefore, there would be no significant change to EMF.

Attachment 2

Environmental Checklist

Following are the questions included in Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Environmental Checklist Form (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.). These are issues that may be evaluated in an environmental impact report (EIR), if they are determined to be relevant to the project. This list is provided only to provide the reader with a general idea of the types of impacts that will be considered for the proposed project.

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public

Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- Involve other changes in the existing environmental which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- 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)?
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

- 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?
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature?
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 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 the California Division of Mines and Geology Spec. Pub. 42)
 - Strong seismic groundshaking?
 - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - Landslides?
- Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- 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?
- 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?

- 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 wastewater?

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- 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?
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- 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?
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- 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?
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- 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?

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- 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?

- 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?
- 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?
- 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?
- Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- 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?
- Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- 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?
- Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- Physically divide an established community?
- 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?
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- 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?

XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:

- Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above 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?
- 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?

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)?
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES.

- 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:
 - Fire protection?
 - Police Protection?
 - Schools?
 - Parks?
 - Other public facilities?

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- 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?
- 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?
- Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- 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?
- Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XV. RECREATION. 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?
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
- Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- 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?
- Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- Result in inadequate emergency access?
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- 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?
- Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?
- 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.)
- Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

