

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of SOUTHERN)
CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E)) A.13-08-XXX
for a Certificate of Public Convenience and)
Necessity for the Coolwater-Lugo Transmission)
Project)

PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COOLWATER-LUGO TRANSMISSION PROJECT

Volume 3 of 7

<p>This PEA is being filed separately from the application and is being submitted as an archival DVD and CD ROM</p>

BETH GAYLORD
TAMMY JONES
ANGELA M. WHATLEY

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6634
Facsimile: (626) 302-1926
E-mail:tammy.jones@sce.com

Dated: **August 28, 2013**

Volume 3 of 7

APPENDIX A

CEQA CHECKLIST

Appendix A Environmental Checklist Form

Project Title

Coolwater-Lugo Transmission Project (“Coolwater-Lugo”)

Lead Agency Name and Address

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

Contact Persons and Phone Number

Thomas Diaz
Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”)
Project Manager, Regulatory Policy & Affairs Department
(626) 302-1164

Project Location

Coolwater-Lugo is located in San Bernardino County. Coolwater-Lugo would traverse through the City of Hesperia, the Town of Apple Valley, unincorporated San Bernardino County, including the unincorporated communities of Lucerne Valley, Daggett, and Newberry Springs; on U.S. Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”) lands; and on California State Lands Commission lands. Alternative Transmission Segment 9 would traverse through the Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, in the City of Barstow.

Project Sponsor’s Name and Address

Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”)
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, California 91770

General Plan Designation

The California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) has primary jurisdiction over Coolwater-Lugo because it authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. CPUC G.O. 131-D Section XIV.B states, “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.” SCE has considered local land use plans as part of the environmental review process.

The Proposed and Alternative Desert View Substation sites are each located in unincorporated San Bernardino County, near the junction of Proposed and Alternative Transmission Line Segment 5, Alternative Segment 6, and Proposed Segment 7. The Proposed Substation is located on the north side of Desert View Road, between Lagartijo Drive and Laguna Seca Drive. The Alternative Substation is located approximately 0.6

mile west of the Proposed Substation, on the north side of Desert View Road, between Japatul Road and Bellview Avenue.

Most of the Coolwater-Lugo transmission lines would be in or directly adjacent to existing utility corridors (Segments 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12). Proposed Transmission Line Segment 1 would start at the south end of Proposed and Alternative Transmission Line Segment 12 and extend southwest parallel to the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (“LADWP”) utility corridor. Proposed and Alternative Transmission Line Segment 2 would extend southeasterly from Segment 1 toward State Route 247 (“SR-247”). It would be located in unincorporated San Bernardino County, on BLM lands, on regional or private lands, and on State of California lands. Proposed Transmission Line Segment 3 would run southerly along SR-247. Alternative Transmission Line Segment 4 would run parallel to Segment 3 approximately 0.5 mile west of SR-247. It is an alternative to Segment 3. Segments 3 and 4 in zoned areas of Lucerne Valley would be located in areas zoned for either rural living or agriculture. From Lucerne Valley, Proposed and Alternative Segment 5, Alternative Segment 6 (portion), and Proposed Segment 7 would run along existing utility corridors that currently have 500 kV and/or 220 kV transmission lines and terminate at the Lugo Substation in Hesperia. Alternative Transmission Line Segment 6 is an alternative to Proposed Transmission Line Segment 7. The north to south portion of Alternative Segment 6 would not be located to an existing utility corridor and would be on lands in unincorporated San Bernardino County. Alternative Transmission Line Segments 11, 9, and 10 would extend from the Coolwater Switchyard in a westerly direction until they intersect with SR-247. Alternative Transmission Line Segment 8 would travel in a southwesterly direction west of SR-247 through the BLM’s Stoddard Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Area. Alternative Segment 9 is an alternative to Alternative Segment 10. Segments 9 and 11 would be located adjacent to an existing 115 kV transmission line. Alternative Transmission Line Segment 9 would traverse a portion of the Marine Corps Logistic Base (“MCLB”) Barstow. Proposed and Alternative Transmission Line Segment 12 would extend south from Coolwater Switchyard along an existing transmission line to the LADWP utility corridor.

Existing land use designation in the Coolwater-Lugo area are shown in Table 1, *General Plan Land Use Designations*.

Table 1 General Plan Land Use Designations

Project Component	Jurisdiction	GP Land Use Designation
Desert View Substation	San Bernardino County	Residential
<i>Transmission Lines</i>		
Segment 1	San Bernardino County	Open Space
Segment 2	San Bernardino County	Open Space
Segment 3	San Bernardino County	Rural Living Residential, Agriculture, Open Space
Segment 4	San Bernardino County	Rural Living Residential, Agriculture, Open Space
Segment 5	San Bernardino County	Rural Living Resource, Agriculture, Open Space
Segment 6	San Bernardino County City of Hesperia	Rural Living Residential, Residential, Open Space, Transportation/Railroad Corridor, Urban Mixed, Utilities
Segment 7	San Bernardino County City of Hesperia	Rural Living Residential, Residential, Agriculture, Transportation/Railroad Corridor, Utilities
Segment 8	San Bernardino County	Open Space, Rural Living Residential
Segment 9	City of Barstow (MCLB), San Bernardino County	Military, Open Space, Rural Living Residential
Segment 10	San Bernardino County	Open Space, Rural Living Residential
Segment 11	San Bernardino County	Open Space
Segment 12	San Bernardino County	Open Space, Rural Living Residential, General Industrial
Telecommunication Route (Apple Valley to Desert View)	Town of Apple Valley	Rural Living Residential, Residential, Agriculture, K-12 Schools, General Commercial, Urban Mixed
Telecommunication Route (Gale to Pisgah)	San Bernardino County	Open Space, Rural Living Residential, Residential, Agriculture, General Commercial, Institutions/ Government, Light Industrial, Other Retail/Service

Zoning

The CPUC has primary jurisdiction over Coolwater-Lugo, as the CPUC authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of public utility facilities. However, SCE has considered other state and local land use plans as part of the environmental review process, even though such projects are exempt from local land use jurisdiction, zoning regulations and permits.

Project Description

To provide additional south of Kramer capacity to integrate current and future renewable generation projects, SCE needs to develop new and upgraded transmission facilities. These new and upgraded transmission facilities would eliminate the bottlenecks that would preclude renewable generation resources from reaching the utility load centers. To this end, SCE is required to develop and maintain a reliable transmission network with adequate capacity. The facilities needed to deliver the electrical power from the new planned generation resources located in the Barstow, Inyokern, Kramer, Lucerne Valley, Apple Valley, and Owens Valley areas have been identified through generation interconnection studies performed as mandated by the CAISO. The major components of these facilities are summarized below.

Substations

- Reconfigure Coolwater 220 kV Switchyard
- Terminate new Coolwater-Desert View 220 kV Transmission Line at the Coolwater and Desert View 220 kV buses
- Install new relay buildings and necessary equipment to support the SPS at Coolwater 220 kV Switchyard
- Expand the Lugo 500 kV Switchrack to the south five positions
- Relocate two existing 500 kV transmission line terminations at Lugo Substation
- Terminate new Desert View-Lugo 220 kV Transmission Line at the Desert View and Lugo 220 kV buses
- Install one 500/220 kV transformer bank at Lugo Substation
- Construct new relay building and install bank protection relays at Lugo Substation
- Install new protection, control, and SPS at Lugo Substation
- License proposed Desert View 500/220/115/12 kV Substation and initially construct the facilities necessary to loop the Coolwater-Lugo 220 kV Transmission Line into Desert View Substation

Transmission and Telecommunication

- Remove approximately 29.1 miles of the existing Lugo-Pisgah No.1 220 kV Transmission Line from Lugo Substation northeast to approximately the intersection of Haynes Road and State Route 247 (“SR-247”)
- Remove approximately 16.0 miles of the existing Lugo-Pisgah No.2 220 kV Transmission Line from Lugo Substation northeast to proposed Desert View

Substation and terminate the remaining portion of this line into the proposed Desert View Substation

- Construct 16.6 miles of 500 kV single-circuit transmission line (initially operated at 220 kV) from Lugo Substation to the proposed Desert View Substation and 13.6 miles of 220 kV double-circuit transmission line in existing ROW from proposed Desert View Substation to approximately the intersection of Haynes Road and SR-247
- Construct approximately 34.0 miles of 220 kV double-circuit transmission line from Coolwater 220 kV Switchyard south to the existing Lugo-Pisgah transmission corridor, located approximately near the intersection of Haynes Road and SR-247
- Install a new 150-foot tall microwave tower and foundation at the existing Coolwater 220 kV Switchyard
- Install lightwave transponder equipment or optical amplifier and channel bank equipment at Coolwater Switchyard, Lugo Substation, and the proposed Desert View Substation
- Install approximately 11.0 miles of Fiber-Optic Cable from existing Apple Valley Substation to the proposed Desert View Substation
- Install approximately 29.0 miles of Fiber-Optic Cable from existing Pisgah Substation near Ludlow to the existing Gale Substation near Daggett

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Coolwater-Lugo is located in San Bernardino County. Coolwater-Lugo would traverse through the City of Hesperia, the Town of Apple Valley, unincorporated San Bernardino County, including the unincorporated communities of Lucerne Valley, Daggett, and Newberry Springs; on U.S. Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”) lands; and on California State Lands Commission lands. Alternative Transmission Segment 9 would traverse through the Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, in the City of Barstow. Much of the surrounding land use is open desert. However, many places along the project route have differing land uses. For example, part of Proposed Transmission Segment 7 passes through a utility corridor in an urbanized portion of Hesperia. The Gale to Pisgah Telecommunication Route parallels Interstate 40 (“I-40”), Proposed and Alternative Transmission Segment 12 connects to the Coolwater Switchyard in an industrial area east of Barstow and passes over I-40, and Proposed Transmission Segment 1 and Segment 5 would be in an existing utility right of way corridor.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES 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 on the following pages. Most of these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of SCE’s Applicant Proposed Measures. However, there are impacts related to aesthetics and air quality that would remain significant.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION

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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the

proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Title

Agency

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 earlier analyses may be cross-referenced as discussed below).
- 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 CHECKLIST

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS:</u> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. <u>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES:</u> 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. 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:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX A CEQA CHECKLIST

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS:</u> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. <u>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:</u> Would the project?				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VIII. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:</u> Would the project?				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IX. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:</u> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX A CEQA CHECKLIST

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
X. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING:</u> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. <u>MINERAL RESOURCES:</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. <u>NOISE:</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XIII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING:</u> 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: 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:				
a) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XV. RECREATION:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) 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 by not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX A CEQA CHECKLIST

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources and Explanation of Answers

This section contains a brief explanation for answers provided in the environmental checklist form.

AESTHETICS

The Proposed Project is not located near a designated scenic vista or scenic highway. As demonstrated in Section 4.1.4, *Aesthetics Impact Analysis*, the Proposed Project represents an incremental change in the visual character or quality of the site, but generally, impacts associated with the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Lights for the Proposed Project would only be used when required for construction work, maintenance work, and emergency repairs occurring at night. The lighting would not have a significant effect on nighttime views in the area.

A series of Key Observation Points (“KOPs”) were selected for the project. At KOP 6, near the Lucerne Valley Cutoff and KOP 9 near SR-247, construction of the Proposed Project would create impacts to scenery that would be moderate, and impacts to viewers would be high. The project would not comply with agency management objectives. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated (See Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*).

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

The Proposed Project would be built on a combination of existing and newly acquired ROWs. It would not be located on land that is zoned for agricultural use or under a Williamson Act contract. Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, also do not occur in the Coolwater-Lugo project area, with the exception of a small portion of land along the Mojave River in the City of Hesperia cultivated with alfalfa, designated as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. Alternative Transmission Segment 6 would traverse land that is under Williamson Act contract but that according to recent aerial photo interpretation, is not currently used for active agriculture. The Proposed Desert View Substation site is currently vacant undeveloped land that is not used for agricultural purposes. There are no agricultural land use designations on or adjacent to the Proposed Desert View Substation. In addition, the Proposed Project would not be located on or near areas zoned for forestland or timberland use nor active agricultural lands are located in the Proposed Transmission Line Route facilities and Proposed Telecommunication Line Route. There is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, along the proposed transmission and telecommunication line routes. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not change existing agricultural use or create additional impacts related to conversion of Farmland. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated in regards to agriculture and forestry resources (see Section 4.2, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*).

AIR QUALITY

The Coolwater-Lugo area is under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (“MDAQMD”), which regulates air quality improvement programs within the desert portion of the MDAB and works to improve regional air quality to

achieve Federal and State standards. The MDAQMD has the authority to comment on all air quality-related matters within its jurisdiction and may provide comments regarding air impacts from projects. According to the MDAQMD CEQA and Federal Conformity Guidelines (MDAQMD 2011), a project is deemed to be consistent with the air quality plan if it is consistent with the existing land use plan.

Annual emissions during construction of each component of the Proposed Project during months 1 through 12, which is the 12-month period with the highest construction emissions, and maximum annual emissions during construction of the entire Proposed Project. The estimated maximum annual emissions of NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} during construction activities exceed corresponding MDAQMD annual significance thresholds. Emissions of these pollutants during construction may contribute to air quality violations. SCE would implement Applicant Proposed Measures (“APM”) AIR-1 and APM AIR-2, which would reduce emissions. In addition, the MDAQMD has developed and implemented Rule 403.2, Fugitive Dust Control for the Mojave Desert Planning Area, to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of human-made fugitive dust sources, by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions. As required by Rule 403.2 for demolition/construction sources disturbing 100 or more acres, SCE would develop and submit to the MDAQMD before the start of construction a dust control plan that describes all applicable dust control measures that will be implemented to reduce impacts to air quality. Compliance with the regulatory requirements described above, and implementation of APM AIR-1 and APM AIR-2, would reduce air quality impacts but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated during construction of the Proposed Project but less than significant impacts during operation of the project.

Construction of the Proposed Project could also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions. Compliance with the regulatory requirements, and implementation of APM AIR-1 and APM AIR-2, would reduce air quality impacts but not to a less than significant level. Therefore, cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated during construction and operation of the Proposed Project (see Section 4.3, *Air Quality*).

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Much of the Proposed Project area has been identified as habitat for numerous special status plant and animal species. Only one listed plant species was documented to occur in the Coolwater-Lugo area: Booth’s evening primrose, in the vicinity of Alternative Transmission Line Segment 6. However, a total of 27 listed plant species were determined to have a “high” or “medium” likelihood of occurring within the Coolwater-Lugo area. Most of these species are annual and dependent on annual rainfall amounts and microhabitat conditions that can vary from year to year. Both survey years had below-average rainfall resulting in a very low annual bloom. Impacts to these special-status plant species from direct grading and construction activities would be avoided where possible; the potential of these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels by incorporating APMs. These measures would provide for the identification and flagging of sensitive species within the Coolwater-Lugo area so that construction crews

will avoid working within the area and observation and documentation of work activities to ensure that no sensitive species are impacted during construction. In addition, construction crews would be provided environmental training outlining Coolwater-Lugo biological concerns, construction crew responsibility, and BMPs.

Ten special-status wildlife species were observed in the Coolwater-Lugo area: desert tortoise, Cooper's hawk, golden eagle, burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, prairie falcon, loggerhead shrike, Bendire's thrasher, Le Conte's thrasher, and coast horned lizard (near Alternative Transmission Line Segment 6). Twenty-two additional special-status wildlife species were determined to have a "high" or "medium" potential to occur in the Coolwater-Lugo area.

Implementation of APMs would ensure identification of special-status species prior to construction activities, and avoidance of impacts through use of biological monitors and through application of species-specific measures. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant following implementation of the proposed APMs (see Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*).

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Ground-disturbing activities such as grading, excavation, and trenching are identified as the activities most likely to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources. These impacts would occur only during construction, but could involve all Coolwater-Lugo components. Indirect impacts would include alteration of the historic setting of the Coolwater-Lugo area, most likely through the introduction of new, intrusive visual elements, and typically would impact historical period resources where the historic setting is a key contributor to a resource's significance. Based on cultural resources survey results to date, as well as flexibility in the final Coolwater-Lugo design, less than significant impacts are anticipated during the construction of the Proposed Project with application of APM CUL-1 for treatment of known historical resources, and APM CUL-2 for construction monitoring and treatment of unanticipated finds.

Construction of the Proposed Project has the potential to result in significant impacts to significant fossils as the result of ground disturbance. Additionally, increased access to the area by the general public and Coolwater-Lugo personnel may result in indirect impacts to surface fossils that erode onto the surface in the future. Coolwater-Lugo personnel involved in ground-disturbing activities will be trained to recognize the presence of fossils in construction excavations. To reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant, SCE has identified one APM (APM PAL-1) that would serve to address potential impacts to paleontological resources and outlines methods by which these impacts may be reduced.

Impacts to cultural and paleontological resources are anticipated to be less than significant following implementation of the proposed APMs CUL-1, CUL-2, and PAL-1 (see Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources*).

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Operation of the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, or injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides. Impacts from liquefaction, landslides, and ground failure are considered to be less than significant. Due to its proximity to an active fault zone, the Proposed Project would experience moderate to high levels of earthquake-induced ground shaking as well as ground rupture. The potential for ground rupture is high in the portions where the Proposed Transmission routes cross AP Fault Zones, however, the placement of the project components would avoid the mapped fault traces. No septic or alternative waste water disposal systems requiring soils capable of supporting these systems would be installed at the Proposed Substation Site. During construction of the Proposed Project, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”) would be implemented, which would reduce any effects due to erosion and the loss of topsoil to less-than-significant levels. In addition, the grading permit issued by the San Bernardino County and other local jurisdictions would include surface improvements that would minimize soil erosion and the loss of topsoil at the Proposed Substation site. Site preparation, design and construction in compliance with the SWPPP and the grading permit would make impacts due to soil erosion and loss of topsoil less than significant. Implementation of permanent best management practices (“BMPs”) would reduce water and wind erosion of soils, or loss of topsoil, from operation of the Proposed Project to less than significant levels (see Section 4.6, *Geology and Soils*).

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Estimated total annual construction GHG emissions are 26,107.52 tons CO₂e per year, and estimated total annual operation GHG emissions are 244.05 tons CO₂e per year. These numbers are well below the 100,000 ton MDAQMD threshold. Total annual amortized GHG emissions are estimated to be 1,836 metric tons (“MT”) CO₂e per year, which is less than the San Bernardino County Review Standard of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to have a significant impact from GHG emissions. The Proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant (see Section 4.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*).

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Proposed Project is not located on a known hazardous waste site. There would be no safety hazard for personnel during construction or operation of the Proposed Project, and no impact to people residing or working in the Proposed Project Area from a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. All transport of hazardous materials would comply with applicable laws, rules and regulations, including the acquisition of required shipping papers, package marking, labeling, transport vehicle placarding, training, and registrations; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Construction of the Proposed Project would require the limited use of hazardous materials, such as fuels, lubricants, and cleaning solvents. There is a possibility of a spill or release of hazardous

materials during construction and operation, but the controls put in place by the SWPPP, Worker Environmental Awareness Plan (“WEAP”), and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (“SPCC”) would minimize the impacts to less than significant levels. The Proposed Project also would not interfere with an emergency response plan.

Approximately 7.8 miles of Proposed Transmission Line Segment 7 would be on land classified as high fire hazard areas. However, most of the Proposed Transmission Line Routes are classified as moderate fire hazard, non-wildland/non-urban, or as urban un-zoned would be built in an area mapped as a moderate fire hazard area. SCE has standard protocols that are implemented when the National Weather Service issues a Red Flag Warning. In addition, SCE participates with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), California Office of Emergency Services, U.S. Forest Service and various city and county fire agencies in the Red Flag Fire Prevention Program and complies with California Public Resources Code Sections 4292 and 4293 related to vegetation management in transmission line corridors. In addition to the protective measures, fire risks during construction and operation would be low, as only a portion of the Proposed Project is located within a high fire hazard area. As a result, the Proposed Project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact to risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires (see Section 4.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*)

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Implementation of the SWPPP(s) and associated BMPs would minimize impacts on water quality from erosion and accidental spills, and other potential water quality impacts during construction. In addition, implementation of the WEAP, as described in Section 3.9, *Worker Environmental Awareness Training*, would provide site personnel with instruction on the individual responsibilities for water quality protection. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level. Implementation of BMPs as required by the SWPPP(s) would, as part of protecting stormwater quality, also promote groundwater recharge. Specifically, BMPs such as silt fences, or wattles that rely on localized stormwater detention as a way to slow stormwater flow would promote groundwater recharge.

Construction of the access roads for the Proposed Project may cross ephemeral drainages or man-made drainage ditches. SCE may propose temporary drainage structures such as wet crossings or pipe culverts to maintain the natural flow of surface stormwater runoff in the area for access during the rainy season and prevent or reduce erosion. If SCE determines that temporary or permanent drainage structures are necessary; an impact analysis of jurisdictional waters¹ would be conducted. The appropriate agencies would be

¹ SCE contractor, BioResource Consultants has completed an initial jurisdictional delineation details of which are included the *Wetland and Other Waters Delineation Report* for the Project, found in Appendix D.

consulted to determine permitting requirements and ensure proposed drainage improvements protect the integrity of the channel as required. Any drainage improvements are expected to cause only minimal alteration of surface water and would not impede or change the overall drainage pattern of the site that would result in substantial erosion or siltation.

Project design and BMPs would ensure that operation of the Proposed Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the area in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on or off site, nor would the Proposed Project exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Following implementation of BMPs and design features, the Proposed Project would not substantially degrade water quality. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant (see Section 4.9, *Hydrology*).

LAND USE AND PLANNING

The Proposed Project would be developed in existing transmission line or distribution line (for the telecommunication routes) ROWs, or near or parallel to existing transmission lines, or in a nonurban, undeveloped desert setting, implementing the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community.

The CPUC's jurisdiction over electric power line projects and substations exempts the Proposed Project from local land use jurisdiction pursuant to General Order No. 131-D. The Proposed Project is generally compatible with San Bernardino County and the other jurisdictions' land use, zoning and future planning for the area. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable environmental plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

From a land use and planning perspective, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with or impact a implementation of a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impacts are anticipated (see Section 4.10, *Land Use and Planning*).

MINERAL RESOURCES

The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan; there would be no impact. Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not represent a significant area that would be unavailable for exploration and extraction of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the state; no impacts are anticipated (see Section 4.11, *Mineral Resources*).

NOISE

The City of Hesperia, Town of Apple Valley, and the San Bernardino County Noise Ordinances would regulate construction noise generated by Project activities. The City of Hesperia, Town of Apple Valley, and the San Bernardino County Noise Ordinances prohibit construction activities between the hours between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. The San

Bernardino County and the City of Hesperia also prohibits construction activity on Sundays and legal holidays and the Town of Apple Valley prohibits construction activities on weekends and legal holidays. As discussed previously, the Town of Apple Valley has also set forth maximum construction noise level limits of 75 dBA.

Construction activities for the Proposed Project would be restricted to the hours and noise level limits specified. If work is required outside the allowed hours, SCE would obtain a noise variance from the applicable agencies.

Noise from operation of the Project would be generated from two primary stationary sources: electrical and related equipment (e.g., transformers and fans) associated with operation of the Proposed Desert View Substation, and corona discharge and similar phenomena associated with the 500 kV and 220 kV transmission lines. In addition, periodic maintenance and inspection activities involving helicopters and/or trucks would generate short-term mobile noise. Operational noise generated by Project activities would be regulated by the City of Hesperia and the San Bernardino County Noise Ordinances. The Proposed Desert View Substation and Proposed Transmission Line Route segments are all located within unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County, with the exception of the western portion of Segment 7, which is located within the City of Hesperia.

The San Bernardino County Development Code prohibits ground vibration that can be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the lot line, or any vibration which produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to two-tenths (0.2) inches per second measured at or beyond the lot line. Use of a vibratory roller within 25 feet of the Proposed Project's shared boundaries with residential parcels could result in vibration levels that exceed the 0.20 PPV vibration threshold of the San Bernardino County Code. These activities, however, would be short term and would not be perceptible at a distance of 50 feet. No structures would be affected by Project construction-related vibration.

While construction noise would be noticeable, the noise levels identified in this analysis are typically considered acceptable for construction activities during daytime hours and do not exceed the daytime hourly Leq of 90 dBA noise level identified by the FTA as the construction noise level where adverse community reaction can occur. In addition, construction would comply with all applicable noise ordinance time limits, and a variance would be acquired in the event the construction must occur outside the noise ordinance allowable work hours, prior to commencement of the construction activities. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant (see Section 4.12, *Noise*).

SOCIOECONOMICS POPULATION AND HOUSING

The Proposed Project would not induce population growth or displace substantial numbers of people or housing. The Proposed Project would not include any new homes, so there would be no direct impact on population growth in the area. The Proposed Project would include new ROW and access roads for portions of the Proposed Project. However, these new ROW and access roads would not provide new opportunities for local industry or commerce in the area and would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. As a result, construction and operation impacts are anticipated to be less than significant (See Section 4.13, *Socioeconomic Population and Housing*).

PUBLIC SERVICES

Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not require expansion of fire and police protection, schools, or other public facilities. There would be a less than significant impact to the performance objectives of these resources from construction and operation of the Proposed Project (See Section 4.14, *Public Services*).

RECREATION

Recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Proposed Project may see a temporary increase in use during project construction, but because of the small number of construction workers in each specific construction area, this increase would not result in substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities in the region or the acceleration of the physical deterioration of those facilities. Additionally, work in the Stoddard Valley OHV area would largely occur in locations not typically used by the public. The Proposed Project would not require the construction of new recreation facilities. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant (See Section 4.15, *Recreation*).

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The addition of the Proposed Project traffic volume during construction to the existing daily traffic volumes on the transportation Study Area roadways would not change the Level of Service (“LOS”) that the roadways are currently experiencing, with the exception of the SR-18 at Milpas Drive and Bear Valley Road at the SR-18. Addition of the full construction traffic to the SR-18 would reduce the LOS from acceptable LOS A to the acceptable LOS B. Similarly, addition of construction traffic to Bear Valley Road would reduce the LOS from acceptable LOS B to acceptable LOS C. The reduction in LOS would still fall within acceptable LOS criteria (LOS C or better).

Construction activities completed within public street rights-of-way would require the use of a traffic control service, and all lane closures would be conducted in accordance with any required permit conditions. These traffic control measures would be consistent with those published in the CJUTCM Manual California Joint Utility Traffic Control Manual (California Inter-Utility Coordinating Committee 2010). Since any closures due to construction of the Proposed Desert View Substation or the Proposed Transmission Line and Telecommunication Routes would be isolated, temporary, short in duration, and coordinated with other agencies, traffic would not be significantly disrupted.

Operation of the Proposed Desert View Substation would consist of routine maintenance and emergency work. There would be no impact to existing traffic load or capacity of the street system from operation of the Proposed Project.

Construction of the Proposed Desert View Substation would not entail any aircraft operations and the construction of the substation structures would not interfere with aviation height requirements. The structures associated with the Proposed Transmission Line and Telecommunication Routes are anticipated to be compliant with FAA requirements.

The Proposed Project is not anticipated to be in conflict with any local or regional policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, including public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; nor is the Proposed Project anticipated to cause inadequate emergency access or increase hazards due to a design feature. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant (see Section 4.16, *Transportation*).

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The Proposed Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, or result in the construction of new water, wastewater, or storm water facilities. The Proposed Project would not affect water supplies or affect wastewater treatment capacities. The waste generated by the Proposed Project would be accommodated in a landfill that has adequate capacity. SCE would handle the reuse and disposal of treated wood poles for the Proposed Project in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes related to solid waste. Impacts to utilities and service systems are anticipated to be less than significant (see Section 4.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*).

APPENDIX B
LIST OF PREPARERS/AGENCY CONSULTATION

This page intentionally left blank.

List of Preparers**SCE**

Joshua Andrews, Interconnect & Added Facility Project Manager for Substation Construction, 12 years construction experience, 7 years construction management experience.

Hamid Arshadi, Project Manager- Major Projects Organization, 23 years of experience managing development projects, CEQA and NEPA compliance, permitting and certification processes for solar energy projects, licensing of high-voltage electric transmission lines and substations, and master planning and development of commercial and industrial projects. MS in Urban & Regional Planning, Certified Public Manager (CPM), and Certified Master Project Manager (MPM) American Academy of Project Management.

Robert Benton, Senior Technical Specialist, 25 years experience in civil and related engineering.

Matthew Botting, Regulatory Compliance, 7 years of experience in environmental compliance and capital project licensing with Federal, State and Local governments, BS, Civil and Environmental Engineering, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; MBA, Graduate Student (current), University of Southern California.

Senica Camello, Electrical Engineer, Substation, 29 years of engineering experience. Bachelor of Science Electrical Engineering (BSEE), Power Engineering, Mapua Institute of Technology, Philippines.

Amanda Cannon, Archaeologist, 13 years of experience in archaeology, paleontology, and cultural resource management. BS, Anthropology, University of California, Davis; BS, Environmental Resource Sciences, University of California, Davis; MA, Social Sciences (emphasis in Archaeology), Humboldt State University, California. Register of Professional Archaeologists.

Kimberly Cuevas, Archaeologist, Natural and Cultural Resources, 15 years of experience in Cultural Resource Management, BA, Anthropology, University of Maine, Orono; MA Anthropology, California State University, Bakersfield.

Gregory Dennis, Edison Carrier Solutions Planner, 16 years of experience in Carrier Solutions.

Rachel de St. Jean, Public Involvement, 3 years of utility experience in public affairs. B.A., Russian Studies & Environmental Studies: University of California, Los Angeles. Project Management Certificate: California Institute of Technology. Certification in Planning, Communications, & Techniques: International Association for Public Participation. Current: M.A., Organizational Management: Antioch University Los Angeles.

Thomas Diaz, Project Manager- Regulatory Policy & Affairs, 28 years utility experience in engineering and regulatory policy. BS, Electrical & Electronic Engineering, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; JD, University of La Verne, College of Law. Former administrative law judge, California State Unemployment Appeals Board. Member California State Bar.

Stephanie Fincher, LEED AP, Senior Environmental Specialist-Water Quality Group, 8 years of water quality experience. BS, Environmental Studies; MS, Environmental Science, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Rey Gonzales, Land Use Specialist, 15 years land use experience, BS, Urban and Regional Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; MPA, California State University, Northridge.

Matthew Hara, Transmission Project Delivery: Licensing & Execution, 9 years of experience, BS Environmental Geography, University of Oregon.

Thomas Hill, Project Geologist, Licensed Engineering Geologist with 43 years of experience in Southern California, Nevada, and Alaska., BS, Geology, California State University, Long Beach; MS, Geology, University of California, Riverside;

Mauro Ibarra, Transmission Engineer, 5 years of experience in transmission line design, BS, Electrical Engineering, University of California, Riverside; MS, Electrical Engineering, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Nancy Jackson, Region Manager, Local Public Affairs Town of Apple Valley, Barstow, Victorville and unincorporated San Bernardino County, High Desert Region, 30 years of utility experience in Residential and Commercial Customer Service and Public Relations, University of California, Los Angeles Public Policy & Technical Management.

Leslie Manderscheid, Regulatory Compliance, 24 years of experience in environmental and regulatory compliance, BS, Business Administration, University of Redlands; MS, City and Regional Planning, California State University Fresno.

Sheridan Mascarenhas, P.E. Distribution Engineering Project Manager, 15 years of energy industry experience, BS, Instrumentation Engineering, University of Pune, India; MS, Electrical Engineering, California State University, Los Angeles; MBA, California State University, Los Angeles.

Ruben Mazzei, EIT # 137568, Responsible Engineer for Civil Engineering Group; 9 years of civil engineering experience; BS, Civil Engineering, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; AA & AS Citrus College; Poly-Technical Vocational Degree in Construction Management.

Anne McAulay, Environmental Coordinator, 6 years of utility siting experience and environmental document preparation, 8 years of commercial real estate research and valuation experience, BA, Economics, Occidental College; MA, Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles.

Jennifer Menjivar-Shaw, Region Manager, Local Public Affairs City of Hesperia.

Cornelis Overweg, Senior Environmental Noise Specialist, 25 years of experience in acoustics, environmental noise control, and hearing conservation, including electrical substations; power plants; gas remediation plants; oil/chemical plants, water treatment facilities; pump stations; horizontal drilling operations, BS, Mechanical Engineering, U.T.S. Hendrick de Keyser; MS,

Mechanical Engineering (Ing.), H.T.S. Amsterdam, Registered Professional Engineer (PE) with the State of California, Certified Noise Control Engineer (INCE Bd. Cert.).

Chad Packard, Estimator Transmission Design, 24 years of electric utility experience.

Sandip Patel, P.E., EMF Technical Specialist, 8 years of experience in low, medium, and high voltage electrical power systems (including power generation, transmission, and distribution). BS, Electrical Engineering from California State University, Fullerton. Registered Professional Electrical Engineer (PE) with the State of California.

Ailyn Powell, Substation Civil Engineer, 4 years of Civil Engineering experience, BS Civil Engineering, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Beverly Powell, Local Public Affairs Region Manager for San Bernardino County.

Kevin Richardson, Generation Interconnection Planning, Project Sponsor, 10 years of experience in electric utility facility design, including Power Systems Planning, Substations, Transmission Lines, and Research and Development, BS, Electronics and Computer Engineering Technology, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Saeed Sadeghi, Project Engineer, BS, Electrical Engineering, University of California in Los Angeles; MS Electrical Engineering, California State University, Long Beach, Registered Professional Engineer (PE) with the State of California, Certified Project Manager (PMP), 25 years experience in the design of electric facilities including Power Plants, Substations and Transmission Lines.

Selene Sanchez, Generation Interconnection Planning, Transmission Planner, 5 years utility experience in engineering. BS, Electrical Engineering, California State University, Los Angeles. Project Management Certification, California Technical Institute.

James Spence, Project Manager Land Acquisition, 15 years of experience in real estate acquisition, property management, and real estate project financial analysis, BS, Electrical Engineering, University of California Los Angeles, Project Management Professional (PMP).

Paul Teensma, Senior Environmental Specialist-Water Quality Group, BS, Geological Sciences, California State University, Fullerton; JD, University of California Hastings College of the Law.

Jeffrey Trow, Biologist, 22 years of experience in natural resources regulatory compliance, BS, Biology, University of California, Riverside.

Tammy Yamasaki, Air Quality Specialist, 6 years of experience in air quality and greenhouse gas modeling/emissions calculations, review, and field compliance. BS, Environmental Science, University of California, Riverside.

Messeret Yilma, Land Services Agent, Government Lands, BS, Business Administration and Management, California State University, San Jose; JD, University of Pittsburgh School of Law. Admitted to the practice of Law in California and Arizona.

AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

Carl Rykaczewski, Project Manager, QA/QC. BS, Environmental Resource Management, Penn State University.

Maxwell Woods, Deputy Project Manager, QA/QC. BA, Environment, Economics, and Politics (EEP), and BA, History, Claremont McKenna College; MS, Environmental Science, Washington State University.

Kim Olsen, Compilation, Editing, and Formatting of PEA; BS, Journalism, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

Sarah Esterson, Contributed to Chapter 3.0 Project Description. BS, Environmental Management, Indiana University; MPA, University of Colorado, Denver.

Merlyn Paulson, Lead Author PEA Section 4.1 Aesthetics. BLA, Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning, Utah State University; MLA, Landscape Architecture, Harvard University.

Hallie Rulnick, Contributed to PEA Sections 4.1 Aesthetics, 6.1 Cumulative Impacts, 6.3 Significant Environmental Effects of the Project, and 6.4 Mandatory Findings of Significance. BA, Environmental Analysis and Design and BA, European Studies (Modern Europe Emphasis), University of California, Irvine; MA, English, Chapman University.

Fareeha Kibriya, Lead Author PEA Sections 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources, 4.13 Socioeconomics, Population and Housing, and Environmental Justice, 4.14 Public Services, 4.15 Recreation, and 4.17 Utilities and Service Systems. BA, Economics, and BA, Sociology, University of California, Irvine. Master of Urban and Regional Planning, University of California, Irvine.

Steven Heisler, Lead Author PEA Section 4.3 Air Quality and PEA Section 4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions; BS, Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology; MS and Ph.D., Environmental Engineering Science, California Institute of Technology.

Carmen Caceres-Schnell, Lead Author PEA Sections 4.6 Geology and Soils and 4.11 Mineral Resources. BS and MS, Geology, California State University, Northridge.

Mike Arvidson, Contributed to PEA Section 4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials. BS, Civil Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles; MBA, Pepperdine University.

Sean Wazlaw, Contributed to Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. BS, Environmental Science, University of Maine.

Brock Treece, Contributed to 4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials. BA Philosophy, Hillsdale College; Master of Environmental Science and Management, The Bren School, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Roy L. Hauger, Jr., Lead Author PEA Section 4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality. BS, Civil Engineering, Rice University.

Alia Hokuki, Lead Author PEA Section 4.10 Land Use and Planning, Contributed to PEA Sections 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources, 4.13 Socioeconomics, Population and Housing, and Environmental Justice, 4.14 Public Services, 4.15 Recreation, and 4.17 Utilities and Service Systems. BA, Development Studies, University of California, Los Angeles; Master of Urban and Regional Planning, University of California, Irvine.

Jeff Goodson, Lead Author PEA Section 4.12 Noise. BS, Civil Engineering, Clemson University; BS, Geology, College of Charleston.

Mike Arizabal, Lead Author PEA Section 4.16 Transportation and Traffic, BS, Civil Engineering, University of California, Irvine.

Jane Chang, Lead Author PEA Section 6.1 Cumulative Impacts, Contributed to 6.3 Significant Environmental Effects of the Project, and 6.4 Mandatory Findings of Significance. BA, Environmental Analysis & Design, University of California, Irvine; Master of Urban and Regional Planning, University of California, Irvine.

Karsten Kelm, GIS Analyst. MS, Landscape Ecology, University of Applied Sciences, Dresden (Germany).

Jimmy McAninch, Visual Simulations.

Charles (Chuck) Skaggs, GIS Analyst. BS, Environmental Geography, University of Louisville. MBA, Western Governors University. MBA, IT Management, Western Governors University.

Nora Castellanos, Technical Support, BA, American Studies, Scripps College.

BioResource Consultants, Inc.

Arthur Davenport, BS Zoology, California Polytechnic University, Pomona (General Avian Surveys).

Brian Holly, MS, Environmental Management-Ecosystem Science and Conservation, Duke University, (Director/Principal Review).

Steve Jones, BA, Environmental Biology, Prescott College (Contributing Author for Botany and Jurisdictional Resources).

Ricardo Montijo, BA, Geography (Ecosystems Emphasis), University of California, Los Angeles; MS (2014), University of Southern California (Principal Investigator and Author of Arroyo Toad Report).

Matt Schaap, BS, Natural Resource Management, Grand Valley State University (Contributing Author PEA and Technical Reports).

Evan Sharp, BA, Environmental Studies, University of California Santa Cruz (Principal Author PEA and Technical Reports).

Bryan Solis, GIS Specialist (GIS and Graphics, Arroyo Toad Report).

Seth Sutherland, BA, Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara (GIS and Graphics).

William Vanherweg, BA, Range Wildlife Ecology, California State University, Chico (Principal Investigator and Author of the Mohave ground squirrel Report).

Pacific Legacy

Michael R. Bever, PhD, Anthropology, Southern Methodist University (Principal Author for Cultural Resources Report).

Tom Jackson, PhD, Anthropology, Stanford University (Contributing Author for Cultural Resources Report).

Marc Greenberg, MA, Anthropology, California State University, Chico (Contributing Author for Cultural Resources Report).

Starla Lane, MA, Historical Archaeology, University of Massachusetts, Boston (Cultural Resources Data Management).

David Earle, MA, Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara (Principal Ethnographer and Historian).

Wendy L. Tinsley Becker, Master of City Planning, San Diego State University (Principal Author for Historical Resources/Historic Property Report).

Paleo Solutions

Geraldine L. Aron, BS, Geological Sciences, California State University, Long Beach; MS, Geological Sciences, California State University, Long Beach (Principal Author for Paleontological Resources Report).

Jennifer C. Kelly, BA, Theatre Arts (Technical), California State University, Long Beach; MS, Geological Sciences, California State University, Long Beach (Co-Author for Paleontological Resources Report).

Colin Lawson, BS, Earth Sciences (Geology), California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Co-Author for Paleontological Resources Report).

Joseph Raum, BS, Geological Sciences, University of Maryland at College Park (Technical Editor for Paleontological Resources Report).

Mark Deering, BA, Philosophy, Pennsylvania State University; MA, Philosophy, University of California Irvine (GIS, Data Management, and Mapping for the Paleontological Resources Report and Survey).

CAPE Environmental Management, Inc.

Robert Renn, Contributed to 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources, 4.3 Air Quality, 4.7 GHG Emissions, 4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Material, 4.10 Land Use and Planning, 4.12 Noise, 4.14

Public Services, 4.15 Recreation, and 4.16 Transportation and Traffic. BS, Earth and Environmental Science, University of California, Irvine.

Robert B. Hernandez Jr., Contributed to 4.6 Geology and Soils, 4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality, and 4.11 Mineral Resources. BS, Geology and Applied Science, University of Texas San Antonio (UTSA).

Carrie Plath, Contributed to 4.10 Land Use and Planning, 4.12 Noise, 4.13 Socioeconomics, Population and Housing, and Environmental Justice; BS, Geology and Geophysics, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Agency Consultations

Christopher Conner, San Bernardino County – Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County’s Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Christopher Warrick, San Bernardino County – Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County’s Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Brad Mastin, Bureau of Land Management (provided input and review of key observation points for Aesthetics analysis in the PEA)

Daren Maynard, City of Victorville – Development Department (provided clarification on the City of Victorville's Development Activity Report for PEA cumulative research)

Debra Hawk, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (notified of project biological surveys)

Ernest Perea, San Bernardino County – Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County’s Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Gus Romo, Romo Planning Group, Inc., consultant to the San Bernardino County – Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County’s Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Jeff Childers, Bureau of Land Management (SCE provided project overview, provided input and review of key observation points for Aesthetics analysis in the PEA)

Jeff Lesser, San Bernardino County – Department of Public Works (provided information regarding the County’s Capital Improvement Projects for PEA cumulative research)

Jim Shearer, Bureau of Land Management Barstow Field Office (SCE provided project overview, contacted regarding cultural and paleontological resource surveys)

Kathy Stine, City of Hesperia - Planning Division (provided information regarding the City’s cumulative projects listing for PEA cumulative research)

Kevin White, San Bernardino County - Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County’s Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Dr. Larry LaPre, Bureau of Land Management Barstow Field Office (SCE provided project overview, contacted regarding biological surveys)

Peggy Riehl, City of Victorville - Planning Division (provided information regarding the City's cumulative projects listing for PEA cumulative research)

Magda Gonzalez, San Bernardino County - Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County's Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Mallory Synder, Town of Apple Valley – Economic Development Office (provided information regarding the City's cumulative projects listing for PEA cumulative research)

Melinda Barnes, San Bernardino County – Department of Public Works (provided information regarding the County's Capital Improvement Projects for PEA cumulative research)

Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), Sacramento, CA, (contacted for list of Native American Tribes for notification of the Proposed Project and to conduct a record search of the Sacred Lands File)

Oxso Shahriari, San Bernardino County – Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County's Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Raymond Bransfield; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ventura Office (SCE provided a project overview, notified of project biological surveys and methodology)

Ridge Rotte, Bureau of Land Management (provided information regarding the Calnev Pipeline Expansion Project for PEA cumulative research)

Rosie Griffith, San Bernardino County – Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County's Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

Scott Webb, Senior Planner, City of Victorville – Development (provided information regarding the City's cumulative projects listing for PEA cumulative research)

Tina Souza, City of Hesperia - Development Services Department (provided information regarding the City's cumulative projects listing for PEA cumulative research)

Tracy Creason, San Bernardino County – Land Use Services (provided information regarding the County's Districts 1 and 3 development projects statuses for PEA cumulative research)

County of San Bernardino Building and Safety staff (provided information on grading permit approval process)

Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow (provided information regarding potential contamination and remediation activities at the base)

Caltrans District 8 Public Affairs operator (provided contact information to obtain the latest status of the current projects listed on their website)

Mr. Darin Cooke, Caltrans District 8 Public Information Officer (left a voicemail to ask about the latest status of the current projects listed on their website)