

**Notice of Preparation  
Environmental Impact Report  
for the  
Silvergate Transmission Substation Project  
Proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric  
Application No. 05-03-024**

**A. INTRODUCTION**

San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) has filed an application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for the proposed Silvergate Transmission Substation Project. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, and the State CEQA Guidelines, the CPUC has decided that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared to evaluate the project in accordance with the criteria, standards and procedures of the CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 *et. seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Administrative Code Sections 15000 *et. seq.*). Therefore, as required by CEQA, this Notice of Preparation (NOP) is being sent to interested agencies and members of the public. The purpose of the NOP is to inform recipients that the lead agency is beginning preparation of an EIR and to solicit information that will be helpful in the EIR process. This notice includes a description of the project that SDG&E proposes to construct, a summary of potential project impacts, the times and locations of public scoping meetings, and information on how to provide comments to the CPUC.

**B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

According to SDG&E, the project is proposed to upgrade aging and obsolete equipment at Main Street Substation, provide increased substation reliability, provide increased bulk power transmission system reliability, provide expansion capability for load growth and potential generation additions, and work with local governments to achieve long-term land use goals. SDG&E is proposing to replace the aging 139/69 kV Main Street Substation with a new 230/69 kV substation (Silvergate). The new Silvergate Substation would be located across the street from the existing Main Street Substation on SDG&E owned property and on adjoining property in the Barrio Logan community. In addition, SDG&E is proposing two associated projects: installation of a Special Protection System at transmission substations dispatching power from the South Bay Power Plant and 138 kV line undergrounding and removal of lattice steel bridge structures located within SDG&E's right-of-way (ROW) between South Bay Power Plant and the Sweetwater River.

As described below, the three primary project components to be evaluated in the Silvergate Transmission Substation Project EIR include 1) a new 230/69 kV Silvergate substation; 2) installation of a Special Protection System; and 3) 138 kV undergrounding and lattice steel bridge structures removal.

### **Silvergate Substation**

The new Silvergate Substation would be approximately five acres in size and would be located across the street from the Main Street Substation. Prior to construction, site demolition of an existing decommissioned power plant, industrial building and portion of a parking lot would occur. The proposed Silvergate Substation would support four 230 kV circuits and eleven 69 kV circuits. Initially, the new substation would include three 230 kV and seven 69 kV transmission lines, two 69 kV capacitors, two 69 kV grounding transformers, two 230/69 kV transformers and associated control shelter, breakers and relay equipment. At build-out, the Silvergate Substation would include four 230 kV/69 kV transformers, two 69 kV grounding transformers, two 69 kV capacitor banks and associated control shelter, breakers and relay equipment.

Once the construction of the proposed Silvergate Substation is complete, the existing Main Street Substation would be de-energized and all above ground structures removed from the site.

### **Special Protection System**

In order to avoid potential overloads at the South Bay Substation, a Special Protection System is proposed. This system would consist of installation of redundant hardware/logic platforms and communication systems that would detect outages and provide triggers to reduce overloads.

### **138 kV Line Undergrounding and Lattice Steel Bridge Structure Removal**

Upon the completion of the proposed Silvergate Substation project, two of the three 138 kV circuits currently installed in the SDG&E ROW between the South Bay Power Plant Switchyard and Main Street Substation and located on the existing lattice steel bridge structures will be de-energized and removed from operation. The remaining 138 kV circuit is designed to be installed underground between the South Bay Power Plant Switchyard and the Sweetwater River. Once these 138 kV circuits are removed and located underground, then approximately 18 existing lattice steel 138 kV bridge structures will be removed in Chula Vista.

## **C. PROJECT LOCATION**

As shown in *Figure 1*, the project components are located in the cities of San Diego and Chula Vista. The new Silvergate Substation would be located across from the existing Main Street Substation at the southwest intersection of Sampson Street and Harbor Drive in the Barrio Logan

community of the City of San Diego. The installation of the Special Protection System, undergrounding of the 138 kV transmission cable and removal of lattice steel bridge structures would occur along the Chula Vista Bayfront in the City of Chula Vista. Work associated with the Special Protection System would be conducted at the South Bay Substation (see *Figure 1*). Installation of the underground cable and removal of the lattice steel bridge structures would occur west of and parallel to Interstate 5. A portion of the project would cross the San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge Sweetwater Marsh Unit.

#### **D. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

In accordance with the guidelines of CEQA, the CPUC intends to prepare an EIR to evaluate potential environmental effects of the proposed project, and to propose mitigation measures to reduce any significant effects identified. The EIR will also study the environmental impacts of potential alternatives and propose mitigation to reduce these effects.

Based on preliminary analysis of the proposed project and review of documents submitted by SDG&E and other parties to the CPUC's CPCN proceeding, completion of the proposed project may have a number of potentially significant environmental effects. Potential issues and impacts to the existing environment include those listed in *Attachment 1*. No determinations have yet been made as to the significance of these potential impacts; such determinations will be made in the EIR after the issues are considered thoroughly. *Attachment 2* includes the CEQA Checklist questions that would be evaluated in an EIR if they cover issues relevant to the project. In addition, to analysis of the issues listed in *Attachment 1* and other issues raised in the scoping process, the EIR will evaluate the cumulative impacts of the project in combination with other present and planned projects in the area.

**Mitigation Measures.** SDG&E has proposed measures that could reduce or eliminate potential impacts of the project. The effectiveness of these measures (called "applicant proposed measures") will be evaluated in the EIR, and additional measures (called "mitigation measures") will be developed to further reduce impacts, if required. When the CPUC makes its final decision on the project, it will define the mitigation measures to be adopted as a condition of project approval and it will require implementation of a mitigation monitoring program.

#### **E. ALTERNATIVES**

In compliance with CEQA, an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or project location that could feasibly attain most of the project objectives and avoid or lessen any of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. Additionally, the No Project Alternative must also be analyzed in the EIR; this alternative describes the situation that would likely occur in the absence of the proposed project. Further, the EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.

SDG&E discusses eight alternatives in its Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA), including the following.

### **E.1 230/69 kV Substation Location Alternatives**

#### ***Expansion of Main Street Substation Onto Existing SDG&E Property***

Under this alternative, the Main Street Substation would expand eastwardly onto existing SDG&E property. The adjacent property consists of two empty buildings that are no longer in use. Due to space limitation, the addition of a 230 kV bus or expansion/rebuilding of the 69 kV switch rack would not occur.

#### ***Expansion of Main Street Substation East to Sampson Street***

Under this alternative the Main Street Substation would be expanded to include both the area occupied by the two empty buildings and the warehouse and parking lot. This alternative would require additional rerouting of the 69 kV lines and boring under the trolley tracks for the 230 kV line.

#### ***Use of SDG&E's Silvergate Power Plant Building***

Under this alternative, the new substation would be constructed within SDG&E owned property, which is currently occupied by the decommissioned Silvergate Power Plant.

#### ***Use of Private Property on the Southwest Corner of Sampson Street and Harbor Drive***

This alternative proposes to construct a new substation immediately north of the existing Silvergate Power Plant site and southwest of the intersection of Sampson Street and Harbor Drive.

### **E.2 Gas Insulated Substation (GIS) Technology Alternative**

This alternative would eliminate the need for structures required by the air insulated substation proposed under the Silvergate Transmission Substation Project and would thus occupy a smaller area, 3.7 acres. Access to the substation would occur to east off of Sampson Street.

### **E.3 Transmission Substation System Alternatives**

#### ***Upgrade Old Town Substation***

This alternative proposes to upgrade the 230 kV portion of the Old Town Substation to increase capacity to the downtown San Diego area. Additional conductor and circuit breaker upgrades would be required under this alternative.

#### ***Upgrade Mission Substation***

This alternative proposes to upgrade the Mission Substation located in the Mission Valley area to increase capacity to the downtown San Diego area.

In addition to the PEA alternatives listed above, additional alternatives will be evaluated for full analysis and consideration in the Draft EIR based on additional input from agencies and the public and additional independent analysis by the CPUC environmental team.

### **E.4 New Silvergate Substation at 138/69 kV Alternative**

Under this alternative, the Main Street Substation would be rebuilt on the Silvergate Power Plant site and adjoining property at the same voltage level that is currently in service, 138/69 kV. The substation would include modern equipment, circuit breakers, transformers and bus configurations.

### **E.5 New AIS 230/69 kV Substation at Silvergate with Additional Harbor Drive Setback**

This alternative would construction a new 230/69 kV substation at the Silvergate Power Plant and adjoining property and would include increasing the substation wall setback along Harbor Drive. The increased setback is proposed to provide additional landscaping along Harbor Drive, which would allow for visual screening of the substation.

### **E.6 Transmission System Load Management Alternative**

This alternative would involve implementation of a load management program to reduce peak electric demand in order to shift electric demand from peak to non-peak time periods.

## **E.7 Energy Conservation Alternative**

Under the direction of the CPUC, SDG&E would offer its customers a number of energy conservation programs, including financial incentives for installing specific energy-efficient appliances or taking other measures to conserve energy.

## **E.8 Alternative to Horizontal Directional Drilling**

This alternative would underground the 138 kV circuit along the Caltrans bike path and Arizona and Eastern Railway Company railroad located to the east. This alternative would require obtaining additional permanent ROW.

## **F. PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS**

The CPUC will conduct two public Scoping Meetings in the City of San Diego and City of Chula Vista, as shown in the table below. The purpose of these meetings is to present information about the proposed project and the CPUC's decision-making process, and to listen to the views of the public on the range of issues relevant to the preparation of the Draft EIR.

### **Public Scoping Meetings**

<b>Date</b>	<b>September 12, 2005</b>	<b>September 12, 2005</b>
<b>Time</b>	<b>2:00 – 4:00 p.m.</b>	<b>6:00 – 8:00 p.m.</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Chula Vista Civic Center Branch Library 365 F Street Chula Vista, CA 91910</b>	<b>San Diego Central Library 820 E Street San Diego, CA 92101</b>

## **G. SCOPING COMMENTS**

At this time, the CPUC is soliciting information regarding the topics and alternatives that should be included in the EIR. Suggestions for submitting scoping comments are presented at the end of this section. All comments must be postmarked by **September 23, 2005**. You may submit comments in a variety of ways: (1) by mail, (2) by fax (fax no. [760] 632-0164), or (3) by attending a Public Scoping Meeting (see times and locations above) and making a verbal statement or handing in a written comment at the meeting.

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

**Jensen Uchida  
California Public Utilities Commission  
c/o Dudek & Associates  
605 Third Street  
Encinitas, CA 92024**

A **Scoping Report** will be prepared, summarizing all comments received (including oral comments made at the Scoping Meetings). This report will be posted on the project website and copies will be placed in local libraries. In addition, a limited number of copies will be available upon request to the CPUC.

***Suggestions for Effective Participation in Scoping***

1. **Review the description of the project** (see Section B of this NOP and the map provided).
2. **Review the CEQA impact assessment questions** (see Attachment 2).
3. **Attend the scoping meetings** to get more information on the project and the environmental review process (see times and dates above).
4. **Submit written comments** or attend the scoping meetings and **make oral comments**. Explain important issues that the EIR should cover.
5. **Suggest mitigation measures** that could reduce the potential impacts associated with SDG&E's proposed project.
6. **Suggest alternatives** to SDG&E's proposed project that could avoid or reduce the impacts of the proposed project.

**H. FOR ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

**Internet Website:** Information about this application and the environmental review process will be posted on the Internet at <http://www.dudek.com/cpuc/sdge-silvergate>. This site will be used to post all public documents during the environmental review process and to announce upcoming public meetings.

**Document Repositories.** SDG&E's PEA is available for review at several area libraries (see list below). The PEA includes a detailed description of the project that SDG&E proposed to construct, and it evaluates potential impacts of the project from SDG&E's perspective.

**San Diego**

San Diego Central Library  
820 "E" Street  
San Diego, CA 92101  
(619) 236-5800

Linda Vista Branch Library  
2160 Ulric Street  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 573-1399

Logan Heights Branch Library  
811 South 28<sup>th</sup> Street  
San Diego, CA 92113  
(619) 533-3968

**Chula Vista**

Civic Center Branch Library  
365 "F" Street  
Chula Vista, CA 91910  
(619) 691-5069

South Chula Vista Branch Library  
389 Orange Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91911  
(619) 585-5755

**National City**

National City Public Library  
200 East 12<sup>th</sup> Street  
National City, CA 91950  
(619) 336-4280

The California Public Utilities Commission hereby issues this Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

*Sean Gallagher / Ken Lewis*

Sean Gallagher, Director  
Energy Division  
California Public Utilities

*8/5/05*

Date

**ATTACHMENT 1  
Summary of Potential Issues or Impacts  
SDG&E Silvergate Transmission Substation Project**

Environmental Issue Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
<b>Aesthetics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed Silvergate Substation could degrade views or intersect panoramic sightlines for motorists on the Coronado Bridge/Highway 75 (State-designated scenic highway).</li> <li>• Duration of visibility of construction materials, equipment and debris may impact views from established recreation areas, facilities, trails and other notable landmarks including the San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge Sweetwater Marsh Unit.</li> <li>• Land use compatibility with surrounding land uses in the Barrio Logan community of the City of San Diego.</li> <li>• Consistency with visual resource goals, objectives and policies of the General Plans of the cities of San Diego and Chula Vista, and Barrio Logan Community Plan.</li> <li>• Consistency with resource management plans prepared for the San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge Sweetwater Marsh Unit pertaining to the protection and/or enhancement of visual resources.</li> </ul>
<b>Agricultural Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issues identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Air Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project construction will produce short-term air emissions (fugitive dust and vehicle equipment exhaust).</li> <li>• Exposure by sensitive receptors including residences and schools to pollutant emissions from project construction.</li> <li>• Exposure by sensitive receptors to odors associated with vehicle and equipment exhaust.</li> <li>• Violation of air quality standards during construction.</li> </ul>
<b>Biological Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project construction could impact rare, threatened, or endangered species in the project area, including but not limited to salt marsh skipper, California gnatcatcher, burrowing owl, Belding's Savannah sparrow, light-footed clapper rail, western snowy plover, Nuttall's lotus, salt marsh bird's-beak, Palmer's frankenia, and Coulter's goldfields.</li> </ul>

Environmental Issue Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project construction could affect upland scrub, annual grasslands, coastal salt marsh, mudflats, open water, wetlands, and drainages.</li> <li>• Conflict with state or local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some fossil-bearing geologic formations that are located in the proposed project area could be impacted.</li> <li>• Potential constructed-related impacts to known and unrecorded prehistoric and historic resources.</li> </ul>
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project construction could cause significant soil erosion or loss of topsoil.</li> <li>• Soil compaction, subsidence and differential settlement could occur as a result of dewatering activities and changes in the groundwater flow during construction.</li> <li>• Exposure by people or structures to risk of ground shaking, liquefaction, seismic ground failure, landslides, unstable soils, lateral spreading, expansive soil, and rupture of known earthquake fault.</li> </ul>
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-existing soil contamination could affect construction workers and the public during project construction.</li> <li>• Potential release of fuel, hydraulic fluid and lubricants during construction.</li> <li>• Exposure of contaminated groundwater during excavation.</li> <li>• Exposure by nearby schools to hazardous emissions or contaminated soil during construction.</li> <li>• Interfere with adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.</li> <li>• Installation of underground cable may result in damning effect of groundwater, preferential pathways of contaminants and mobilization of soil and contaminants into the stormwater conveyance system.</li> <li>• (See discussion EMF under “Other Issues” below).</li> </ul>
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project construction could affect surface water flow and erosion rates causing subsequent downstream sedimentation and reduced surface water quality.</li> <li>• Dewatering activities may affect groundwater supply and surface water quality.</li> <li>• New facilities/infrastructure may affect groundwater flow and recharge capabilities.</li> </ul>

Environmental Issue Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contaminated groundwater may be encountered during construction.</li> <li>• Stormwater runoff from permanent structures/access road and temporary work areas may degrade surface water quality.</li> <li>• Construction of permanent structures/facilities may alter drainage patterns, which may result in increased runoff, erosion, siltation and flooding off-site.</li> <li>• Accidental release of hazardous materials during construction may affect surface water and ground water quality.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project route crosses multiple jurisdictions including cities of San Diego and Chula Vista. In addition, the project will cross the San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge Sweetwater Marsh Unit and occur within the Coastal Zone in Chula Vista.</li> <li>• Project construction will restrict access or use to existing commercial, recreational and industrial land uses.</li> <li>• Potential conflict during construction of underground cable with parks, recreational areas, transportation corridors and bike paths.</li> <li>• Consistency with planned land uses in the cities of San Diego and Chula Vista.</li> <li>• Conflict with environmental plans, policies, regulations, or habitat conservation plans.</li> </ul>
<b>Noise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction would generate noise for a few months in several locations, including in the vicinity of residences, recreational uses, or schools.</li> <li>• Concern about ground-borne vibration, because the project would require excavation work near residences, schools and industrial uses that may be sensitive to vibration.</li> <li>• Transmission lines and substation upgrades may generate corona noise at levels above existing conditions.</li> </ul>
<b>Population and Housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for proposed project to encourage or accelerate growth in the region.</li> </ul>
<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction along streets and linear ROWs could disrupt local and regional services provided through underground utilities.</li> </ul>
<b>Recreation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially reduce the quality of recreational experiences in open spaces and recreational facilities during construction.</li> </ul>

Environmental Issue Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational facilities in the proposed project corridor that could be affected include: Chula Vista Bayfront Park, Bay Boulevard Park, and San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge Sweetwater Marsh Unit.</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the underground portion of the project could affect traffic flow, parking, road usage and property access.</li> <li>• Lane closures during construction of underground portion include the following roadways: Harbor Drive, Bay Boulevard and Lagoon Drive, and G Street.</li> <li>• Disruption of public transit services.</li> <li>• Street parking will be displaced during construction.</li> <li>• Temporary lane closures and equipment may affect access to driveways for residences and property owners during construction.</li> <li>• Temporary closures of recreational trails and bicycle lanes.</li> </ul>
<b>Other Issues</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on property values to landowners of properties crossed by or near the proposed transmission lines.</li> <li>• Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) effect of the underground transmission lines.</li> <li>• Potential environmental justice issues associated with locating transmission lines in urbanized areas.</li> </ul>

## **ATTACHMENT 2**

### **Environmental Checklist**

Following are the questions included in the California Environmental Quality Act's (CEQA) environmental checklist. These are issues that may be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report, if they are determined to be relevant to the project.

#### **AESTHETICS**

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

#### **AGRICULTURE**

- a) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

#### **AIR QUALITY**

- a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

- b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

- a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- b) Would the project 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c) Would the project 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?
- d) Would the project 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?
- e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?
- b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemetery?

## **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

- a) Would the project 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.
  - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
  - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
  - iv) Landslides?
- b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Would the project 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks of life or property?
- e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

- a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Would the project 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?
- c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Would the project 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?
- 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?
- 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?
- g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Would the project 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?

## **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

- a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- b) Would the project 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 a 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)?

- c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite?
- d) Would the project 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 offsite?
- e) Would the project 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?
- f) Would the project otherwise degrade water quality?
- g) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- h) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- i) Would the project 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?
- j) Would the project be susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

#### **LAND USE AND PLANNING**

- a) Would the project physically divide an established community?
- b) Would the project 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?
- c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

## **MINERAL RESOURCES**

- a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Would the project 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?

## **NOISE**

- a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- 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?
- 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?

## **POPULATION AND HOUSING**

- a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

## **PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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 following public services:
  - i) Fire protection?
  - ii) Police protection?
  - iii) Schools?
  - iv) Parks?
  - v) Other public facilities?

## **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?
- 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?

## **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

- a) Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- b) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Would the project 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?

- d) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

### **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

- a) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Would the project result in 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?
- f) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

## **GENERAL ISSUES**

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
  
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
  
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?