

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.0 DETAILED DISCUSSION OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS.....5-1

5.1 INTRODUCTION.....5-1

5.2 APPLICANT PROPOSED MEASURES TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS.....5-1

5.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS5-1

5.3.1 Introduction 5-1

5.3.2 Methodology 5-2

5.3.3 Proposed Project Objectives..... 5-2

5.3.4 No Project Alternative..... 5-2

5.3.5 Proposed Project..... 5-2

5.3.6 Replacement in Existing Alignment Alternative..... 5-3

5.3.7 TL 695 Realignment Alternative..... 5-3

5.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS5-4

5.4.1 Growth Caused by Direct and Indirect Employment 5-4

5.4.2 Proposed Project and Growth..... 5-5

5.5 REFERENCES.....5-5

LIST OF TABLES

5-1 Alternatives Considered..... 5-2

THIS PAGE IS INTENDED TO BE LEFT BLANK

5.0 DETAILED DISCUSSION OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the PEA Checklist issued by the CPUC on November 24, 2008, this chapter:

- Identifies the potentially significant impacts that would result from the construction, operation, or maintenance of the proposed TL 695 and TL 6971 Reconductor Project (i.e., the Proposed Project).
- Summarizes the alternatives that were evaluated to select the Proposed Project and the justification for the selection of the preferred alternative.
- Discusses the Proposed Project's potential to induce growth in the area.

5.2 APPLICANT PROPOSED MEASURES TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Based on the findings in Chapter 4, Environmental Impact Assessment, the Proposed Project is not likely to result in significant impacts to any resource areas after implementation of Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs). Refer to Section 3.9, Applicant Proposed Measures, for a description of the APMs that have been proposed as part of the Proposed Project.

5.3 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

5.3.1 Introduction

Section 15126.6, subdivisions (a) and (f)(2)(A) of the CEQA Guidelines and Assigned Commissioner's Ruling on Application 01-07-004 (dated October 16, 2002) do not require a review of alternatives when a project would not result in significant environmental impacts after mitigation, as is the case with the Proposed Project. However, the CPUC has adopted an "Information and Criteria List" in order to determine whether applications for projects are complete. The list specifies the information required from any applicant for a project subject to CEQA. As the lead agency, the CPUC requires applicants to obtain a Permit to Construct or a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to describe a reasonable range of alternatives within the PEA.

This section summarizes and compares the environmental advantages and disadvantages of the Proposed Project and the alternatives considered. In accordance with CPUC requirements, SDG&E evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives that meet some or all of the project objectives.

This environmental alternatives analysis evaluates the No Project Alternative, and two power line reconductoring alternatives that also include the removal of existing wood pole structures and the installation of new steel pole structures. Each alternative is evaluated for its feasibility and ability to fulfill the Proposed Project objectives, as well as its ability to reduce environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Project. Table 5-1, Alternatives Considered lists each alternative that was considered during the evaluation process. Alternatives to the Proposed Project that were evaluated, including the No Project Alternative, are summarized in the following sections.

Table 5-1. Alternatives Considered

Alternative	Evaluated or Eliminated
No Project Alternative	Eliminated Prior to Environmental Review
Proposed Project	Evaluated
Replacement in Existing Alignment Alternative	Eliminated Prior to Environmental Review
TL 695 Realignment Alternative	Eliminated Prior to Environmental Review

5.3.2 Methodology

The alternatives were considered based on their feasibility and their ability to meet the engineering requirements and the Proposed Project objectives. Because the No Project Alternative, the Replacement in Existing Alignment Alternative, and the TL 695 Realignment Alternative were either infeasible or did not meet all of the Proposed Project objectives, no environmental review was conducted.

5.3.3 Proposed Project Objectives

The Proposed Project would meet the following objectives identified by SDG&E:

1. To eliminate a North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) Category B violation to increase reliability.
2. To increase the fire safety and service reliability of TL 695 and TL 6971.
3. To minimize adverse environmental impacts to the extent feasible.

Each of these Proposed Project objectives is more thoroughly described in Chapter 2.0, Project Purpose and Need.

5.3.4 No Project Alternative

CEQA requires an evaluation of the No Project Alternative so that decision makers can compare the impacts of approving the Proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the Proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)). Under the No Project Alternative, TL 695 and TL 6971 would not be reconductored, existing wood pole structures would not be removed, and new dull galvanized steel pole structures would not be installed.

The No Project Alternative is feasible; however, it would not meet Objective 1 because the existing conductor would remain in place, thereby failing to eliminate the NERC Category B violation. Also, because the Proposed Project would not remove existing wood pole structures and install new steel pole structures, it would not increase the fire safety and service reliability of TL 695 and TL 6971. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not fulfill Objective 2. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no change to the environmental consequences associated with ongoing operation and maintenance of the existing TL 695 and TL 6971 power lines. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would meet Objective 3.

5.3.5 Proposed Project

The Proposed Project will involve reconductoring, removal of existing wood structures, and installation of new steel structures within an existing 69 kilovolt (kV) power line alignment that extends roughly 10 miles between Talega Substation, San Mateo Junction, Basilone Substation, and Japanese Mesa Substation. The Proposed Project is feasible and meets all of the Proposed Project objectives. Because the

Proposed Project involves reconductoring that will eliminate the NERC Category B violation, it will fulfill Objective 1. The Proposed Project will meet Objective 2 because it will remove the existing wood pole structures in a high fire risk area, and install new steel pole structures that will be able to better withstand wildfire damage. The Proposed Project will also meet Objective 3 because it has been designed to include elements that will minimize or avoid adverse effects to the environment, including the following:

- Adherence to SDG&E environmental standard operating procedures, including Natural Community Conservation Plan Operational Protocols and procedures described in the Best Management Practices Manual for Water Quality Construction;
- Modifications to the Proposed Project design to minimize or avoid impacts to sensitive biological and cultural resources;
- Use of existing access roads, footpaths, and disturbed areas during construction, to the extent feasible; and
- Reducing fire risk and the associated environmental harm resulting from fires during construction through the implementation of a project-specific fire prevention plan.

Because the Proposed Project is feasible and will meet all of the objectives, it was evaluated for environmental impacts to each resource area. A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project is provided in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Impact Assessment. Because the Proposed Project is feasible and meets all of the Proposed Project objectives, the Proposed Project was selected as the preferred alternative.

5.3.6 Replacement in Existing Alignment Alternative

The Replacement in Existing Alignment Alternative would include the removal of existing TL 695 and TL 6971 wood pole structures and the installation of new steel pole structures within the existing power line alignment. All 69kV conductor would be reconducted to eliminate the NERC Category B violation.

The Replacement in Existing Alignment Alternative is feasible. Also, because this alternative would involve removal of wood pole structures and installation of steel pole structures, it would fulfill two of the Proposed Project objectives (i.e., to eliminate the NERC Category B violation and to increase fire service reliability). However, the Replacement in Existing Alignment Alternative would require removal of existing wood pole structures and installation of new steel pole structures in environmentally sensitive areas to the west of Basilone Substation. These areas contain both biological and archaeological resources. Construction activities, including excavation, would have a relatively higher impact to these resources than the Proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative would not fulfill Objective 3.

5.3.7 TL 695 Realignment Alternative

The TL 695 Realignment Alternative involves the removal of existing wood pole structures and the installation of new steel pole structures along TL 695 from the existing Talega Substation to San Mateo Junction. TL 695 would then head southeasterly down existing steel lattice towers until it is located northeast of the Basilone Substation. At this point, TL 695 would turn southwest to Basilone Substation and connect at the substation's 69kV facilities. Under the TL 695 Realignment Alternative, all wood pole structures would be removed and new steel pole structures would be installed, and TL 695 and TL 6971 would be reconducted to eliminate the NERC Category B violation. The new connection from the steel lattice towers to Basilone Substation would involve the construction of a new approximately 1.2-mile-

long utility alignment that would cross sensitive biological resources to the north and east of Basilone Substation.

The TL 695 Realignment Alternative is feasible, and it would fulfill Objective 1 as the result of reconductoring and it would also meet Objective 2 because existing wood pole structures would be removed and new steel pole structures would be installed. However, because the new alignment would involve construction of facilities through sensitive environmental areas, this alternative would not fulfill Objective 3.

5.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

CEQA requires a lead agency to review and discuss ways in which a project could induce growth. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.2d) consider a project to be growth-inducing if it fosters economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding area. New employees hired for proposed commercial and industrial development projects and population growth resulting from residential development projects represent direct forms of growth. Other examples of growth-inducing projects are the expansion of urban services into previously undeveloped areas or the removal of major obstacles to growth, such as transportation corridors and potable water supply.

The growth-inducing potential of the Proposed Project could be considered significant if it were to stimulate population growth or a population concentration in the MCB Camp Pendleton, City of San Clemente or other surrounding communities, above what is assumed in local and regional land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning authorities. Significant growth impacts could also occur if the Proposed Project were to provide infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate growth levels beyond those permitted by local or regional plans and policies. Because the Proposed Project will not increase housing, bring in new services, or improve the existing infrastructure system (with the exception of making the existing electric service more reliable), it will not stimulate population growth or result in a new concentration of residents, businesses, or industries.

5.4.1 Growth Caused by Direct and Indirect Employment

The construction and operation of the Proposed Project will not affect employment patterns in the area. Construction activities are anticipated to occur between January and September 2018. A total of 81 workers would be involved and, during the peak construction period, up to 29-36 workers may be employed. Most of the workers will travel from within 30 miles of the Proposed Project. Only a small percentage of the total number of contractor-supplied workers, if any, will need to reside temporarily in hotels/motels in San Clemente, Oceanside, and/or other surrounding communities. The need for temporary lodging will therefore occur on an as-needed basis. Given that construction will employ the existing local workforce plus a relatively minor number of temporary as-needed additional workers, and considering the temporary nature of construction activities, the Proposed Project will not result in substantial population growth in the Proposed Project area. Any temporary increase in population due to construction will not have an impact compared to the existing population in the surrounding areas.

Following construction of the Proposed Project, no permanent jobs are expected to be created as a result of the Proposed Project. When in operation, the Proposed Project will be unstaffed and remotely operated. Maintenance of the power lines will be periodic and of short duration. Because the Proposed Project will not result in an increase in employment during the operation and maintenance phase, the Proposed Project will not increase the demand for new housing.

5.4.2 Proposed Project and Growth

The Proposed Project will improve the reliability of the electric system. This will allow TL 695 and TL 6971 to better serve existing load and to prevent potential long outages or disruption of service to existing and new customers. However, the Proposed Project will not create a new service or source of power that will indirectly allow for an increase in population or housing as a result, as it will not extend infrastructure into previously unserved areas.

The Proposed Project will accommodate existing and planned power demands in SDG&E's service territory, as well as those based on state- and locally- adopted plans and projections. SDG&E responds to projected development and forecasts, rather than inducing growth by extending infrastructure for future unplanned development. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not induce population growth in the area.

5.5 REFERENCES

No references are cited in this section.

THIS PAGE IS INTENDED TO BE LEFT BLANK