EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Campo Wind Project with Boulder Brush Facilities (Project) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Project would include wind energy generation facilities on the Campo Band of Diegueño Mission Indians Reservation (Reservation), and supporting infrastructure on private lands that are subject to the land use jurisdiction of the County of San Diego (County). This EIR addresses the Project as a whole. Although the County as Lead Agency is analyzing the Project as a whole, the County's land use jurisdiction is limited to the private lease lands within the Boulder Brush Boundary (i.e., the Boulder Brush Facilities). Operation of the generation transmission (gen-tie) line, access road, and high-voltage substation Off-Reservation would be subject to County jurisdiction. However, the switchyard and connection to the Sunrise Powerlink would be owned and operated by San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), and thus subject to the jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission for operation and maintenance.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) has jurisdiction over the portion of the Project within the Reservation Boundary (i.e., Campo Wind Facilities), and has prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate the impacts of the Project under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The impact analysis included in the subsections of this EIR herein hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the EIS.

The Notice of Preparation for the EIR was released for public review on February 14, 2019, and associated comment letters received during the public review period are included as Appendix A to this EIR. The Initial Study prepared for the Boulder Brush Facilities is also included in Appendix A. This EIR addresses issues identified in the Initial Study and comments received regarding the Notice of Preparation.

As required by CEQA, this EIR (1) assesses the potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the Project; (2) identifies potential feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, including the required No Project Alternative. The County is the Lead Agency for the Project and has the principal responsibility for preparing this EIR. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR consists of an evaluation of the effects of the entire Project. This EIR will be used by the County to inform public agencies, the public, and decision makers of the significant environmental effects of the Project; identify ways to minimize significant effects; and describe reasonable alternatives to the Project.

Since the majority of the Project is located on the Reservation, the Project is also subject to NEPA. The BIA is the Lead Agency for the Project under NEPA, and has prepared an EIS for the Project. The County is a cooperating agency for the EIS. The BIA released a Notice of Intent to prepare an

EIS on November 21, 2018, and closed the comment period on December 21, 2018. The BIA held a public scoping meeting on December 6, 2018, at the Tribal Hall on the Reservation. The Draft EIS was released on May 24, 2019, for a 45-day public review period, which ended on July 8, 2019.

ES.1 Project Synopsis

ES.1.1 Project Description

For purposes of this EIR, the Project is referred to as the "Campo Wind Project with Boulder Brush Facilities," or "Project" for short.

The Project consists of the Campo Wind Facilities that would be located on land leased from the Campo Band of Diegueño Mission Indians (Tribe) within the 16,000-acre Reservation Boundary, and the Boulder Brush Facilities that would be located on adjacent land to the northeast of the Reservation leased from a private landowner within the Boulder Brush Boundary. Implementation of the Campo Wind Facilities requires BIA approval of a 25-year lease (with the possibility of a 13-year extension) of land within the Reservation Boundary between the Tribe and the Developer (Campo Lease). Approval of the Campo Lease would allow Terra-Gen Development Company LLC to develop, construct, operate, maintain, and ultimately decommission the Campo Wind Facilities on leased land within the Reservation Boundary. Approval of the Campo Lease will authorize the Tribe's lease of trust land consistent with federal laws and regulations governing the leasing of tribal trust lands and the federal trust responsibility to tribes. Collectively, the land within the Reservation Boundary and the Boulder Brush Boundary comprise the Project Area (see Figure 1-1, Project Location, and Figure 1-2, Project Area, in Chapter 1 of this EIR). Throughout this document, the term "On-Reservation" refers to anything within the Reservation Boundary, and the term "Off-Reservation" refers to anything outside of the Reservation Boundary.

The Campo Wind Facilities, which would consist of 60 wind turbines and associated infrastructure, would be located within a corridor of approximately 2,200 acres of land (Campo Corridor) within the Reservation Boundary. The Boulder Brush Facilities, which would consist of a portion of the Project gen-tie line and related facilities to connect energy generated by the Project to the existing SDG&E Sunrise Powerlink, would be located within a corridor of approximately 320 acres of land (Boulder Brush Corridor) within the approximately 2,000-acre Boulder Brush Boundary. These Private Lease lands are under the land use and permitting jurisdiction of the County. Collectively, the Campo Corridor and the Boulder Brush Corridor compose the approximately 2,520-acre Project Site. Project disturbances associated with the construction of the Campo Wind Facilities within the Campo Corridor are expected to be approximately 800 acres, whereas Project disturbances associated with the construction of the Boulder Brush Facilities within the Boulder Brush Corridor are expected to be approximately 130 acres.

The Project as a whole would consist of the construction, operation, maintenance, and ultimately the decommissioning of a renewable wind energy generation project consisting of 60 wind turbines, three permanent meteorological (MET) towers, six temporary MET towers, a temporary concrete batch plant for use during construction, a temporary equipment staging and parking area for use during construction, an operations and maintenance (O&M) facility, water collection and septic systems, access roads, an electrical collection and communications system (ECCS), an approximately 8.5-mile-long gen-tie line, a collector substation, a high-voltage substation, and a switchyard to interconnect the Project to the existing SDG&E Sunrise Powerlink (see Figure 1-3, Project Site Plan, in Chapter 1 of this EIR). The Project would operate for more than 30 years, after which it would be decommissioned, except for the SDG&E-owned and operated switchyard and connection lines to Sunrise Powerlink, which would not be decommissioned. The details regarding the Project components and construction thereof are provided in Chapter 1, Project Description, Location, and Environmental Setting, of this EIR.

Project Approvals and Permits

The Project requires approvals by BIA and the County. In addition, permits may be required by other state and federal agencies. The Campo Wind Facilities are subject to lease approval by the BIA and subject to environmental review under NEPA, as discussed above.

The Boulder Brush Facilities are subject to the land use jurisdiction of the County. Land use actions that would be required to implement the Boulder Brush Facilities include one or more Major Use Permits (MUPs), building permit, grading permit, County Right-of-Way permit, and various administrative permits as described below.

- **Major Use Permit(s).** The Boulder Brush Facilities are considered a Major Impact Service and Utility type of use that requires approval of one or more MUPs. The land within the Boulder Brush Boundary has a zone classification of S92. Applications for MUPs would be processed according to Section 7350 of the Zoning Ordinance, including making required findings pursuant to Section 7359.
- **Building Permits.** The building of structures on private lands would require a building permit from the County. Although this is a ministerial permit, the applicant must adhere to all applicable regulations. Exact requirements for building permits are dependent upon the type of structure proposed.
- **Grading Permits.** The County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) is contained in Title 8, Division 7, of the Code of Regulatory Ordinances. The Project involves grading, clearing, and removal of natural vegetation and therefore requires a grading permit from the County for activities on private land. Proposed grading activities must meet requirements of the County's Grading Ordinance.

In addition to the BIA lease approval for the Campo Wind Facilities and County permit approvals for the Boulder Brush Facilities, other federal, state, and local agencies require approvals for the construction of the Project. Chapter 1 of this EIR identifies the permits, and/or approvals that may be needed for the Project. A final list would be refined throughout the planning and development process. Other local and state agencies may rely on this EIR in approving any discretionary permits required for the Project.

ES.1.2 Project Objectives

The fundamental purpose of the Project is to generate and deliver to the grid renewable wind energy to meet the demands of consumers.

Specific objectives for the Project are as follows:

1. Develop approximately 252 megawatts (MW) of renewable wind energy that can offset the need for additional energy production from fossil fuels and assist the state in meeting its air quality goals and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in conformance with Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 32.
2. Develop a wind energy project that can meet the criteria to achieve the maximum federal tax credit requiring placement into operation by December 31, 2020, which is intended to decrease the cost of renewable energy generation and delivery, promote the diversity of energy supply, and decrease dependence of the United States on foreign energy supplies.
3. Assist in achieving the state's goal of delivering 100% zero carbon energy by 2045.
4. Develop a wind energy facility as near as possible to existing transmission infrastructure.
5. Develop a wind energy facility within the Reservation, enhancing their economy by creating short- and long-term employment opportunities and providing long-term revenue.
6. Support an economically feasible wind energy project that would be developed through commercially available financing.
7. Support displacement of approximately 58,000 tons of carbon dioxide (CO_2, a GHG) emissions per year that would otherwise be required to generate the same amount of electricity as generated by the Project.

ES.1.3 Project Location

The Project would be located in southeastern San Diego County (see Figure 1-1, Project Location, in Chapter 1). The Project consists of both the Campo Wind Facilities that would be located on Reservation land leased from the Tribe and the Boulder Brush Facilities that would be located on adjacent land to the northeast of the Reservation leased from a private landowner. The Project Site

totals approximately 2,520 acres, which includes approximately 2,200 acres of land within the Reservation (Campo Corridor) and 320 acres on private lands (Boulder Brush Corridor). Land ownership surrounding the Project Area consists of a mixture of private, State of California, Bureau of Land Management, and tribal lands.

In the Project Vicinity, Community Plan areas (designated by the County's General Plan) include the Pine Valley Community Plan area, the Campo/Lake Morena Community Plan area, the Boulevard Subregional Planning Area, and the Mountain Empire Subregional Planning area. Figure 3.1.6-1, Existing Land Use Designations, in Section 3.1.6, Land Use and Planning, of this EIR depicts the surrounding Community Plans in relation to the Project Area. Project consistency with applicable plans is discussed in detail in Section 3.1.6 of this EIR.

Boulder Brush Boundary

The Boulder Brush Facilities would be located on private land in the McCain Valley area of the unincorporated County, north of the community of Boulevard and Interstate (I) 8 (see Figure 1-2, Project Area, and Table 1-2, Assessor's Parcel Numbers for Boulder Brush Facilities, in Chapter 1). Regional access is provided by I-8. Local access is provided by Ribbonwood Road.

Land within the 2,000-acre Boulder Brush Boundary currently consists of largely undeveloped ranch land, a portion of which had been used for cattle grazing in the past. There is evidence of off-highway vehicle activity within the Boulder Brush Boundary. Numerous "No Trespassing" signs have been posted at locations along the Boulder Brush Boundary to deter off-highway vehicle use by the public. The 500-kilovolt (kV) Sunrise Powerlink traverses the northeast portion of the Boulder Brush Boundary, and the existing Kumeyaay Wind and Tule Wind facilities are located to the west and northeast, respectively. In addition, several rural residential homes are located to the south.

The Boulder Brush Facilities would be located within a 320-acre corridor (Boulder Brush Corridor) within the Boulder Brush Boundary. The total disturbed area within the Boulder Brush Corridor would be approximately 131 acres.

Reservation Boundary

The Campo Wind Facilities would be located on lease lands within the 16,000-acre Reservation. The Campo Wind Facilities are proposed within an approximately 2,200-acre corridor (Camp Corridor) on the Reservation. The area of disturbance within the Camp Corridor would be approximately 800 acres. The Reservation extends from the United States/Mexico international border to north of I-8. Regional access is provided by I-8, and local access is provided by Crestwood Road, BIA 10/Church Road.

The Reservation is surrounded by open space and rural residential developments in unincorporated communities. The Manzanita Reservation borders the northern portion of the Reservation and the La Posta Reservation is located to the northwest.

ES.1.4 Environmental Setting

The following description of the environmental setting provides a general overview of the Project Area. More detailed descriptions of the environmental setting as it relates to each environmental issue area are provided in the individual sections of this EIR.

The Project Site lies between two major drainage divides: the Tecate Divide to the west, and the In-Ko-Pah Mountains to the east. This area occurs within the Live Oak Springs U.S. Geological Survey topographic quadrangle.

Boulder Brush Facilities

Land within the Boulder Brush Boundary is characterized by sparsely developed, high-desert rolling hills and surrounded, in part, by rural single-family residences, large-lot ranches, renewable energy and transmission infrastructure. The elevation ranges from approximately 3,280 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to approximately 4,120 feet amsl.

There are no existing or currently proposed residential uses within the Boulder Brush Boundary. Existing rural residences are located to the south of the Boulder Brush Boundary. The community of Boulevard, to the south of I-8, is located approximately 3.5 miles south of the Boulder Brush Boundary.

Native vegetation communities within the Boulder Brush Boundary consist of montane buckwheat scrub, big sagebrush scrub, granitic northern mixed chaparral, granitic chamise chaparral, red shank chaparral, semi-desert chaparral, wildflower field, emergent wetland, southern arroyo willow riparian forest, and coast live oak woodland (including open coast live oak woodland). The terrain in the area ranges from valley bottoms to house-sized boulder-covered ridgelines.

As previously described, there is evidence of off-highway vehicle activity within the Boulder Brush Boundary. Numerous ‘No Trespassing’ signs have been posted at locations along the Boulder Brush Boundary to deter off-highway vehicle use by the public. The Bureau of Land Management-managed McCain Valley Recreation Management Zone is located directly north of the Boulder Brush Boundary. Off-highway-vehicle use is considered a primary activity in the McCain Valley Recreation Management Zone, as identified in the Eastern San Diego County Resource Management Plan.

Campo Wind Facilities

Terrain within the Reservation is characterized by sparsely developed, high-desert rolling hills interspersed with renewable energy and transmission infrastructure. The elevation ranges from approximately 3,100 feet amsl to approximately 4,200 feet amsl.

The Reservation is in a desert transition zone, which supports a variety of habitat types and vegetation communities and is dominated by chamise chaparral with both a monotypic phase and a mixed chaparral phase. Additional vegetation communities found throughout this area and especially along ridges and slopes include red shank chaparral, big sagebrush scrub, and upper Sonoran subshrub scrub. A series of ridges running north to south is located throughout the Reservation separated by shallow valleys consisting of coast live oak woodland, nonnative grassland, and southern willow scrub vegetation. Various large rock-outcrops of light-colored boulders are scattered throughout this area but are primarily located along the ridgelines.

The Reservation includes scattered housing and some moderate development near the Tribal Administration Center, the Southern Indian Health Center Clinic, the current Campo Materials sand-mining operation, and the Golden Acorn Casino. Three highways cross the region: I-8, Old Highway 80, and State Route 94. San Diego Metropolitan Transit Service owns and operates the Desert Line railway that extends north and east from the U.S./Mexico border to Plaster City in Imperial County, where it joins the Union Pacific Railroad Line from El Centro. The rail line runs south of the Project Site.

Uses within the Reservation include rural residential, wind energy facilities, the Golden Acorn Casino, Tribal facilities, and Campo Materials aggregate activities. The Campo Corridor does not directly include these uses, although portions of the Campo Corridor are adjacent to these uses.

ES.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table ES-1, Summary of Significant Effects, presents the results of the environmental analysis completed for the Project. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce environmental impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, Tribal cultural resources, and traffic, and are included in Table ES-1. The mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to below a significant level, with the exception of impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, and noise which remain significant and unavoidable. A detailed analysis of significant environmental effects and mitigation measures is discussed throughout Chapter 2 of this EIR.

ES.3 Areas of Controversy

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires that an EIR identify areas of controversy, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. Areas of known controversy associated with the Project that are relevant to the EIR are as follows:

Aesthetics

- Lighting from the wind turbines
- Degraded views
- Shadow flicker from the wind turbines

Biological Resources

- Avian species strikes
- Wildlife migratory routes

Hazards

- Public concerns of health effects including:
- Exposure to electric and magnetic fields (EMF)
- Exposure to low-frequency noise
- Exposure to shadow flicker
- Oil leakage from generators

Hydrology

- Availability of groundwater
- Contamination of the water table

Noise

- Noise from wind turbines
- Noise from construction
- Infrasound and low-frequency noise

Wildfire

- Fire hazards

ES.4 Issues to Be Resolved by the Decision-Making Body

The San Diego County Planning Commission serves as the decision-making body for the Project. Issues to be resolved by the Planning Commission include: (1) how to mitigate the significant effects of the Project; (2) whether to reject or approve one of the alternatives to the Project and other environmental findings; and (3) whether to reject or approve the Project.

The Planning Commission must adopt detailed findings on the feasibility of mitigation measures that substantially lessen or avoid the significant effects of the Project on the environment.

In addition to mitigation measures, the Planning Commission will decide whether or not to adopt the Project or any of the Project alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the Project objectives while avoiding or substantially reducing any of the significant impacts of the Project.

Because this EIR has identified adverse environmental effects that are unavoidable, the Planning Commission must also determine whether the adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable with consideration given to economic, social, technological, and other relevant benefits of the Proposed Project pursuant to CEQA Section 15093.

Although the County as Lead Agency is analyzing the Campo Wind Project with Boulder Brush Facilities as a single project, the County's land use jurisdiction for the Project is limited to the Boulder Brush Facilities. BIA has jurisdiction over the Campo Wind Facilities and has prepared an EIS to evaluate the impacts of the Project under NEPA.

ES.5 Project Alternatives

Section 15126.6(f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines states that "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries,… and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives."

The County selected a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project that would attain most of the basic objectives of the Project, would be feasible to implement, and would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the Project. Accordingly, the following alternatives to the Project were selected:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: No Boulder Brush Facilities on Private Lands Alternative
- Alternative 3: Alternative Gen-tie Route within Boulder Brush Boundary
- Alternative 4: Underground Gen-tie within Boulder Brush Boundary Alternative

Pursuant to Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, each alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be less than, similar to, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the proposed Project. Each alternative is also evaluated to determine whether the Project objectives would be substantially attained.

The analysis methodology uses the following process:

- Determination of environmental impact resulting from the alternative.
- Comparison of the Project's impact and the alternative's impact with determinations of the following:
    - Less: Where the alternative's impact would be clearly less adverse or more beneficial than the impact of the proposed Project
    - Similar: Where the alternative and proposed Project would have roughly equivalent impacts
    - Greater: Where the alternative's impact would be clearly more adverse or less beneficial than the proposed Project
- The comparative analysis is followed by a general discussion based on the CEQA resource topic area and a discussion of the alternative's ability to meet the Project objectives.

In several cases, the severity of the impact may be the same under an alternative as measured against the CEQA significance thresholds (e.g., both the Project and a given alternative would result in a less than significant impact). However, the actual magnitude of the impact may be slightly different, providing the basis for a conclusion of greater or lesser impacts, even though both are considered less than significant.

A detailed analysis of Project alternatives is outlined in Chapter 4, Alternatives, of this EIR.

ES.5.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate the specific alternative of "no project" along with its impact. As stated in this section of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of describing and analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving a proposed project with the impacts of not approving that project. As specified in Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative for a development project consists of the circumstance under which a proposed project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) further states that "in certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained."

The No Project Alternative assumes that no portion of the Project would be developed and the existing conditions would remain. No reasonably expected actions or changes to the Project Site would be anticipated.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the Project objectives.

Feasibility

The No Project Alternative would be feasible to implement. The Project Site would remain in its current condition.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 1 to the Proposed Project

The No Project Alternative would result in minimal change to the existing baseline conditions. These baseline conditions are described in detail in each topic area of this EIR in the Existing Conditions section (see also Section 4.3.1 and Table 4-1, Comparison of Impacts from Alternatives to the Project, in Chapter 4, Alternatives, of this EIR).

ES.5.2 Alternative 2: No Boulder Brush Facilities on Private Lands Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate the specific alternative of "no project" along with its impact. As stated in this section of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of describing and analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving a proposed project with the impacts of not approving that project. As specified in Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative for a development project consists of the circumstance under which a proposed project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) further states that "in certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained."

The No Boulder Brush Facilities on Private Lands Alternative assumes that the Boulder Brush Facilities would not be developed and the existing conditions on lands within the County's land use jurisdiction would remain. No reasonably expected actions or changes to the Boulder Brush Corridor would be anticipated if the County does not approve the MUP for the Boulder Brush Facilities. Because the Reservation is outside the jurisdiction of the County, the No Project on Private Lands Alternative may not result in no development of the Campo Wind Facilities. This alternative considers the connection of power generated on the Reservation by the 60 wind turbines to the grid via the Sunrise Powerlink, via a gen-tie route that extends across the Manzanita Band of Diegueño Mission Indians' (Manzanita) Reservation and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) managed lands, connecting to a substation on a portion of the Sunrise Powerlink on BLM managed

lands. The Alternative 2 On-Reservation gen-tie route alignment would generally be the same as that of the Project On-Reservation gen-tie route, but the Off-Reservation gen-tie line would traverse north and then east, eliminating the need for the Boulder Brush Facilities on private lands. The County does not have any authority or ability to (a) mandate that a gen-tie line alignment be approved on BLM-managed or Tribal lands or (b) exercise discretion for activities on the Reservation, Manzanita Reservation, or BLM-managed lands (including an alternative gen-tie line route, substation location on BLM or Tribal lands, or any components on the non-private lands).

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The No Boulder Brush Facilities on Private Lands Alternative could achieve most of the Project objectives if the wind turbines on the Reservation were able to be built without the Boulder Brush Facilities and instead were connected to the Sunrise Powerlink via similar interconnection facilities on federal lands. The viability of this alternative is uncertain, however, given the need to obtain permission to cross land under the control of another tribe and BLM. The Developer does not have land rights to place the gen-tie line in this alternative alignment.

Feasibility

The No Boulder Brush Facilities on Private Lands Alternative may not be feasible to implement. The Boulder Brush Corridor would remain in its current condition.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 2 to the Project

While removing connection to the grid through private lands could jeopardize the feasibility of the Project, the Campo Wind Facilities could persist under the No Project On Private Lands Alternative if an alternative alignment that avoids private lands (e.g., connecting instead via facilities on Manzanita Reservation and BLM lands) could be achieved. As such, associated impacts for the Campo Wind Facilities would be the same as the Project and the analysis below addresses the change resulting from not undertaking the Boulder Brush Facilities on private lands. Impacts associated with the development of the gen-tie line and high-voltage substation would likely occur to a similar degree as Boulder Brush Facilities, but not on County-jurisdictional lands or subject to County discretion.

ES.5.3 Alternative 3: Alternative Gen-Tie Line Route within Boulder Brush Boundary

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of the Campo Wind Facilities as described under the Project, but a portion of the Off-Reservation gen-tie line would be located along an alternative alignment on private land within the Boulder Brush Boundary, as shown in Figure 4-1 in Chapter 4. The southern portion of the Off-Reservation gen-tie line route would follow an alternate route to the west. The northern portion of the Off-Reservation gen-tie route would follow the same

alignment as the Project. Although this alternate gen-tie route would modestly increase the total length of the Off-Reservation gen-tie line from approximately 3.5 miles to 3.7 miles, there would not be an increase in the number of required pole structures. In addition, there would be one less pull site required due to a reduction in need for one angle structure, and there would be a reduction of approximately 1.1 miles of decomposed granite roads required to access pole structures since this alternative route would align much closer to the main east/west decomposed granite access road. Therefore, even though the overall length of the Off-Reservation gen tie line would increase by approximately 0.2 miles, there would be an approximately 8 to 10 acre net decrease in disturbed acres associated with construction of the Boulder Brush Facilities due to the reduction in disturbance associated with elimination of 1.1 miles of decomposed granite access roads and one pull site. Finally, the alternate route would span a narrower portion of the Tule Wash reducing disturbance resulting in a decrease in RPO wetlands and vegetation disturbance during construction. The high-voltage substation, 500 kV switchyard and incoming/outgoing connection lines, and the paved access road would be the same as described for the Project.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Alternative 3 would meet the stated Project objectives outlined in Chapter 1.

Feasibility

Alternative 3 would be feasible to implement.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 3 to the Proposed Project

Under this alternative, the Campo Wind Facilities would be the same as the Project, and the analysis presented in Section 4.3.3 and summarized in Table 4-1 in Chapter 4 of this EIR addresses the change resulting from altering the Off-Reservation gen-tie line on private lands only.

ES.5.4 Alternative 4: Underground Gen-Tie Line within Boulder Brush Boundary Alternative

Alternative 4, Underground Gen-Tie Line within Boulder Brush Boundary Alternative, would result in implementation of the Campo Wind Facilities as described under the Project; however, the Off-Reservation 230 kV gen-tie line from the Reservation Boundary to the high-voltage substation and switchyard across the private lands would be underground rather than overhead. The underground gen-tie alignment would attempt to follow the same route as the Off-Reservation 230-kV gen-tie line, as feasible (provided no previously unknown subsurface condition arises during either pre-construction geotechnical investigations or underground gen-tie line construction). The high-voltage substation, 500 kV switchyard and incoming/outgoing connection lines, and the main paved access road would be the same as described for the Boulder Brush

Facilities (refer to Figure 4-2, Alternative 4: Underground Gen-Tie Line with Boulder Brush Boundary Alternative, in Chapter 4).

Construction of the high-voltage underground gen-tie line alternative would require additional construction activities when compared to construction of the overhead gen-tie line described for the Boulder Brush Facilities under the Project. These additional construction activities include additional trenching, excavating, blasting, grading and vegetation clearing and are anticipated to result in the following:

- Increased ground disturbance
- Increased dust, noise, and construction machinery and equipment emissions
- Increased concrete production and water demand
- Increased construction traffic
- Increased construction waste materials

Alternative 4 would require an approximately 3.5-mile-long, continuous trench of approximately 3.5 to 5 feet wide and approximately 5 to 7 feet deep to construct the underground high voltage transmission system. At approximately every 2,000 feet along the route, the trench would need to be widened and deepened to accommodate construction of a concrete splice vault which can be up to 8 feet wide by 8 feet tall and 24 feet long. Concrete splice vaults are required to provide areas for splicing the segments of the conductor cables during construction and to serve as permanent access points for routine line maintenance during operations.

Trenching would require additional temporary ground disturbance on either side of the trench for placement of construction supplies and equipment, the stockpiling of excavated material, and to provide access for the construction machinery and equipment. While the trenching activities would, to the extent possible, follow the alignment of the access road, these activities could fall outside of the disturbance area associated with the access road resulting in additional disturbed area. The additional disturbance could result in increased loss of natural vegetation and modification of terrain (e.g., alteration of topography). Required excavation, grading and vegetation clearing along the underground gen-tie line route would be greater than for construction of the overhead gen-tie line route for the Boulder Brush Facilities under the Project.

While the soil profiles may not be consistent throughout the entire 3.5-mile-long underground gen-tie line route, the geotechnical investigation (Appendix M) conducted at the high-voltage substation and switchyard area suggests that that the open trench excavation associated with Alternative 4 may encounter areas that could require hard rock excavation techniques including controlled blasting and/or the use of an impact hammer (i.e. hoe ram), both of which could cause an increase in noise and dust emissions relative to construction of the overhead gen-tie line route

for the Boulder Brush Facilities. In addition, the underground gen-tie line route could have to be re-routed and/or require additional, unanticipated blasting in the event that large, unexposed boulders are discovered in the path during the course of construction.

While the overall 14-month construction period for the Project would not need to be extended, Alternative 4 is anticipated to require a longer construction period than identified for the Off-Reservation overhead gen-tie line. Therefore, the increase in noise, dust and construction equipment emissions associated with this Alternative 4 could be compounded by the additional time required for construction of this alternative. While modeling for additional noise and air quality emissions has not been conducted, due to the overall duration and increased amount of additional disturbance and construction equipment required to construct an underground 230kV gen-tie line, both noise and air emissions are expected to be greater than that described for construction of the overhead gen-tie line route for the Boulder Brush Facilities under the Project.

Underground high voltage transmission line installations require that the high-voltage conductor cables and associated communications cables be installed in concrete encased polyvinyl chloride (PVC) duct banks for the entire length of the underground facilities. The amount of concrete required (and water needed to mix the concrete) for both the duct bank and splice vaults would be greater than the amount of concrete required for the Off-Reservation overhead gen-tie pole structure foundations. Similarly, due to the increased ground disturbance required to construct an underground 230kV gen-tie line, the water needed for dust suppression during construction is expected to be greater than described for dust suppression during construction of the overhead gen-tie line route.

Since Alternative 4 would require additional equipment and supplies than described for construction of the Off-Reservation overhead gen-tie line, it could generate an increase in construction traffic. Such additional trips would be associated with equipment and materials deliveries as well as water trucks. In addition, underground, high-voltage transmission lines often require fluidized thermal backfill for backfilling the open trench after the underground system has been constructed. This thermal backfill is required to help dissipate the heat that is generated when underground high-voltage transmission lines are in operation. Additional construction traffic could be produced by both thermal backfill deliveries as well as the equivalent off-site hauling for disposal of excavated material replaced by the thermal backfill.

Alternative 4 could create increased construction waste compared to that described for construction of the overhead gen-tie line route for the Boulder Brush Facilities under the Project. The duct banks and splice vaults would require the use of wood, nails and other waste-generating construction supplies needed to construct temporary concrete forms. Upon completion of construction, these supplies would be dismantled and hauled off-site to either a landfill or recycling facility.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Alternative 4 would meet the stated Project objectives, with the exception of objective 6 (economically feasible wind energy project).

Feasibility

Alternative 4 would be challenging to implement based on the additional construction requirements described above. These include the physical difficulties associated with the topography and potential to encounter boulders below the surface. In addition, the cost to underground high-voltage transmission lines is expected to be between 5 to 20 times greater than the cost of an overhead high-voltage transmission line due to the time, materials, specialized labor and installation processes that are required.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 4 to the Project

While undergrounding the 230 kV high-voltage Off-Reservation gen-tie line is addressed under this alternative, Project components on the Reservation would be the same as described under the Project, and the analysis presented in Section 4.3.4 and summarized in Table 4-1 of Chapter 4 addresses the change resulting from altering the Off-Reservation gen-tie line on private lands only.

ES.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a project must identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The CEQA Guidelines also state that should it be determined that the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the EIR must identify another Environmentally Superior Alternative among the remaining alternatives.

Table 4-1 in Chapter 4 compares the environmental impacts of each alternative to those of the Project. Based on the comparative analysis, Alternative 3, Alternative Gen-Tie Line Route within Boulder Brush Boundary, is considered environmentally superior to the Project. Compared to the Project, this Alternative would reduce impacts on Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources during construction while all other impacts would be similar during construction and all impacts would be similar during operations.

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Significant and Unavoidable Impacts			
2.1 – Aesthetics			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
No significant and unavoidable impacts to Aesthetics			
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact AE-A	Size and scale of proposed turbines	**M-AE-A** through **M-AE-H**	Significant and unavoidable
Impact AE-B	Alteration of visual landscape	**M-AE-A** through **M-AE-H**	Significant and unavoidable
Impact AE-C	Interruption and degradation of existing vistas from surrounding roads	**M-AE-A** through **M-AE-G**	Significant and unavoidable
Impact AE-D	Lighting from proposed wind turbines on existing night views	**M-AE-H**	Significant and unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts			
Impact AE-CU-A	Cumulative impacts on the visual environment	**M-AE-A** through **M-AE-H**	Significant and unavoidable
2.3 – Biological Resources			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
No significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources			
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact BI-B	Direct loss of County List A and B special-status plants during construction	N/A	Significant and unavoidable
Impact BI-D	Permanent direct impacts to habitat for special-status wildlife species	N/A	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact BI-M	Direct impacts to sensitive vegetation communities within the Campo Wind Corridor	N/A	Significant and unavoidable
Impact BI-U	Permanent direct impacts to RPO wetland and wetland buffer	N/A	Significant and unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts			
Impact BI-CU-1	Potential cumulative project impacts to sensitive plants and vegetation communities	**M-BI-C (**General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Significant and unavoidable
2.6 – Noise			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
No significant and unavoidable noise impacts			
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact N-A	Potentially significant noise impacts due to operational wind turbines	No feasible mitigation	Significant and unavoidable
Impact N-B	Potentially significant noise impacts due to operational wind turbines	No feasible mitigation	Significant and unavoidable
Impact N-C	Potentially significant noise impacts to noise-sensitive land uses On-Reservation	No feasible mitigation	Significant and unavoidable
Cumulative Impacts			
Impact N-CU-A	Cumulative noise impacts with regard to the L_{dn} Guidance Limit	N/A	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Significant Impacts Mitigated to a Level of Less Than Significant			
2.1 – Aesthetics			
None (see significant and unavoidable impacts)			
2.2 – Air Quality			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
Impact AQ-1	Calculated cancer risk and non-cancer chronic hazard risk	**M-AQ-1** through **M-AQ-5**	Less than significant
Cumulative Impacts			
Impact AQ-CU-1	Construction-related emissions of NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$	**M-AQ-1** through **M-AQ-5**	Less than cumulatively considerable
Campo Wind Facilities			
No significant impacts to air quality			
2.3 – Biological Resources			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
Impact BI-1	Permanent direct impacts to potentially occupied Quino checkerspot butterfly habitat	**M-BI-1** (Quino checkerspot butterfly-specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-2	Direct loss of County List A and B special-status plants during construction	**M-BI-5** (habitat preservation)	Less than significant
Impact BI-3	Temporary direct impacts to County List A and B special-status Plants outside of designated construction areas	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3 (**temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP)	Less than significant
Impact BI-4	Temporary direct impacts to habitat for special-status wildlife species	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-6** (nesting bird surveys) **M-BI-7** (revegetation of temporarily impacted areas)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact BI-5	Permanent direct impacts to habitat for special-status wildlife species	**M-BI-5** (habitat preservation)	Less than significant
Impact BI-6	Temporary direct impacts to habitat for special-status wildlife species outside of designated construction areas	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3 (**temporary construction flagging/fencing)	Less than significant
Impact BI-7	Direct electrocution or collisions impact to sensitive birds	**M-BI-8** (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee Standards)	Less than significant
Impact BI-8	Permanent impacts to raptor foraging habitat	**M-BI-5** (habitat preservation)	Less than significant
Impact BI-9	Indirect temporary impacts to special-status plant species (County List A and B special-status plants) during construction	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3 (**temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-10** (fugitive dust control), **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants)	Less than significant
Impact BI-10	Indirect permanent impacts to special-status plant species (County List A and B special-status plants) during operations and maintenance	**M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-10** (fugitive dust control) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants) **M-BI-13** (prevention of invasive plant species)	Less than significant
Impact BI-11	Temporary indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species during construction	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-6** (nesting bird survey) **M-BI-7** (replanting temporarily impacted areas)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		M-BI-10 (fugitive dust control) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants) **M-BI-13** (prevention of invasive species)	
Impact BI-12	Permanent indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species during operations and maintenance	**M-BI-10** (fugitive dust control) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-13** (prevention of invasive species) **M-BI-14** (fire protection) **M-BI-15** (access control)	Less than significant
Impact BI-13	Direct impacts to nesting raptors during construction	**M-BI-6** (nesting bird surveys)	Less than significant
Impact BI-14	Direct impacts to sensitive vegetation communities within the biological study area	**M-BI-5** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-7** (revegetation of temporarily impacted areas) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant
Impact BI-15	Direct impacts to sensitive habitat outside of the Boulder Brush Corridor	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant
Impact BI-16	Direct impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources	**M-BI-5** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant
Impact BI-17	Direct impacts to jurisdictional habitat outside of Boulder Brush Corridor	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-7** (revegetation of temporarily impacted areas) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant
Impact BI-18	Temporary indirect impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact BI-19	Permanent indirect impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources	**M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants) **M-BI-13** (prevention of invasive plant species) **M-BI-14** (fire protection) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant
Impact BI-20	Temporary indirect impact to sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-7** (revegetation of temporarily impacted areas) **M-BI-10** (fugitive dust control) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants)	Less than significant
Impact BI-21	Permanent indirect impact to sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants) **M-BI-13** (prevention of invasive plant species) **M-BI-14** (fire protection) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant
Impact BI-22	Permanent direct impacts to RPO wetland and wetland buffer	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-5** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-7** (revegetation of temporarily impacted areas) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control) **M-BI-12** (regulation of chemical pollutants) **M-BI-16** (federal and state agency permits)	Less than significant
Impact BI-23	Temporary direct impacts to habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-7** (revegetation of temporarily impacted areas)	Less than significant
Impact BI-24	Impacts to wildlife species movement from collision and electrocution	**M-BI-8** (APLIC standards) **M-BI-9** (carcass removal)	Less than significant
Impact BI-25	Direct and indirect impacts to active migratory bird nesting	**M-BI-2** (biological monitoring) **M-BI-3** (temporary construction flagging/fencing) **M-BI-4** (SWPPP) **M-BI-5** (habitat preservation) **M-BI-6** (nesting bird survey) **M-BI-7** (revegetation of temporarily impacted areas) **M-BI-10** (fugitive dust control) **M-BI-11** (erosion and runoff control)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
		M-BI-12 (regulation of chemical pollutants) **M-BI-13** (prevention of invasive species) **M-BI-14** (fire protection) **M-BI-15** (access control)	
Impact BI-26	Direct impacts to golden eagle foraging	**M-BI-5** (habitat preservation)	Less than significant
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact BI-A	Project impacts to 222.1 acres of potentially occupied Quino habitat	**M-BI-A** (Implementation of USFWS-Issued Terms and Conditions)	Less than significant
Impact BI-C	Temporary direct impacts to County List A and B special-status plants outside of designated construction areas	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-E	Impacts to special-status wildlife species from collisions	**M-BI-B** (Avian-Specific Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-F	Impacts to special-status wildlife species from electrocution	**M-BI-B** (Avian-Specific Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-G	Permanent impacts to raptor foraging habitat	N/A	Less than significant
Impact BI-H	Indirect temporary impacts to special-status plant species (County List A and B special-status plants) during construction	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-I	Indirect permanent impacts to	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
	special-status plant species (County List A and B special-status plants) during operations and maintenance		
Impact BI-J	Temporary indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species during construction	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-K	Permanent indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species during operations and maintenance	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-L	Direct impacts to active raptor nests	**M-BI-B** (Avian-Specific Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-N	Direct impacts to sensitive habitat outside of Campo Wind Corridor	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-O	Direct impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources	**M-BI-D** (Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands Compensation)	Less than significant
Impact BI-P	Direct impacts to jurisdictional habitat outside of Campo Wind Corridor	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-Q	Temporary indirect impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-R	Permanent indirect impacts to jurisdictional aquatic resources	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact BI-S	Temporary indirect impact to sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-T	Permanent indirect impact to sensitive vegetation communities	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-V	Temporary direct impacts to wildlife access to foraging and breeding habitat	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-W	Impacts to wildlife species movement from electrocution	**M-BI-B** (Avian-Specific Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-X	Impacts to wildlife species movement from collisions	**M-BI-B** (Avian-Specific Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures)	Less than significant
Impact BI-Y	Direct and indirect impacts to active migratory bird nesting	**M-BI-B** (Avian-Specific Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures)	Less than significant
Cumulative Impacts			
Impact BI-CU-2	Potential cumulative indirect impacts (invasive species and dust) to sensitive plants and vegetation communities	**M-BI-C** (General Avoidance and Minimization Measures)	Less than significant
2.4 – Cultural Resources			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
Impact CR-1	Project development has potential to affect resources within 50 feet of Boulder Brush ADI or within buffers	**M-CR-1** (temporary exclusionary fencing)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact CR-2	Potential to affect 37 cultural resources that are important under the County CEQA Guidelines	**M-CR-2** (archaeological monitoring)	Less than significant
Impact CR-3	Potential to affect unknown human remains	**M-CR-3** (avoidance through preservation in place)	Less than significant
Impact CR-4	Potential to affect undiscovered cultural resources that may qualify as significant under County Guidelines	**M-CR-1** (temporary exclusionary fencing) **M-CR-2** (archaeological monitoring) **M-CR-3** (avoidance through preservation in place)	Less than significant
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact CR-A	Project development has potential to affect resources within 50 feet of Project ADI or within buffers	**M-CR-A** (Monitoring and Treatment Plan)	Less than significant
Impact CR-B	Potential to affect 37 cultural resources that are important under the County CEQA Guidelines	**M-CR-B** (archaeological and Native American monitoring) and **M-CR-C** (significance evaluation and data recovery)	Less than significant
Impact CR-C	Potential to affect unknown human remains	**M-CR-B** (archaeological and Native American monitoring)	Less than significant
Impact CR-D	Potential to affect undiscovered cultural resources that may qualify as significant under County Guidelines	**M-CR-A** (Monitoring and Treatment Plan) **M-CR-B** (archaeological and Native American monitoring) **M-CR-C** (significance evaluation and data recovery)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
2.5 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
Impact HZ-1	Potential for accidental spills and unauthorized releases of hazardous materials	**M-HZ-1**	Less than significant
Impact HZ-2	Wildfire hazards	**M-WF-1**	Less than significant
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact HZ-A	Potential for accidental spills and unauthorized releases of hazardous materials	**M-HZ-A** through **M-HZ-D**	Less than significant
Impact HZ-B	Hazardous materials sites	**M-HZ-A** through **M-HZ-D**	Less than significant
Impact HZ-C	Wildfire hazards	**M-BI-C (h)**	Less than significant
2.6 – Noise			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
Impact N-1	Potentially significant construction noise impacts	**M-N-1** (construction noise best management practices for activities on private land)	Less than significant
Campo Wind Facilities			
None (see significant and unavoidable impacts)			
2.7 – Tribal Cultural Resources			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
Impact TCR-1	Possibility of unknown resources	**M-TCR-1** (temporary exclusionary fencing) **M-TCR-2** (archaeological and Tribal monitoring) **M-TCR-3** (avoidance through preservation in place)	Less than significant
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact TCR-A	Possibility of unknown resources	**M-CR-A** (Monitoring and Treatment Plan) **M-CR-B** (archaeological and Native American monitoring) **M-CR-C** (significance evaluation and data recovery)	Less than significant
2.8 – Traffic and Transportation			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
No significant traffic and transportation impacts			
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact TR-A	Impacts to roadway facilities	**M-TR-A** (Use of Traffic Flagger during PM Peak Hour)	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Significant Effects

Impact No.	Impact	Mitigation	Conclusion and Mitigation Effectiveness
Impact TR-B	Potential damage to existing roadways during construction	**M-TR-B** (Repair and Restoration of Roads)	Less than significant
Impact TR-C	Increase in hazards and adequate emergency access	**M-TR-C** (Traffic Control and Management Plan)	Less than significant
2.9 – Wildfire			
Boulder Brush Facilities			
Impact WF-1	Potential for increased wildfire risk.	**M-WF-1** (Implementation of all fire protection measures and features identified in the Boulder Brush Facilities FPP)	Less than significant
Campo Wind Facilities			
Impact WF-A	Potential for increased wildfire risk.	**M-BI-C (h)** (Preparation of a Fire Protection Plan for the Campo Wind Facilities)	Less than significant