

D.17 Plan Amendments – Contents

D.17.1	Federal and State Plan Descriptions	D.17-1
D.17.2	Plan Amendments Resulting from Proposed Project and Alternatives.....	D.17-5

D.17 Plan Amendments

This section describes the federal and State plan amendments that could result from the Proposed Project and some of the identified route alternatives. Section D.17.1 provides an overview of the applicable plans and Section D.17.2 describes the necessity of the various plan amendments resulting from the Proposed Project and some of the identified route alternatives. Plan amendments may also be required for the connected actions and future transmission system expansion corridors. While specific amendments to the MCAS Miramar Master Plan may not be required, the Proposed Project and alternatives that would involve Miramar property and operations would need to be consistent with the Master Plan, as determined by the USMC.

Section D.16 (Policy Consistency) addresses the consistency of the Proposed Project and alternatives with applicable policies and plans of the jurisdictions through which the alignment would pass or in which substations would be located. In some cases, policy inconsistencies are identified that would require amendments to plans described in this section. This section focuses on the process and regulations driving plan amendments, and not on the conclusions as to whether or not any specific policies are consistent.

D.17.1 Federal and State Plan Descriptions

D.17.1.1 Bureau of Land Management

As a component of the ROW Grant permitting procedure, the Proposed Project and several route alternatives would require an amendment to BLM's California Desert Conservation Area Plan (as amended) and/or to the Eastern San Diego Resource Management Plan (RMP). An overview of these Plans is provided below, as well as an overview of the South Coast Resource Management Plan since the Modified Route D Alternative would traverse the BLM lands managed by this Plan.

California Desert Conservation Area Plan. The 25-million-acre CDCA is a special planning area administered by the BLM that contains over 12 million acres of public lands within the California Desert, which includes the Mojave, the Sonoran, and a small portion of the Great Basin Deserts. The goal of the CDCA Plan is to provide for economic, educational, scientific, and recreational uses of public lands and resources in the CDCA in a manner that enhances without diminishing the environmental, cultural, and aesthetic values of the desert.

The Energy Production and Utility Corridor Element of the CDCA Plan established a network of joint-use planning corridors intended to meet the projected utility service needs at the time the Plan was written (see Figure D.17-1). In addition to these existing utility corridors, the CDCA Plan (as amended) identified eight contingent utility corridors as having some potential for use in the future should project status associated with the existing 16 corridors change. Contingent corridors may be brought forward into the Plan after successfully completing the Plan Amendment process. The Proposed Project would include the development of a new transmission line on BLM land within the CDCA planning area outside of the designated utility corridors (see Figure D.17-1); therefore a Plan Amendment would be required.

Eastern San Diego County Draft Resource Management Plan (2007). The Proposed Project and three identified route alternative (the Partial Underground ABDSP SR78 to S2 Alternative, Interstate 8 and BCD Alternatives) traverse the BLM El Centro Field Office's Eastern San Diego County Manage-

ment Area. The BLM is in the process of revising the Resource Management Plan (RMP) for this area; a Draft EIS on the Eastern San Diego RMP was published on March 2, 2007. The public comment period ended on May 31, 2007, and BLM is now preparing the Final EIS. Under all Eastern San Diego County Resource Management Plan alternatives, new transmission line towers and cables 161 kV and above would be required to be located within a single designated utility ROW (the SWPL corridor) one mile wide and between one and 1.5 miles in length encompassing 960 acres of BLM-administered within the planning area. (Under the No Action alternative of the DEIS, the corridor would remain 2 miles in width and encompass 1,920 acres.) Since the Proposed Project and BCD and Partial Underground ABDSP SR78 to S2 alternatives would be partially located with the designated utility ROW, they would each require a Plan Amendment before BLM could approve a transmission line route in this area. However, the Interstate 8 Alternative would not require a Plan Amendment because it is located within the designated utility ROW.

South Coast Resource Management Plan (1994). The South Coast Resource Management Plan (RMP) provides guidance for the management of approximately 300,000 acres of BLM administered public lands in portions of five highly urbanized southern California counties: San Diego, Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange, and Los Angeles. These public lands include over 130,000 acres of BLM administered surface lands and 167,000 acres of federal mineral ownership where the surface is privately owned. The Proposed Project route passes through Mt Gower Open Space Preserve in the area southeast of Ramona. This Preserve is BLM land managed by the County of San Diego. Currently, no Plan amendment would be required to the South Coast RMP because the plan does not designate utility corridors; however, in August 2007, the BLM announced that they intend to revise the 1994 South Coast RMP and prepare an associated Environmental Impact Statement to replace the current plan.

The existing South Coast RMP was completed and signed in 1994. Since that time there have been significant changes in the patterns of urban growth, increased demands on the resources of the public lands, changing policies and emphasis on the management of public lands and local land use planning, and new data that has led to the listing of additional threatened or endangered species. Under BLM planning regulations, planning revisions are necessary if monitoring and evaluation findings, new data, new or revised policy, or changes in circumstances indicate that decisions for an entire plan or a major portion of the plan no longer serve as a useful guide for resource management. Plan revisions will be prepared using the same procedures and documentation as for new plans. The BLM web site presents additional information on potential public involvement in the plan revision process (<http://www.blm.gov/ca>). Documents pertinent to the plan revisions will be available for public review at the BLM Palm Springs–South Coast Field Office located at 690 W. Garnet Avenue, North Palm Springs, California, or the San Diego project office located at 10845 Rancho Bernardo Road, Suite 200, San Diego, California, during regular business hours of 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays, and may be published as part of the EIS.

D.17.1.2 Anza-Borrego Desert State Park

The ABDSP General Plan establishes the overall long-range purpose and vision for the future of ABDSP. The General Plan delineates six management zones and a set of goals and guidelines that will guide park management, as well as specific project management and implementation. These goals and guidelines address recreational, operational, interpretive, and resource management opportunities and constraints consistent with the classifications of State Park and State Wilderness, as set forth in Sections 5019.53 and 5019.68 of the Public Resources Code and Department Resource Management Directives. The General Plan does not locate or design facilities, but instead provides goals and guidelines for the appropriate types, locations, and designs of those that may be proposed in the future.

Figure D.17-1. BLM Planning Areas and Utility Corridors
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

Management zones in the ABDSP General Plan describe the overall management purpose and intent of specific regions within the Park as well as depict their intended uses. Each zone provides direction for the general level and type of development and use within the Park. The management zones are ordered, in general, from the highest intensity of visitor use to the lowest. Areas within each zone may also have varying degrees of use intensity. The six management zones are as follows: Information/Entrance Zone, Focused-Use Zone I, Focused-Use Zone II, Backcountry Zone, Wilderness Zone, and the Cultural Preserve Zone.

The General Plan acknowledges an easement for the existing SGD&E 69 kV transmission line through the Park; however, the Plan specifically excludes the existing SDG&E 69 kV easement from the Wilderness designations. The Proposed Project would in general follow the existing 69 kV transmission line easement for a distance of approximately 22 miles; however, because of the scale of the 500 kV structures, portions of the Proposed Project ROW would intrude into the Wilderness zones bordering the existing 69 kV easement. As a result of this wilderness effect and also because of back country designations and potential inconsistencies with Plan goals and guidelines, an amendment of the ABDSP General Plan ~~could~~ would be required.

D.17.1.3 U.S. Forest Service

All National Forests, including the Cleveland, are guided by direction from numerous sources. Laws passed by Congress, such as the National Environmental Policy Act, National Forest Management Act, Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, and others provide direction for certain aspects of management. Additionally, the Forest Service has developed regulations and policies for the management of resources in response to legislation or management needs. This direction is contained in the Code of Federal Regulations and Forest Service Manuals (FSM) and Handbooks (FSH) and covers a wide range of direction for managing Forest resources.

At the national level, the Resources Planning Act (RPA) program gives broad direction. At the Regional level, the Regional Guide gives direction for management as well as target levels of output for various resources on each National Forest. The Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan (“Forest Plan”) serves as a guide for the implementation of the laws, regulations, policies, and guidelines mentioned. The first level of direction in the Plan is the “Forest Goals” (Section B). Goals provide the broad, overall direction for the type and amount of goods and services that the Forest will provide in the future. The “Forest Goals” are followed by a discussion of the “Future Condition of the Forest” (Section C), “Acreage Allocations of the Management Areas” (Section D), and “Outputs and Costs” (Section E). The Forest Plan is intended to serve as a guiding document for project level planning that will occur prior to conducting the activities proposed. Projects will still require an environmental analysis.

The Proposed Project alignment does not traverse the Cleveland National Forest, and would not require Forest Service approval to be carried forward. However, several identified route alternatives would traverse the Forest: the Interstate 8 Alternative, the Route D Alternative, the Modified Route D Alternative, the BCD Alternative, and the CNF Existing ROW Alternative. Any of these alternatives would require approval through a Special Use authorization from the Forest Service. As required by statute (16 USC 1604Ii), a Special Use authorization cannot be issued to SDG&E without first ensuring its consistency with the Forest Plan (through improvement in design and/or Forest Plan amendment).

D.17.2 Plan Amendments Resulting from Proposed Project and Alternatives

The Proposed Project and several route alternatives would cross federal and State lands managed by their respective agencies through the implementation of various land management plans as described in Section D.17.1. Table D.17-1 summarizes the plans that would require amendment as a result of the Proposed Project and several route alternatives.

Table D.17-1. Federal and State Plan Amendments Resulting from Proposed Project and Alternatives

Agency	Land Management Plan	Proposed Project	Route Alternatives				
			I-8	BCD	D	MD	Other
BLM ¹	California Desert Conservation Area Plan	x ²					x ^{2, 3}
	Eastern San Diego Draft Resource Management Plan (2007)	x	x	x			
USFS	Cleveland National Forest Land Use Management Plan		x ⁴	x	x	x	x ⁵
Anza-Borrego Desert State Park	Anza-Borrego Desert State Park General Plan	x ²					x ^{2, 3}

1 The Modified D Alternative would cross BLM lands managed under the BLM South Coast Resource Management Plan (1994). Since the Plan does not designate utility corridors no plan amendment would be required; however, San Diego County would be a party to decisionmaking on granting a ROW easement.

2 Note: The extent of BLM jurisdiction to authorize rights of way through ABDSP is still being determined.

3 Overhead 500 kV ABDSP within Existing ROW Alternative [and Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2 Alternative](#).

4 Including West Buckman Springs Option and Buckman Springs Underground Option.

5 CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative.

D.17.2.1 BLM Plan Amendments

As presented in Table D.17-1, the Proposed Project would require amendment of the BLM California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan. In addition, the Proposed Project, and Interstate 8 and BCD Alternatives would require amendment of the Eastern San Diego Draft Resource Management Plan. The Proposed Project traverses the Sonoran Desert within the CDCA for 83.6 miles, following existing utility corridor “N” for 4.7 miles, then diverging from this corridor for another 78.9 miles through Imperial and San Diego Counties, including 31.4 miles on BLM land and 22.6 miles on State Park land (Figure B-2 in Section B). The Proposed Project route passes through 26.7 miles of BLM-administered lands through the CDCA that are not designated as joint-use planning corridors; however, 16.0 of those miles are on BLM-administered land in contingent corridor Z. The BLM will use this EIR/EIS to consider amending the CDCA Plan of 1980 (as amended), an action that would be necessary for construction of the Proposed Project. If the CDCA Plan is not amended, the BLM may only authorize installation of a project within existing designated corridors. Alternatively, the BLM may deny the Proposed Project if the existing corridor option does not prove feasible.

Section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) states: “The Secretary shall, with public involvement ... develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land use plans which provide by tracts or areas for the use of the public lands” (43 United States Code [USC] 1712). The regulations for making and modifying land use plans and planning decisions are found in Title 43 CFR Part 1600. The proposed land use plan amendment is to follow the regulations as set forth in Title 43 CFR Part 1610, Resource Management Planning, which requires an interdisciplinary approach be taken in

amending resource plans, where the disciplines of the preparers shall be appropriate to the values involved and the issues identified for the amendment. The amendment is to be analyzed through the NEPA process, in which the public and other federal, State, and local governments are to be provided opportunities to meaningfully participate in and comment on the preparation of the amendment and be given early notice of planning activities. The analysis and public involvement for the proposed land use plan amendment are to coincide, to the extent possible, with the public notices, hearings, and comment periods of this EIR/EIS for the proposed SRPL Project.

Because the Draft EIR/EIS also evaluates a BLM draft land use plan amendment, the public review period will be 90 days from the date the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS is published in the Federal Register.

Proposed revisions of CDCA joint-use corridors classification or their boundaries are approved by the BLM California State Director according to the Plan amendment procedures outlined in Chapter 7 of the CDCA Plan (as amended). The CDCA Plan requires that BLM encourage the use of designated utility corridors for utility projects. The Proposed Project is not consistent with the CDCA Plan because the proposed transmission alignment is outside of designated utility corridors on BLM-managed CDCA land. This EIR/EIS serves as a land use plan amendment proposal to modify the CDCA Plan to the extent necessary to allow BLM to issue a permit for the Proposed Project. It is BLM's policy that an EIR/EIS also address an alternative primarily within an existing utility corridor at the same level of details as the Proposed Project. This EIR/EIS analyzes the Interstate 8 Alternative, which follows a designated utility corridor (the existing SDG&E Southwest Powerlink) for much of its length through BLM lands. An alternative entirely following the Southwest Powerlink was considered but eliminated; detailed discussion of this consideration is presented in Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report), Section 4.9.5 and in Attachment 1A to Appendix 1.

D.17.2.2 Anza-Borrego Desert State Park Plan Amendment

There are three reasons that the proposed SRPL ~~may~~ would require an amendment to the General Plan of the ABDSP: conflict with established wilderness, conflict with backcountry zone, and conflict with goals and guidelines. Each issue is discussed below.

Wilderness. Transmission lines are not a permitted use in the Wilderness Zone (GP §3.2.4.5. See also General Plan at page 2-92). The ABDSP General Plan acknowledges an easement for the existing SGD&E 69 kV transmission line through the Park; however, the Plan specifically excludes the existing 69 kV easement from the Wilderness designations. The Proposed Project would in general follow the existing 69 kV transmission line easement for a distance of approximately 22 miles; however, because of the scale of the 500 kV structures, portions of the Proposed Project ROW would intrude into the Wilderness zones bordering the existing 69 kV easement. This expansion would result in approximately 50.2 acres of State Wilderness within the Pinyon Ridge Wilderness Area (48.1 acres) and Grapevine Mountain Wilderness Area (1.3 acres) being traversed by the Proposed Project (see Figure D.5-2 in Section D.5, Recreation and Wilderness and Appendix 11B). Given the definition and prohibited uses within wilderness areas, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would be inconsistent with wilderness area designation. Specifically, the presence of the towers and conductors, temporary and permanent roads, motor vehicles and helicopters within wilderness areas would be inconsistent with Pub. Res. Code § 5093.36 (b) and the ABDSP Final General Plan and EIR. The existing wilderness boundaries would need to be modified in order for the Proposed Project ROW to be located outside of a designated wilderness area. The de-designation of State wilderness would require approval of the State Park and Recreation Commission (SPRC). De-designation of a State Wilderness Area has not occurred.

Also, as required by Pub. Res. Code § 5002.2(a), modification of State wildernesses as designated by SPRC, would require a revision to the existing ABDSP General Plan:

Following classification or reclassification of a unit by the State Park and Recreation Commission, and prior to the development of any new facilities in any previously classified unit, the department shall prepare a general plan or revise any existing plan, as the case may be, for the unit.

Amendment of the ABDSP General Plan as a result of the Proposed Project would be conducted in conformance with the General Plan's broad policy goals, guidelines, and management zones. The analysis of broad potential environmental impacts discussed in the Environmental Analysis Section of the Plan would provide the basis for future second-level environmental review, which will provide more detailed information and analysis for site-specific developments and projects. This EIR/EIS serves as the second-level environmental review. The Park staff noted that the criteria for designating and de-designating wilderness in a General Plan amendment could require 8 to 12 months. The SPRC would oversee the Plan amendment process and make a decision on whether to amend the General Plan.

Backcountry Zone. Transmission lines are also generally inconsistent with the Backcountry Zone (GP §3.2.4.4) and the General Plan does not exclude the existing SDGE line from lands so designated (GP Fig. 6-6). In acknowledging the existence of the existing transmission line, though, the existing line and easement were implicitly grandfathered in (see also Operations Goal 4). Nevertheless, the Proposed Project would require expansion into the Backcountry Zone, necessitating a General Plan amendment.

Goals and Guidelines. The proposed project would require amendments involving specific goals and guidelines (see Section D.16). Compatibility of a project with a General Plan does not necessarily require conformity or compliance with every applicable goal and guideline, but there is enough inconsistency demonstrated for the Proposed Project, especially with key recreational and operation policies, to require more than just a Management Zone change, Infrastructure and Operations Guideline 4a notwithstanding.

State Parks states that for it to provide additional right-of-way for new or additional transmission facilities without an amendment first being approved by the State Park & Recreation Commission would violate applicable sections of the Public Resources Code. Providing any permit or approval within ABDSP is a subordinate act that must be consistent with the ABDSP General Plan (Pub. Res. Code §5002.2)

D.17.2.3 Forest Plan Amendments

As presented in Table D.17-1, several of the route alternatives would require amendment of the Cleveland National Forest Land Use Management Plan ('Forest Plan'). The Forest Service cannot approve any of the route alternatives without first ensuring their consistency with the Forest Plan (through improvement in design and/or Forest Plan amendment). The Forest Plan amendments must be completed before Special Use authorization(s) (and possibly temporary Special Use Permits for construction) can be issued by the Forest Service to the Applicant (SDG&E) for any project alternative. If required, plan amendments would need to be in place before any permit for occupancy or construction (even temporary construction) could be issued.

If a project would require changes to established land use zones or scenic integrity objectives, a plan amendment would have to be prepared. Figure D.17-2 shows the Forest's Land Use Zones for the Forest's southern area, as well as the alternatives considered in this EIR/EIS. Figure D.17-3 shows the Scenic Integrity Objectives.

The Forest Service is required (under 36 CFR 219.10) to review all site-specific projects, including authorized uses of the land, to ensure they are consistent with the 2005 Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan, per the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) (16 U.S.C 1600-1614, as amended). Necessary amendments to the Forest Plan would be made using the amendment process defined in the Forest Service Manual 1920 and Forest Service Handbook 1909.12, following all “appropriate public notification and satisfactory completion of NEPA procedures.” The decision by the Forest Service to approve or deny Forest Plan amendments associated with alternatives to the Proposed Project in this EIR/EIS will be based, in part, on the findings of the impact analyses reported in this EIR/EIS and also on the NFMA determination of the consistency of the proposed use with the transmission line alternatives parameters specified in the Forest Plan. The three types of Forest Plan amendments on Forest Service land include:

- **Scenic Integrity Objectives:** Potential changes to the Scenic Integrity Objectives along the alternative routes, as defined in Forest Plan Standards S9 and S10.
- **Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail:** Modifying the Forest Standard related to the Pacific Crest Trail (S1) specifically regarding the alternatives, as the alternative utility corridor(s) and transmission line(s) would adversely impact the foreground views.
- **Forest Plan Land Use Zones.** Modifying or creating exemptions for inconsistencies with the Forest Plan land use zones.

The necessity for Forest Plan amendments as a result of the route alternatives is discussed below:

Forest Plan Amendment Process

The following text was provided by the Cleveland National Forest, and describes the Forest Plan Amendment process. The latest information on the NFMA can be viewed on the Forest Service website at <http://www.fs.fed.us/emc/nfma/index.htm>.

1926.5 – Amendment

The need to amend a land management plan may arise from several sources, including the following:

1. Recommendations of the Forest, Grassland, Prairie, or other comparable administrative unit interdisciplinary team that are based on findings that result from monitoring and evaluating implementation of the land management plan (FSM 1926.7).
2. Findings that existing or proposed permits, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other instruments authorizing occupancy and use are not consistent with the land management plan, but should be approved.
3. Changes necessitated by resolution of administrative appeals.
4. Changes in plan guidance needed to correct planning errors.
5. Changes in plan guidance necessitated by changed physical, social, or economic conditions.
6. Desired implementation of projects or activities outside the scope of the land management plan.

Upon receiving advice from the interdisciplinary team that the plan requires change, the Responsible Official shall:

1. Determine whether proposed changes to a land management plan are significant or not significant in accordance with the requirements of sections 1926.51 and 1926.52.
2. Document the determination of whether the change is significant or not significant in a decision document.
3. Provide appropriate public notification of the decision prior to implementing the changes.

Findings of the Responsible Official regarding the consistency of projects or activities and actions with the land management plan and the determination of the significance of an amendment are an integral part of decisions. As such, they are subject to administrative review under 36 CFR 219.14.

1926.51 – Changes to the Land Management Plan That Are Not Significant

Changes to the land management plan that are not significant can result from:

1. Actions that do not significantly alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management.
2. Adjustments of management area boundaries or management prescriptions resulting from further on-site analysis when the adjustments do not cause significant changes in the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management.
3. Minor changes in standards and guidelines.
4. Opportunities for additional projects or activities that will contribute to achievement of the management prescription.

The Forest, Grassland, Prairie, or other comparable administrative unit Supervisor must prepare an amendment to the land management plan to accommodate a change determined not to be significant. Appropriate public notification is required prior to implementation of the amendment.

1926.52 – Changes to the Land Management Plan That are Significant

The following examples indicate circumstances that may cause a significant change to a land management plan:

1. Changes that would significantly alter the long-term relationship between levels of multiple-use goods and services originally projected (see section 219.10(e) of the planning regulations in effect before November 9, 2000 (see 36 CFR parts 200 to 299, revised as of July 1, 2000)).
2. Changes that may have an important effect on the entire land management plan or affect land and resources throughout a large portion of the planning area during the planning period.

When a significant change needs to be made to the land management plan, the Forest, Grassland, Prairie, or other comparable administrative unit Supervisor must prepare an amendment. Documentation of a significant change, including the necessary analysis and evaluation should focus on the issues that have triggered the need for the change. In developing and obtaining approval of the amendment for significant change to the land management plan, follow the same procedures as are required for developing and approving the land management plan. (See sections 219.10(f) and 219.12 of the planning regulations in effect before November 9, 2000 (36 CFR parts 200 to 299, revised as of July 1, 2000)).

Figure D.17-2. Cleveland National Forest Land Use Zones
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

Figure D.17-3. Cleveland National Forest Scenic Integrity Objectives
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

Scenic Integrity Objectives

Table D.17-2 presents the Forest Plan delineated “Place” and Scenic Integrity Objectives that exist along each alternative route. The definition for the ‘high’ Scenic Integrity Objective that applies to all of the route alternatives is as follows:

***High:** Landscapes where the valued landscape character ‘appears’ intact. Visual deviations (human-made structures) may be present but must repeat the form, line, color, texture, and pattern common to the landscape character so completely and at such a scale that they are not evident.*

Table D.17-2. Alternative Scenic Integrity Objectives

Route Alternative	Forest Plan Place(s) ¹	Scenic Integrity Objective
Interstate 8 Alternative ²	Moreno and Sweetwater ²	High
BCD Alternative	Moreno and Sweetwater	High
<u>BCD South Alternative</u>	<u>Moreno</u>	<u>High</u>
Route D Alternative	Upper San Diego River and Sweetwater	High
Modified Route D Alternative	Pine Creek and Sweetwater	High
CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative	Upper San Diego River	High

¹ The Forest Plan delineates all lands within the Forest as a series of geographic units described as ‘Places.’ There are 11 ‘Places’ identified for the Cleveland National Forest. Each ‘Place’ has its own landscape character as well as a theme, setting, desired condition, and program emphasis.

² Includes the West Buckman Spring Option and Buckman Springs Underground Option for which the ‘Place’ for both is Moreno only.

As presented in Table D.17-2, the Interstate 8, BCD, Route D, Modified Route D, and CNF Existing 69 kV Route alternatives would traverse Forest Service lands designated as having a ‘high’ Scenic Integrity Objective. As a result, the Forest Service plan would need to be amended to address any of these alternatives.

Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail

The Cleveland National Forest Plan states the following standard with respect to the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail:

CNF S12 – Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail – Protect scenic values in accordance with adopted Scenic Integrity Objectives. Protect foreground views from the footpath as well as designated viewpoints. Where practicable avoid establishing unconforming land uses within the viewshed of the trail (Moreno, Laguna, Aguanga Places).

As presented in Sections E.1.1-~~2-1~~ and E.~~2.11-2-2~~, both the Interstate 8 Alternative, West Buckman Springs Option, and BCD Alternative would be visible from the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail. Both these alternatives would traverse the Moreno Place, with a designated Scenic Integrity Objective of ‘high’ (see Table D.17-2). The Moreno Place is maintained as a natural appearing landscape that can be viewed from the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail and Interstate 8. The noted alternatives would introduce prominent built structures with substantial industrial character into a predominantly natural landscape. As a result, amendment of the Forest Plan would be required for these alternatives.

The Interstate 8 Alternative would cross the Pacific Crest Trail at the approximate location that the Trail proceeds underground to cross Interstate 8. As a result, the scenic value of the Trail at the Interstate 8 Alternative crossing has already been degraded by Interstate 8. The Modified D Alternative would also cross the Pacific Crest Trail, but at this location the Trail is on private land.

Forest Plan Land Use Zones

The Cleveland National Forest land-use zones for the alternative corridors include the following. Table D.17-3 provides a summary of land-use zones for each alternative.

Table D.17-3. Alternative USFS Land Use Zones (Total Miles)¹

Route Alternative	USFS Land Use Zone				Total Miles in Forest
	BCNM	BC	BCMUR	DAI	
Interstate 8 Alternative ²	5.7	4.7	2.7	2.8	15.9
BCD Alternative (original)	4.1	2.2	0.6	0	6.9
BCD Alternative Revision	0	1.3	0.25	0	1.55
BCD South Option Revision	0	5.5	0	0	5.5
Route D Alternative	6.0	2.5	3.1	2.4	14
Modified Route D Alternative	0	2.5	8.3	5.9	16.7
Modified Route D Alternative with all Revisions (Cameron, PCT Route Option A, Western Route Revisions)	0	1.6	6.8	3.9	12.3
Star Valley Option Revision	0	0	1.0	0.6	1.6
CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative	0	0	0	0.5	0.5

¹ With the exception of the CNF Alternative, each alternative crosses an intermittent array of USFS land use zones. Total miles presented are for the combined miles for each land use zone along the length of each alternative.

² The Interstate 8 Alternative West Buckman Springs Option and Buckman Springs Underground Option primarily traverse land use zone BC, whereas the Interstate 8 Alternative between MP 53.6 to 58 traverses primarily BCNM and 0.75 miles of BC.

- Back Country, Non Motorized (BCNM):** The BCNM zone includes areas that are undeveloped with few, if any, roads. Developed facilities supporting dispersed recreation activities are minimal and generally limited to trails and signage. The level of human use and infrastructure is low. This zone is managed for a range of non-motorized uses that include mechanized, equestrian, and pedestrian public access. Administrative access, usually for community protection, is allowed by exception for emergency situations and for short duration management purposes, such as fuel treatment. The intent is to use temporary routes while management is occurring and then close or remove the route. Access to authorized facilities and to private land is not anticipated, but may occur by exception when there are existing rights to such access. Except for trails, facility construction is generally not allowed, but may occur in remote locations where road access is not needed for maintenance. Temporary facilities are expected to be removed when they are no longer needed. Major utility corridors and roads are not suitable within this land use zone.
- Back Country (BC):** The BC zone includes areas that are undeveloped, with few roads. The level of human use and infrastructure is generally low to moderate. The zone is managed for motorized public access on designated roads and trails. A network of low standard Back Country roads provide access for a wide variety of dispersed recreation opportunities in remote areas, and some new trails may be constructed to improve opportunities between trails on the existing system. Although this zone generally allows a broad range of uses, the management intent is to retain the natural character inherent in the zone and limit the level and type of development. USFS managers expect to manage the zone for no increase or a very low level of increase in the national forest road system in this zone. Major utility corridors are permitted in designated areas within this land-use zone, and roads are suitable within this zone.
- Back Country, Motorized Use Restricted (BCMUR):** Like the BC zone, the BCMUR zone includes areas that are undeveloped, with few roads. Few facilities are found in this zone, and the level of human use and infrastructure is low to moderate. The zone is managed for non-motorized (mech-

anized, equestrian, and pedestrian) access. The zone allows for a range of low intensity land uses, and the management intent is to retain the natural character of the zone and limit the level and type of development. Some roads may be constructed and maintained, but the intent is to manage the zone for no increase or a very low level of increase in road system development. Major utility corridors are permitted in designated areas within this land-use zone, and roads are suitable for authorized use within this zone.

- **Developed Area Interface (DAI):** the DAI land-use zone includes areas adjacent to communities or concentrated developed areas with more scattered or isolated community infrastructure. the level of human use and infrastructure is typically higher than in other zones. Major utility corridors are permitted in designated areas within this land-use zone, and roads are suitable for authorized use within this zone.

As previously presented, major utility corridors and roads are permitted within the BC, BCMUR, and DAI land use zones; whereas, major utility corridors and roads are not considered suitable within the BCNM land-use zone. With the exception of the Modified Route D Alternative and CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative, all other route alternatives traversing the Cleveland National Forest would traverse BCNM lands for a total distance ranging from 4.1 to 5.7 miles. Plan amendments would be required for those alternatives crossing the BCNM land use zone.