

## 4. Other Modifications to the Draft EIR/EIS

After publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, changes in the impact analysis have been made in a few areas where new or more severe significant impacts have been identified. This has occurred in three areas:

- Cultural resources in the Central Link of the Proposed Project, along the Campo North Option, and in the Interstate 8 Alternative (underground segment in Alpine Boulevard).
- The analysis of the San Diego Community Power Project (SDCPP, or ENPEX) was a part of the New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative and two potential sites were identified in a feasibility study. In the Draft EIR/EIS, the visual and biological resources analyses did not consider both sites, so analysis is added for these sites where there is the potential for more severe significant and unmitigable (Class I) impacts.
- Expansion of temporary workspace required for the Interstate 8 Alternative between the Imperial Valley Substation (MP I8-0) and the BCD Alternative (MP I8-40).

This section presents modifications to impact analysis for these subjects.

### 4.1 Revisions to Cultural Resources Impact Analysis

The analysis of cultural resources has changed in three areas; these areas are described in Sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 below.

#### 4.1.1 Proposed Project: Central Link

***Impact C-2: Construction of the project would cause an adverse change to sites known to contain human remains (Class I)***

A comment from SDG&E provided new information about cultural resources in the Central Link of the Proposed Project. This information indicated that a new significant and unmitigable (Class I) impact to human remains (CA-SDI-17,285) would occur within the Central Link. Therefore, revised discussion of this impact is included in this Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. Impact C-2 (Construction of the project would cause an adverse change to sites known to contain human remains) was not addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS for the Central Link because no impact was found. Based on new information provided in comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, this impact has been revised to be significant and unmitigable (Class I) within the Central Link. Impact C-2 was found to be significant and unmitigable in the Imperial Valley, Anza-Borrego, and Inland Valley Links in the Draft EIR/EIS.

A total of 49 known cultural resources were identified within the 200- to 300-foot-wide survey corridor for the Central Link of the Proposed Project or within the proposed Central East Substation property. Thirty-nine (39) of these resources are prehistoric in age and are dominated by evidence of past bedrock milling activities. Two of these, CA-SDI-12,447 and CA-SDI-17,285, have been documented as habitation sites. One of these, CA-SDI-17,285, is a major village site, with known human cremations, and is presumed to be eligible for the NRHP. Site CA-SDI-17,285 was listed in Table Ap.9B-4 in Appendix 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS, but at the time of publication of the Draft EIR/EIS it was not known to contain human remains.

The text in Section D.7.11 of the Draft EIR/EIS will change in the Final EIR/EIS to reflect the information presented herein, updating the description of CA-SDI-17,285 to include information about human cremations at the site, and to discuss potential adverse effects on it from construction of the Proposed Project.

Any adverse effect to human remains is considered significant (Class I). CR-APM-3 outlines procedures for the treatment of unanticipated discoveries during construction, but it would not mitigate construction impacts to Native American human remains. Mitigation Measures C-1b, C-1c, C-1d, C-1e, C-1f, and C-2a (see Section 2.7 for the full text of the measures) would partially mitigate impacts to human remains; however, the impacts would still be considered significant and unmitigable (Class I). Impacts to Native American human remains are considered an adverse effect, even after mitigation (36 CFR 800).

*Mitigation Measures for Impact C-2: Construction of the project would cause an adverse change to sites known to contain human remains*

- C-1b**      **Avoid and protect potentially significant resources.**
- C-1c**      **Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan.**
- C-1d**      **Conduct data recovery to reduce adverse effects.**
- C-1e**      **Monitor construction at known ESAs.**
- C-1f**      **Train construction personnel.**
- C-2a**      **Properly treat human remains.**

#### 4.1.2 Interstate 8 Alternative: Campo North Option

As discussed in Section 1, the Environmentally Superior Southern Route has been modified and no longer includes the Campo North Option. The modified Environmentally Superior Southern Alternative would instead incorporate the BCD Alternative with the BCD South Option, both of which have been revised as described in Section 3.3.2. However, this revised impact analysis is presented because it is still possible for the CPUC and BLM to approve the Campo North Option, if the Campo Band removes its opposition to the Interstate 8 Alternative through its land. The information has been included in this Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, because there is the potential for a new significant and unmitigable (Class I) impact with Impact C-1 along the Campo North Option.

*Impact C-1: Construction of the project would cause an adverse change to known historic properties (Class I or Class II)*

The Campo North Option is located entirely on the Campo Indian Reservation. Because access for surveys was not granted by the Campo, the Campo North Option was not surveyed for cultural resources. However, based on the density of prehistoric and historic period resources in the vicinity, as well as the known occupation of the area, it is assumed that cultural resources would be encountered during records search and survey of the North Campo Option. These might include prehistoric artifact scatters, temporary camps, bedrock milling stations, habitation sites (possibly including human burials or cremations), or historic roads or refuse pits. Because it is anticipated that pre-construction surveys would identify archaeological sites, this discussion of Impact C-1 for project construction and operation will also be added to Section E.1.7.4 in the Final EIR/EIS.

Adverse construction impacts to historic properties would be mitigated to a less than significant level (Class II) by implementing Mitigation Measures C-1a, C-1b, C-1c, C-1d, C-1e, and C-1f (see Section 2.7 for the full text of the measures). Surveys conducted to mitigate Impact C-1 through implementation

of Mitigation Measure C-1a could identify resources, such as structures or human remains that would require additional mitigation which would be detailed as part of Mitigation Measures C-1b and C-1c. The full text of these mitigation measures is presented in Section 2. If direct impacts to human remains cannot be avoided, project effects would be significant (Class I) even with mitigation.

*Mitigation Measures for Impact C-1: Construction of the project would cause an adverse change to known historic properties*

- C-1a**      **Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in Final Area of Potential Effect.**
- C-1b**      **Avoid and protect potentially significant resources.**
- C-1c**      **Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan.**
- C-1d**      **Conduct data recovery to reduce adverse effects.**
- C-1e**      **Monitor construction.**
- C-1f**      **Train construction personnel.**

### 4.1.3 Interstate 8 Alternative – Alpine Boulevard

*Impact C-2: Construction of the project would cause an adverse change to sites known to contain human remains (No Impact, pending Viejas Band confirmation)*

In the Draft EIR/EIS, Impact C-2 for the Interstate 8 Alternative was found to be a significant and unmitigable (Class I) impact. That conclusion could be modified based on new information, as described herein. If this information is found to be acceptable by the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, the entire the Star Valley Option (MP SV0 to SV-3) would no longer be included as part of the Environmentally Superior Southern Route.

The Star Valley Option was originally proposed to bypass a portion of the Interstate 8 Alternative that appeared to cross a Native American village site (CA-SDI-6706), containing a complex of habitation and resource processing areas including a prehistoric cemetery. The original assessment indicated that construction of the Interstate 8 Alternative could directly impact human remains, a significant, unmitigable (Class I) impact. Analysis of potential impacts to this resource conducted for the Draft EIR/DEIS was predicated largely on information provided by archaeologists who had observed and recorded the site during studies on the Viejas Reservation, north of Interstate 8. Formal documentation of the site and its specific components was unavailable through the California Historical Resources Inventory System (CHRIS — the standard data bank for archaeological resources) because of restrictions on disseminating information about resources on Tribal lands. The only documents provided by the CHRIS showed that a site boundary for CA-SDI-6706 extended south of the Reservation, south of Interstate 8, and across Alpine Boulevard — the proposed location of underground installation of transmission lines for the Interstate 8 Alternative. No specific information was available about the configuration of the habitation areas or the cemetery, and whether those elements of the site extended south of Interstate 8 and into Alpine Boulevard. Therefore, given all available data at the time, the Draft EIR/DEIS cautiously concluded that the Interstate 8 Alternative would have an unmitigable adverse effect on Native American human remains.

Research conducted by the CPUC/BLM after the public distribution of the Draft EIR/DEIS demonstrates that site CA-SDI-6706 does not extend south of Interstate 8 and into Alpine Boulevard. Although the site has been known to archaeologists since the late 1970s, there is no evidence that there have ever been any artifacts or site deposits found off the Reservation, south of Interstate 8. There has been only one study that investigated whether site deposits extend beyond the southern Reservation boundary, south of Interstate 8; a report of this study had not been filed at the CHRIS. Extensive test excavations

were completed in this vicinity in 2001, within Alpine Boulevard prior to installation of underground fiber optics lines by Level 3. No site deposits were found. In fact, this portion of Alpine Boulevard has been excavated into decomposing granite (TRC, 2001). Thus, if this information is confirmed with the Viejas Band, the original Interstate 8 Alternative proposal to underground within Alpine Boulevard would have no impact on this very important village site.

## 4.2 Revision to In-Basin Renewable Generation Alternative (SDCPP Component)

The intent of the analysis of the SDCPP, as a component of the In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative, is to provide the public and decisionmakers with information on the type, size, and location of potential projects that could make up this alternative. If the New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative is approved, each component of the alternative would require full analysis under CEQA and/or NEPA prior to their construction. ENPEX would need to submit an application and receive approval for the SDCPP from both the California Energy Commission (CEC) and MCAS Miramar. These agencies would conduct a thorough environmental evaluation of the project.

Draft EIR/EIS Section E.6.1.4 describes the SDCPP, and explains that two potential power plant sites were identified in a 2006 Siting and Feasibility Study: Site 1D and Site 1B/1C. These two sites are illustrated in Figure E.6.1-3 of the Draft EIR/EIS and on Figure 4-1 in this section. The two sites are separated by only about 1,000 feet, so the impact analysis in nearly all environmental disciplines is not affected by whether Site 1D or Site 1B/1C is considered. However, in the Draft EIR/EIS the impact analysis in two disciplines, Biological Resources and Visual Resources, addressed different sites. The analysis for Biological Resources (Draft EIR/EIS Section E.6.2, starting on page E.6-48) addressed impacts of Site 1D, and analysis in Visual Resources (Draft EIR/EIS Section E.6.3, starting on page E.6-79) addressed impacts of Site 1B/1C. As a result, Site 1D did not include a visual resource analysis and Site 1B/1C did not include a biological assessment. Because both sites are considered to be feasible in the study prepared by MCAS Miramar, the discussion herein clarifies impact assessment in these two resource areas for the two sites.

Figure 4-1. New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative, San Diego Community Power Project  
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

*This page intentionally blank.*

## 4.2.1 Biological Resources

Site 1D was evaluated for the effects of the SDCPP on biological resources in the Draft EIR/EIS (Section E.6.2, starting on page E.6-48). The following impacts are identified:

- Impact B-1: Construction activities would result in temporary and permanent losses of native vegetation (Class II and III)
- Impact B-2: Construction activities would result in adverse effects to jurisdictional waters and wetlands through vegetation removal, placement of fill, erosion, sedimentation, and degradation of water quality (Class II)
- Impact B-3: Construction and operation/maintenance activities would result in the introduction of invasive, non-native, or noxious plant species (Class II)
- Impact B-4: Construction activities would create dust that may result in degradation of vegetation (Class II)
- Impact B-5: Construction activities would result in direct or indirect loss of listed or sensitive plants or a direct loss of habitat for listed or sensitive plants (Class I)
- Impact B-6: Construction activities, including the use of access roads, would result in disturbance to wildlife and would result in wildlife mortality (Class III)
- Impact B-7: Direct or indirect loss of listed or sensitive wildlife, or a direct loss of habitat for listed or sensitive wildlife (Class I for listed species; Class II for non-listed sensitive species)
- Impact B-8: Construction activities would result in a potential loss of nesting birds (Violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; Class II)
- Impact B-10: Presence of power plant and associated transmission lines may result in electrocution of, and/or collisions by, listed or sensitive bird species (No Impact for electrocution; Class I for collision for listed species; and Class II for collision for nonsensitive species or daytime migration)
- Impact B-15: Power plant operation and maintenance activities would result in disturbance to wildlife and could result in wildlife mortality (Class II)

All of the impacts above would also apply to Site 1B/1C, and no additional analysis is required for these impacts at that site. However, comments on the Draft EIR/EIS provided new information on potential effects at this site. The City of Santee and the Padre Dam Municipal Water District commented that the impact analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS did not consider effects on a proposed wildlife corridor. The wildlife corridor was not addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS because it is described only in preliminary (unpublished) documents. However, due to the importance of this corridor in regional planning efforts, this concern is addressed in Impact B-9.

***Impact B-9: Adverse effects to linkages or wildlife movement corridors, the movement of fish, and/or native wildlife nursery sites (Class I, Class III)***

**Site 1B/1C.** The Draft City of Santee MSCP Subarea Plan identifies a 300-foot wildlife corridor connecting Santee open space on the Fanita Ranch project, east of MCAS Miramar, with open space on MCAS Miramar. The configuration of the open space on Fanita Ranch requires placement of a wildlife corridor in a specific area, requiring the wildlife crossing in the area of the existing Padre Dam MWD oxidation pond. Site 1B/1C would be immediately west of the pond. Therefore, the SDCPP located at Site 1B/1C would be in the path of the wildlife corridor, so would likely impede wildlife movement and

create a significant impact (Class I). If this project is developed, it would be important for SDCPP developers to work with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and local agencies to select a specific area for the plant within the Site 1B/1C boundaries that minimizes the direct effect on wildlife movement. Therefore, Mitigation Measure B-9b (Design power plant to accommodate wildlife corridor) is presented. However, the impact would remain significant (Class I) if this site is developed.

*Mitigation Measure for Impact B-9: Adverse effects to linkages or wildlife movement corridors, the movement of fish, and/or native wildlife nursery sites*

**B-9b Design power plant to accommodate wildlife corridor.** The SDCPP, if constructed at Site 1B/1C, shall be designed based on coordination with wildlife agencies, City of Santee and Padre Dam Municipal Water District in order to minimize effects on the wildlife corridor proposed in the draft City of Santee MSCP Subarea Plan, and shall accommodate the proposed wildlife corridor passing north of the site.

**Site 1D.** This site is located southwest of Site 1B/1C, and south of Sycamore Canyon. A power plant at this site would have minimal effect on the wildlife corridor because no barriers to movement would be created (Class III).

## 4.2.2 Visual Resources

The discussion of construction impacts in Section E.6.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS is not affected by the selection of Site 1D versus Site 1B/1C. Those impacts are:

- Impact V-1: Short-term visibility of construction activities, equipment, and night lighting (Class II)
- Impact V-2: Long-term visibility of land scars and vegetation clearance in arid and semi-arid landscapes (Class II)

*Impact V-NW12: Increased structure contrast, industrial character, view blockage, and skylining (Class I)*

**Site 1B/1C.** The visual resources analysis of the SDCPP/ENPEX in Section E.6.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS evaluated Site 1B/1C, and presented a photosimulation of the SDCPP at that location (Figure E.6.3-4B).

Site 1B/1C is adjacent to recreation areas: the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve area of the Padre Dam Municipal Water District, including its new RV campground. While there are no residential, commercial, or agricultural land uses immediately adjacent to Site 1B/1C, the City of Santee has approved the development of 1,380 homes on land east of the ENPEX/SDCPP site (the Fanita Ranch development). Site 1B/1C would be highly visible from residences at the north end of Strathmore Drive to the east of the site and the camping area at the north end of Santee Lakes to the immediate south of the site.

One key viewpoint (No. 74) was selected for detailed evaluation of the SDCPP/ENPEX site in the Draft EIR/EIS. Key Viewpoint (KVP) 74 was established at the north end of Strathmore Drive in the vicinity of existing residences. The view is to the west. Figure 4-1 shows the location of KVP-74. Due to the visibility of the power plant from residential and recreational areas, the Draft EIR/EIS identified a significant and unmitigable (Class I) visual impact from Key Viewpoint 74 due to the presence of the plant during its operation. Although there is no mitigation available to reduce the visual impact to a level that would be less than significant, Mitigation Measures V-3a, V-NW9a, V-NW9b, V-NW12a, and V-NW12b were recommended in the Draft EIR/EIS to reduce the visual impacts of the SDCPP facility to the extent possible at Site 1B/1C.

*Mitigation Measures for Impact V-NW12: Increased structure contrast, industrial character, view blockage, and skylining*

- V-3a Reduce visual contrast of towers and conductors.** The following design measures shall be applied to all new structure locations, conductors, and re-conducted spans, in order to reduce the degree of visual contrast caused by the new facilities:
- All new conductors and re-conducted spans are to be non-specular in design in order to reduce conductor visibility and visual contrast.
  - No new access roads shall be constructed such that they directly approach existing or proposed towers in a straight line from locations immediately downhill of the structures.
- V-NW9a Develop and implement architectural treatment for the power plant.** A public input process shall be used to determine specific architectural treatments recommended by the community and local decisionmakers, and the power plant shall incorporate the treatments.
- V-NW9b Develop and implement a Landscape Concept Plan.** A Landscape Concept Plan shall be developed by the Applicant at least 60 days before the start of construction. Plant material shall include use native materials, and non-native plant material where appropriate and necessary (only if non-native materials are considered essential by the Applicant, and approved by the agencies with jurisdiction), to blend and screen elements of the power plant.
- V-NW12a Site the power plant to take advantage of topography for screening.** The power plant infrastructure shall be arranged on the site in such a way as to make maximum use of the visual screening afforded by site topography. Specifically, the power plant and cooling towers will be located in the western portion of Site 1B/1C.
- V-NW12b Reduce visual plumes from power plant.** The power plant shall be operated to minimize visible plumes according to the following plume abatement standards: no plume of any height shall be visible above the top of a HRSG stack at any time; no visible plume from the evaporative cooling tower shall extend more than 20 feet above the top of the cooling tower at any time; and no plume from the evaporative cooling tower shall be visible for more than 1.0 hour during any 24-hour period.

**Site 1D.** As stated above, the construction impacts would be the same for Site 1D as described in the Draft EIR/EIS for Site 1B/1C. Site D would be located further from the Santee Lakes Recreation Preserve area and from residences. However, its operational impact would be greater because it would be located higher on the hillside and in a more prominent viewshed from residences and recreation areas to the east. The major difference between Sites 1D and 1B/1C is that Mitigation Measure V-NW12a (Site the power plant to take advantage of topography for screening) recommended for implementation at Site 1B/1C would not be effective at Site 1D due to its topography. While Site 1D would be farther from residences, its location on a hillside makes it impossible to screen the power plant facilities using the site's topography as is described in Mitigation Measure V-NW12a. The significant operational visual impact of the power plant would be greater at Site 1D, though still significant and unmitigable (Class I).

### 4.3 Expanded Workspace for Interstate 8 Alternative

SDG&E notified the CPUC and BLM in late June 2008 that based on further engineering studies related to construction methods, it would require expanded workspace adjacent to each tower in the eastern portion of the Interstate 8 Alternative. The request defined the use of temporary pads measuring 200 feet in width by 400-feet in length (all within the proposed 200 feet of right-of-way), rather than the originally proposed 100 by 100-foot construction pads. This change in disturbance would be required for each tower site located along the east end of the I-8 Alternative, specifically, from MP I8-0 to I8-22 and I8-30 to I8-40. SDG&E requested this larger temporary work space in order to have adequate space during construction of each transmission structure.

#### 4.3.1 Biological Resources

The impacts of these larger workspaces would occur primarily to habitat for plants and animals. Table 4-1 presents the acreage of impact in various habitat types. The result of using larger workspaces would increase the severity of impacts already identified in the Draft EIR/EIS, but no change in impact classification would occur. The following impacts would be made more severe:

- Impact B-1 – Impacts to sensitive vegetation (Class I). Mitigation requirements would be larger for this increase in temporary impacts. SDG&E suggested that some impacts to vegetation and other habitat may be mitigated by placing construction mats over the ground. As a result, Mitigation Measure B-1a (Provide restoration/compensation for affected sensitive vegetation communities) has been modified to add the following language (new text is underlined):

**B-1a**      **Provide restoration/compensation for affected sensitive vegetation communities.** Surface-disturbing components of the project shall be located in previously disturbed areas or where habitat quality is poor to the extent possible, and disturbance of vegetation and soils shall be minimized. Temporary construction mats may be used in areas to minimize habitat and soil disturbance only where deemed appropriate by the monitoring biologist (see Mitigation Measure B-1c). The construction mats shall not be left on the ground for more than 3 weeks. Use of the construction mats would be considered a temporary impact to vegetation and shall be mitigated in accordance with the temporary impacts described in this mitigation measure.

- Impact B-2 – Impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands (Class II). Mitigation requirements would increase if additional impacts occur to jurisdictional features (Note: a jurisdictional delineation has not been completed for any alternatives; this would be done after an alternative is selected by the CPUC and BLM).
- Impact B-5 – Impacts to sensitive plant species (Class I). Mitigation requirements would increase if temporary impacts would occur to additional sensitive plants.
- Impact B-7A – Flat-tailed horned lizard (FTHL; Class I). FTHL Management Area occurs between MP I8-0.0 and I8-7.0. The mitigation ratio for temporary impacts is 3.5:1. FTHL habitat outside of the Management Area occurs between MP I8-7.0 and I8-23.0. The mitigation ration for temporary impacts outside of the Management Area is 1:1.
- Impact B-7B – Peninsular bighorn sheep (PBS; Class I). Temporary impacts would occur to PBS critical habitat between I8-15.8 to I8-17.9 and between I8-22.8 to I8-30.4. Impacts must be mitigated at 3:1 ratio.

Table 4-1. Impacts to Vegetation Communities

Vegetation Communities	200x400 foot pads			100x100 foot pads		
	Section 10B (acres)	Section 9C (acres)	Total Acres	Section 10B (acres)	Section 9C (acres)	Total Acres
<b>Non-Native Vegetation, Developed Areas, and Disturbed Habitat</b>						
Developed	0.38	0.58	0.96	0	0	0
Disturbed habitat	4.12	2.16	6.28	0.54	0.28	0.82
Extensive agriculture – field/pasture, row crops	0.00	1.94	1.94	0.00	0.23	0.23
Unvegetated habitat-badlands	22.77	0.00	22.77	3.01	0.00	3.01
Unvegetated habitat-badlands – disturbed	1.83	0.00	1.83	0.23	0.00	0.23
Unvegetated habitat-desert pavement	23.54	0.00	23.54	2.97	0.00	2.97
Unvegetated habitat-desert pavement – disturbed	2.32	0.00	2.32	0.24	0.00	0.24
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>54.96</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>59.64</b>	<b>6.99</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>7.5</b>
<b>Desert Scrub and Dune Habitats</b>						
Desert saltbush scrub	0.00	1.27	1.27	0.00	0.20	0.20
Sonoran creosote bush scrub	63.06	3.00	66.06	7.68	0.45	8.13
Sonoran creosote bush scrub – open	0.36	0.00	0.36	0	0	0
Sonoran creosote bush scrub – disturbed	5.82	0.00	5.82	0.84	0.00	0.84
Sonoran desert mixed scrub	0.00	2.65	2.65	0.00	0.26	0.26
Sonoran desert scrub	3.13	0.00	3.13	0.25	0.00	0.25
Sonoran mixed woody and succulent scrub	0.12	5.58	5.70	0.00	0.69	0.69
Sonoran mixed woody scrub	0.90	10.79	11.69	0.17	1.42	1.59
Sonoran mixed woody scrub – disturbed	1.59	0.00	1.59	0.22	0.00	0.22
Sonoran wash scrub	3.20	0.00	3.20	0.58	0.00	0.58
Stabilized and partially stabilized desert sand dunes – disturbed	1.84	0.00	1.84	0.23	0.00	0.23
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>80.02</b>	<b>23.29</b>	<b>103.31</b>	<b>9.97</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>12.99</b>
<b>Coastal and Montane Scrub Habitats</b>						
Big sagebrush scrub	0.00	0.33	0.33	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Grasslands and Meadows</b>						
Non-native grassland	0.00	0.36	0.36	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Chaparrals</b>						
Northern mixed chaparral	2.61	7.63	10.24	0.31	0.97	1.28
Red shank chaparral	0.00	4.21	4.21	0.00	0.46	0.46
Semi-desert chaparral	0.00	25.73	25.73	0.00	3.44	3.44
Semi-desert chaparral – disturbed	0.00	0.08	0.08	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>37.65</b>	<b>40.26</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>4.87</b>	<b>5.18</b>
<b>Woodlands and Forests</b>						
Coast live oak woodland	0.00	0.02	0.02	0	0	0
Peninsular juniper woodland and scrub	0.00	3.65	3.65	0.00	0.37	0.37
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.37</b>
<b>Riparian Scrubs</b>						
Mesquite bosque	0.65	0.00	0.65	0.03	0.00	0.03
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.03</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>138.24</b>	<b>69.98</b>	<b>208.22</b>	<b>17.30</b>	<b>8.77</b>	<b>26.07</b>

Source: SDG&E (June 26, 2008)

- Impact B-7J – Quino checkerspot butterfly (Class I). Temporary impacts to critical habitat (and occupied habitat) mitigated at 2:1 ratio. Critical habitat occurs between approximately between I8-34.3 and I8-38.5.
- Impact B-7O – Barefoot banded gecko (Class I). The species was assumed to be present between MP I8-23 and I8-39, so the expanded work areas would occur in gecko habitat between MP I8-23 and I8-30 where this species would face greater impacts. No specific mitigation measures were developed for this species because it is difficult to know where this cryptic species actually occurs. As a result, required mitigation is tied to restoration of sensitive vegetation communities and jurisdictional habitat.

#### 4.3.2 Cultural Resources

Because the larger workspaces would be located entirely within the 200-foot ROW, cultural resources impacts have already been defined based on completed surveys (see Draft EIR/EIS Section E.1.7). With the implementation of mitigation measures required for cultural resources there would be no change to the level of impact defined in the Draft EIR/EIS.

#### 4.4 References

TRC Mariah Associates, Inc. 2001. Final Cultural Resources Report Results of Site Testing at Site CA-SDI-6706. Level 3 Communications Long Haul Fiber Optics Project Segment WD04 San Diego to Yuma. Report submitted to Kiewit Western, Lakeside, CA.