

SX-PQ Transmission Line Traffic Study

Response to Comments

#	Comment Type	Comment	KOA's Response - February 4th, 2016
1	Conceptual	It does not appear that laydown yard #2 (West of Camino Ruiz) is feasible due to a riparian corridor. Additional information is needed to understand how this entry point is used.	Based on review of the area surrounding this laydown yard location, we agree with the issues raised with this comment and are <u>removing</u> this laydown yard as an option and from the analysis. The remaining laydown yards have been renumbered to account for the removal of laydown yard #2.
2	Conceptual	The daily trips appear to be taken from the Draft EIR for Proposed Project Segment A which is an overhead alignment. The current alignment calls for an underground alignment so the assumptions found in Table 1 concerning daily trips are in need of revision.	We agree with the comment raised and have updated Table 1 to reflect the equipment likely to be used, the activities that are expected to be completed, and the corresponding daily trips as a result of these activities.
3	Conceptual	Please provide justification for the PCE values shown in Table 1 .	The PCE values shown in Table 1 are taken from two sources, the previous Draft EIR contained a PCE factor for large semi trucks (3.0), which is used for vehicles with 4 or more axles. For vehicles with 3 axles, we used a PCE factor from Exhibit 11-10 in the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual. We have updated the references footnote to be more specific where these values came from.
4	Conceptual	Check and provide justification the PCE Subtotal per Day shown in Table 1 as the CPUC's consultant team calculated different values.	The PCE Subtotal per Day value was calculated using the formula now shown in the new Table 1 footnote. The PCE factors were obtained from the previous Draft EIR and the Highway Capacity Manual. The assumptions concerning the number of trips to and from the yard and job site were conservative, assuming a maximum number of trips for a total of 3 crews working on the job site.
5	Text	Under Table 2 , Mira Mesa Boulevard: Black Mountain Road to I-15, has 6 lanes, not 4.	Table 2 has been updated to reflect the correct number of lanes and the correct classification.
6	Text	The "Lanes/Class" for Carroll Canyon Road: Black Mountain Road to I-15 is not consistently identified under Table 2 or Table 3 and the Appendices. Please Revise	Table 3 has been revised to have this segment's "Lanes / Class" to be "4C"
7	Text	Check for consistency throughout the document for "Lanes/Class" of each roadway segment.	We have edited and verified that the "Lanes/Class" for each roadway segment is consistent between each table and through the appendices.
8	Text	The Mira Mesa Boulevard and Miramar Road: Black Mountain Road to I-15 should be identified as a "Primary Arterial" rather than a "Major Arterial"	We agree with this comment and have changed the classification to read "Primary Arterial"
9	Text	In attachment 2, revise the 6 lane Freeway LOS for C,D, and E under the City of San Diego Roadway Capacity Standards Table.	We have corrected the error in Attachment 2 and have edited the entire table to be consistent with the City of San Diego Roadway Capacity Standards Table.
10	Text	Revise the Street Classification of "Prime Arterial" to "Primary Arterial"	This request has been completed and is now consistent with the City of San Diego Roadway Capacity Standards Table.