

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

Access Roads		
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
1. Although the holder may restore and maintain existing access roads, they cannot be either widened or upgraded without approval of the Authorized Officer.		
2. New access road construction will be kept to a minimum.		
Geology		
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
1. The line will be located to minimize the disruption of any active mining operations.	G-1. The line will be located to minimize the disruption of any active mining operations.	<u>There may be some disruption where the proposed line crosses Granite Construction north of Palm Springs.</u>
2. <u>Individual</u> transmission towers will not be sited on nor straddle the mapped traces of any known fault that has been designated active or potentially active (see Figure 4.2-1 in the CPUC Draft EIR). In areas where known faults are present, the Holders Geologist will visually check the tower site area before clearing, and will check the tower footing holes for any trace of a previously unmapped fault. If manifestations of a fault are found, construction will immediately stop at that site and the holder will consult with the <u>Holders Geologist and the</u> BLM Authorized Officer. The <u>Holders Geologist and the</u> BLM Authorized Officer will determine if it is a fault trace and if so, will ascertain if it is active, potentially active, or inactive.	G-2. <u>Individual</u> transmission towers will not be sited on nor straddle the mapped traces of any known fault that has been designated active or potentially active. In areas where known faults are present, the Holders Geologist will visually check the tower site area before clearing, and will check the tower footing holes for any trace of a previously unmapped fault. If manifestations of a fault are found, construction will immediately stop at that site and the Holder will consult with <u>the Holders Geologist and the</u> BLM Authorized Officer. The <u>Holders Geologist and the</u> BLM Authorized Officer will determine if it is a fault trace and if so, will ascertain if it is active, potentially active, or inactive.	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>
3. Towers will be located so that the line will span the surface traces of active and potentially active faults such that a relative lateral surface displacement would shorten the span between towers and thus avoid potential line breaks. Where this is not feasible, the holder will incorporate slack spans to bridge the fault(s) such that the projected lateral surface displacement, as <u>forecast by the Holder's Geologist and</u> accepted by the BLM Authorized Officer, will not structurally affect the associated towers.	G-3. Towers will be located so that the line will span the surface traces of active and potentially active faults such that a relative lateral surface displacement would shorten the span between towers, and thus avoid potential line breaks. Where this is not feasible, the Holder will incorporate slack spans to bridge the fault(s) such that the projected lateral surface displacement, as <u>forecast by the Holder's Geologist and</u> accepted by the BLM Authorized Officer, will not structurally affect the associated towers.	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>

←E2-1

←E2-2

←E2-3

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>4. Appropriate tower design will be used to mitigate the potential for very strong seismic ground shaking. In general, an appropriate tower design which accounts for lateral wind loads and conductor loads <u>during line stringing will</u> exceed any credible seismic loading (ground shaking).</p>	<p>G-4. Appropriate tower design will be used to mitigate the potential for very strong seismic ground shaking. In general, an appropriate tower design which accounts for lateral wind loads and conductor loads <u>during line stringing will</u> exceed any credible seismic loading (groundshaking).</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-4</p>
<p>5. Towers will be located to avoid areas of highly sensitive dune sand (see Map 10-AZ in the Draft EIS and Figure 4.5.1. in the CPUC Draft EIR). Where these areas cannot be avoided, towers will be located to minimize disturbance to the deposits at a site approved by the BLM Authorized Officer.</p>	<p>G-5. Towers will be located to avoid areas of highly sensitive dune sand areas. Where these areas cannot be avoided, towers will be located to minimize disturbance to the deposits at a site approved by the BLM Authorized Officer. (BLM B-2.5. Note: Text here omits references to specific figures and maps in the original.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>6. Wherever feasible possible to minimize the potential for slope instability, towers will be located to avoid gullies or active drainages, and oversteepened slopes.</p>	<p>G-6. Wherever feasible possible to minimize the potential for slope instability, towers will be located to avoid gullies or active drainages, and over-steepened slopes.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-5</p>
<p>7. <u>SCE will provide a list of sites where helicopter assisted construction is recommended.</u> The Authorized Officer will require, on a site specific basis, helicopter assisted construction in sensitive areas. Sensitive areas are those that exhibit both: (1) High erosion potential and/or slope instability; and (2) A lack of existing <u>stub access</u> roads within a reasonable distance of the tower site (<u>generally no more than a quarter mile</u>) or existing access that is not suitable for upgrading to accommodate conventional tower construction or line stringing equipment, and where it is determined that after field review the issues of erosion and/or slope instability cannot be successfully mitigated through implementation of accepted engineering practices.</p>	<p>G-7. <u>SCE will provide a list of sites where helicopter construction is recommended.</u> The Authorized Officer may require, on a site-specific basis, helicopter assisted construction in sensitive areas. Sensitive areas are those that exhibit both (1) high erosion potential and/or slope instability; and (2) a lack of existing <u>stub access</u> roads within a reasonable distance of the tower site (<u>generally no more than a quarter mile</u>), or existing access that is not suitable for upgrading to accommodate conventional tower construction or line stringing equipment, and where it is determined that, after field review, the issues of erosion and/or slope instability cannot be successfully mitigated through implementation of accepted engineering practices.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-6</p>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>8. Mitigation of potentially significant impacts to the western end of the proposed transmission line due to (1) potential surface fault rupture along the Banning, Mission Creek, and Mecca Hills faults, and (2) potential for severe seismic shaking can be achieved by standard design methods listed below:</p> <p>a. <u>Individual</u> towers will be sited so as not to straddle active fault traces</p> <p>b. The alignment will be designed to cross an active fault such that future rupture on the fault would not cause excessive stress on the line or the towers</p> <p>c. Standard foundation and structural design measures will be utilized to minimize the impact from severe seismic shaking</p>	<p>G-8. Mitigation of potentially significant impacts to the western end of the proposed transmission line due to (1) potential surface fault rupture along the Banning, Mission Creek, and Mecca Hills faults, and (2) potential for severe seismic shaking can be achieved by standard design methods listed below:</p> <p>a. <u>Individual</u> towers will be sited so as not to straddle active fault traces.</p> <p>b. The alignment will be designed to cross an active fault such that future rupture on the fault would not cause excessive stress on the line or the towers.</p> <p>c. Standard foundation and structural design measures will be utilized to minimize the impact from severe seismic shaking.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-7</p>
<p>9. Appropriate design of tower foundations will be used to reduce the potential for settlement and compaction.</p>	<p>G-9. Appropriate design of tower foundations will be used to reduce the potential for settlement and compaction.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>EIR/EIS</p>	<p>Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures</p>	<p>Comment</p>	
<p>G-1a. Protect desert pavement <u>to the extent feasible.</u></p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-8</p>
<p>G-2a. Conduct geotechnical studies for soils <u>to assess characteristics and design foundations appropriately.</u></p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-9</p>
<p>G-3a. Conduct geotechnical surveys for landslides.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>G-5a. <u>Design</u> project facilities <u>to avoid impact</u> from ground failure.</p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-10</p>
<p>G-6a. Coordinate with quarry operations.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>G-7a. Minimize project structures within active fault zones.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

Soils		
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
Mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts on soil resources are:		
1. New access roads and soil disturbance will be avoided or minimized in all areas designated as having high erosion hazards or potential slope instability (see Map 9-AZ, Appendix F in the Draft EIS; and Figures 4.2-1 and 4.3-1 in the Devers-Palo Verde #2 EIR). If the Authorized Officer, after consultation and review of alternatives (including helicopter or helicopter assisted construction) deems the proposed new access road feasible, design plans must be submitted for approval, in writing, prior to construction.	G-10. New access roads and soil disturbance will be avoided or minimized in all areas designated as having high erosion hazards or potential slope instability. If the Authorized Officer, after consultation and review of alternatives (including helicopter or helicopter assisted construction), deems the proposed new access road feasible, design plans must be submitted for approval, in writing, prior to construction.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
2. New access roads which are required will be designed to minimize ground disturbance from grading. They will follow natural ground contours as closely as possible and include specific features for road drainage, including water bars on slopes over 25 percent. Other measures could include drainage dips, side ditches, slope drains, and velocity reducers. Where temporary crossings are constructed, the crossings will be restored and repaired as soon after completion of the discrete action associated with construction of the line in the area as possible.	G-11. New access roads, which are required, will be designed to minimize ground disturbance from grading. They will follow natural ground contours as closely as possible and include specific features for road drainage, including water bars on slopes over 25 percent. Other measures could include drainage dips, side ditches, slope drains, and velocity reducers. Where temporary crossings are constructed, the crossings will be restored and repaired as soon as possible after completion of the discrete action associated with construction of the line in the area.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
3. Side casting of soil during grading will be minimized. Excess soil and excavated soil will be properly stabilized or, if necessary, end hauled to an approved disposal site dispersed around tower construction sites or on stub or access roads.	G-12. Side casting of soil during grading will be minimized. Excess soil and excavated soil will be properly stabilized or, if necessary, end hauled to an approved disposal site dispersed around tower construction sites or on stub or access roads.	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u> ←E2-11
EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
G-1a. Protect desert pavement <u>to the extent feasible.</u>		<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u> ←E2-12
G-2a. Conduct geotechnical studies <u>for soils to assess soil characteristics and design foundations appropriately.</u>		<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u> ←E2-13
G-3a. Conduct geotechnical surveys for landslides.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>

Comment Set E2
Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
(SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

G-5a. <u>Design</u> project facilities <u>to avoid impact from</u> ground failure.		<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>	←E2-14
G-6a. Coordinate with quarry operations.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
G-7a. Minimize project structures within active fault zones.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
Hydrology			
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
1. During the first year following construction potential soil erosion sites will be inspected by the holder after each major rain storm as access permits. For the purpose of this measure, a major rain storm is defined as any singular storm where the total precipitation exceeds the arithmetic mean for similar events in the area and results in flooding. Examples include cloudburst (high quantity - short duration) or storms where saturated soils produce runoff (high quantity - long duration).		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
2. Construction equipment will be kept out of flowing stream channels except when absolutely necessary to construct crossings.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
3. Erosion control and hazardous material plans will be incorporated into the construction bidding specifications to ensure compliance.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
4. Appropriate design of tower footing foundations, such as raised foundations and/or enclosing flood control dikes, will be used to prevent scour and/or inundation by a 100-year flood.	W-4. Appropriate design of tower footing foundations, such as raised foundations and/or enclosing flood control dikes, will be used to prevent scour and/or inundation by a 100-year flood.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
5. Towers will be located <u>to the extent feasible</u> to avoid active drainage channels, especially downstream of steep hillslope areas, to minimize the potential for damage by flash flooding and mud and debris flows.	W-5. Towers will be located <u>to the extent feasible</u> to avoid active drainage channels, especially downstream of steep hillslope areas, to minimize the potential for damage by flash flooding and mud and debris flows.	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>	←E2-15
6. Diversion dikes <u>or other structural enhancements</u> will be required to divert runoff around a tower structure if: (a) the location in an active channel cannot be avoided; and (b) where there is a very significant flood scour/deposition threat, unless specifically exempted by the BLM Authorized Officer.	W-6. Diversion dikes <u>or other structural enhancements</u> will be required to divert runoff around a tower structure if (a) the location in an active channel cannot be avoided; and (b) where there is a very significant flood scour/deposition threat, unless specifically exempted by the BLM Authorized Officer.	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>	←E2-16
7. Runoff from roadways will be collected and diverted from steep, disturbed, or otherwise unstable slopes.	W-7. Runoff from roadways will be collected and diverted from steep, disturbed, or otherwise unstable slopes.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	

Comment Set E2
Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
(SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

8. Ditches and drainage concourses will be designed to handle the concentrated runoff, will be located to avoid disturbed areas, and will have energy dissipations at discharge points.	W-8. Ditches and drainage concourses will be designed to handle the concentrated runoff, will be located to avoid disturbed areas, and will have energy dissipations at discharge points.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
9. Cut and fill slopes will be minimized by a combination of benching and following natural topography where possible.	W-9. Cut and fill slopes will be minimized by a combination of benching and following natural topography where possible.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
P-1a. Develop Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan P-1b. Conduct environmental training and monitoring program. P-1c. Ensure proper disposal of construction waste. P-1d. Maintain emergency spill supplies and equipment.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
P-4a. Prepare Spill Prevention, Countermeasure, and Control Plans.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
H-6a. Design diversion dikes <u>or other site remediations</u> to avoid damage to adjacent property.		<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>
Biological Resources – Vegetation		
BLM	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
1. Avoid direct disturbance of highly sensitive features (as identified in E. Linwood Smith's (1985) Impact Assessment/Mitigation Planning Chart; see Appendix E) with spanning and careful local adjustment in tower footing placement.	B-1. Avoid direct disturbance of highly sensitive features (as identified in E. Linwood Smith's (1985) Impact Assessment/Mitigation Planning Chart; see Appendix E) with spanning and careful local adjustment in tower footing placement. (BLM B-5.1 Vegetation) [Note: The reference to Appendix E is inaccurate. There is no Appendix E as part of the BLM right-of-way grant (provided from PEA Appendix A). The Smith report is found in FSEIS (1988) as Appendix B, Study of Desert Bighorn Sheep.]	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>

←E2-17

Comment Set E2
Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
(SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>2. Provide additional detailed surveys and tower-specific adjustments as needed prior to construction for major sensitive feature sites (e.g., concentrations of sensitive plants, individual palm trees, woody dune or wash communities) which cannot be easily avoided by spanning. (See Appendix B of the Devers-Palo Verde #2 EIR and Appendix E of the SEIS.) The methodologies and results of these surveys must be submitted to and approved in writing by the BLM Authorized Officer.</p>	<p>B-8. Provide additional detailed surveys and tower-specific adjustments as needed prior to construction for major sensitive feature sites (e.g., concentrations of sensitive plants, individual palm trees, woody dune or wash communities) which cannot be easily avoided by spanning. (See Appendix B of the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 EIR [1987] and Appendix E of the SEIS [1988].) The methodologies and results of these surveys must be submitted to and approved in writing by the BLM Authorized Officer.</p>	<p><u>Additional surveys are scheduled to be performed next spring, 2007.</u></p>	<p>←E2-18</p>
<p>3. Minimize as much as practical, the area needed for equipment operation and material storage and assembly.</p>	<p>B-14. Minimize, as much as practical, the area needed for equipment operation and material storage and assembly.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined. SCE will flag work areas and will confine work activities to these areas to the greatest extent practical. SCE will use old previous material storage areas, if available. If not available, SCE will try to locate material storage in previously disturbed areas.</u></p>	<p>←E2-19</p>
<p>4. Initiate transplant efforts for <u>Ferocactus</u> and <u>Coryphantha</u> as soon as probable losses can be determined. Any plans for transplanting must be developed in consultation with a BLM botanist and approved in writing by the BLM Authorized Officer.</p>	<p>B-9. Initiate transplant efforts for <i>Ferocactus</i> and <i>Coryphantha</i> as soon as probable losses can be determined. Any plans for transplanting must be developed in consultation with a BLM botanist and approved in writing by the BLM Authorized Officer.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure. Applies to both Arizona and California? There are different requirements for Arizona vis-à-vis California where SCE may be required to buy Arizona plants of this type. See the next mitigation measure.</u></p>	<p>←E2-20</p>
<p>5. The right-of-way Holder will have the Arizona State Department of Agriculture and Horticulture identify native plants that would otherwise be destroyed by construction and sell them to the Holder.</p>	<p>B-10. The right-of-way Holder will have the Arizona State Department of Agriculture and Horticulture identify native plants that would otherwise be destroyed by construction and sell them to the Holder.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>6. The Authorized Officer may require vegetation in certain areas be cleared by hand tools. Scalping of top soil and removal of low growing vegetation will not be allowed unless authorized by the Authorized Officer.</p>	<p>B-11. The Authorized Officer may require vegetation in certain areas to be cleared by hand tools. Scalping of top soil and removal of low growing vegetation will not be allowed unless authorized by the Authorized Officer.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests information on where, and how extensive these areas are? It is difficult for us to agree to this without knowing the location and extent of these areas.</u></p>	<p>←E2-21</p>

**Comment Set E2
Southern California Edison Company**

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
(SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>7. Where possible, towers or access roads will be located so as to avoid sensitive plants or plant communities. Where this is not feasible, affected individual plants will be transplanted. Towers will also be placed so that the lines will span critical wildlife habitat.</p>	<p>B-12. Where possible, towers or access roads will be located so as to avoid sensitive plants or plant communities. Where this is not feasible, affected individual plants will be transplanted. Towers will also be placed so that lines will span critical wildlife habitat.</p>	<p><u>For the most part, SCE agrees with this measure. Please note this is not a feasible mitigation measure for annual plants. It would be more effective to avoid these types of plants during their growing season and wait until they have set seed. Need to define what they mean by critical wildlife habitat. For example, are we talking about the Colorado River, all desert tortoise habitat (which cannot be avoided), etc.?</u></p>	← E2-22
<p>8. To the greatest extent feasible, tower sites will be selected to allow maximum spanning of sensitive features.</p>	<p>B-13. To the greatest extent feasible, tower sites will be selected to allow maximum spanning of sensitive features.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	← E2-23
EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
<p>B-1a. Prepare and implement a Habitat Restoration/Compensation Plan</p>		<p><u>B-1a: This measure requires “restoration of all disturbed areas, including areas around tower sites, laydown areas, etc. SCE must retain a recognized habitat restoration specialist. Hydroseeding shall be done”. While SCE does not have a problem with restoring the contours to match existing land forms, hydroseeding in arid environments does not work. In fact, revegetation in arid environments, or in areas with less than 9-11 in. of annual precipitation is not successful. If the agencies can provide SCE documentation that this is a process that will work in the desert, SCE would reconsider its position on this condition SCE does not have a problem with undertaking habitat restoration in most areas of natural vegetation along the Devers-Valley T/L alignment (e.g., where coastal sage scrub exists).</u></p>	← E2-24
<p>B-1b. Coordinate tower placement with USFWS/BLM</p>		<p><u>B-1b: Does “coordinate with the BLM and USFWS” mean the KOFA NWR with respect to the USFWS. SCE requests confirmation that this is the case.</u></p>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>B-2a. Conduct invasive and noxious weed inventory</p> <p>B-2b. Implement control measures for invasive and noxious weeds.</p>		<p><u>SCE believes that a 500 ft. buffer around noxious weeds is excessive. Why is there a larger buffer around these weeds than around sensitive species?. Please identify what is considered to be noxious or invasive weeds.</u></p> <p><u>Washing vehicles before and after entering all project sites is not workable. Does this mean washing all vehicles before leaving at the end of the day to travel to town, and at the beginning of the day once they come back to the job after spending the night in a hotel or going to a restaurant? The project area is a desert environment and there may not be sufficient water to accomplish this. Unless workers sleep at the job site, and take all their meals there, there will be a large line of vehicles at the beginning and end of each day waiting to be washed. This measure would make the project a significant user of water from the Colorado River in order to have enough water to daily wash all these vehicles.</u></p>	<p>←E2-25</p>
<p>B-5. Construction activities during the breeding season would result in potential loss of nesting birds.</p>		<p><u>SCE believes that this measure is not feasible, nor is it necessary. This mitigation measure unnecessarily constrains construction. A 500 ft. buffer is excessive and could potentially place large segments of the transmission line off-limits for extended periods of time. Most birds can handle disturbance within distances much less than 500 ft. Other draft mitigation conditions don't even recommend these distances for sensitive bird species (e.g., burrowing owls) and generally exceeds what the USFWS requires for gnat-catchers. Additionally, there is no regulatory framework for establishing a 500 ft. buffer. State and federal law requires avoiding "taking" of a nest (which means to physically take the nest while there are eggs or young birds on the nest. It does require establishing a buffer.</u></p>	<p>←E2-26</p>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>B-6a Develop a transplanting plan</p>		<p><u>SCE requests information on what native plant species transplantation is required. Does the list include all native plant species, including common species like creosote and burro bush? This is unworkable. If such a measure applies to some protected native plant species (e.g., those protected under California Desert Native Plants Protection Act or Arizona's comparable law), it should be noted that California utilities are exempt under California Law. As noted in BLM Biological Resources Mitigation Measure 5, there are already measures in place for SCE to deal with similarly protected plants in Arizona. This mitigation measure needs to be revised.</u></p>	<p>←E2-27</p>
<p>Biological Resources – Wildlife</p>			
<p>BLM Right-of-Way Grant</p>	<p>Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures</p>	<p>Comment</p>	
<p>1. In the vicinity of the Colorado River, existing tower spacings and conductor heights will be matched to the <u>greatest</u> extent practical. This would reduce the potential for bird collisions with the powerline.</p>	<p>B-15. In the vicinity of the Colorado River, existing tower spacings and conductor heights will be matched to the <u>greatest</u> extent practical. This would reduce the potential for bird collisions with the power line.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-28</p>
<p>2. Wash communities along the entire route and sand dune communities in the Coachella Valley (see Map 10-AZ in the Draft SEIS and Figure 4.5-1 in the CPUC Draft EIR) will be spanned to the extent possible.</p>	<p>B-26. Wash communities along the entire route and sand dune communities in the Coachella Valley (see Map 10-AZ in the Draft SEIS and Figure 4.5-1 in the CPUC Draft EIR, 1987) will be spanned to the extent possible.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>3. The Holder will be required to purchase lands to compensate or enhance lands or conduct studies for the disturbance of public lands that are within areas of moderate to high value desert tortoise habitat. This will include disturbance caused by tower pad clearance and new <u>stub access</u> roads. Acquired lands will be in a nearby area of good tortoise density, within tortoise crucial habitat, and within an area where tortoise conservation is a priority (e.g., Chuckwalla Bench ACEC). Compensation utilizing land acquisition will be for disturbance of desert tortoise habitat in California only. The land to be acquired is estimated to be between 92 acres and 197 acres based upon a pre-construction review. BLM and the Holder will conduct a field inspection of the disturbed areas after completion of construction of the transmission line to determine the exact acreage. The Department of Fish and game and the Desert Tortoise Council must also be consulted. The lands purchased will be transferred to the United States and be administered by the BLM.</p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p> <p><u>SCE requests information how the land is acquired. Does SCE purchase the land, or write a check to the BLM (or other suitable agency) to cover cost of land purchase. If the latter situation is the case, how much per acre? Is this for permanent or temporary disturbance? If both, are they treated the same? While the requirement seems appropriate, additional discussion is required.</u></p>	<p>←E2-29</p>
<p>4. Prior to construction activities, the Holder shall have a qualified tortoise biologist present a class or briefing to construction workers. Subjects addressed shall include tortoise sensitivity to human disturbance, daily and seasonal activity patterns, and proper handling for removal from roadways.</p>	<p>B-27. Prior to construction activities, the Holder shall have a qualified tortoise biologist present a class or briefing to construction workers. Subjects addressed shall include tortoise sensitivity to human disturbance, daily and seasonal activity patterns, and proper handling for removal from roadways.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>5. The Holder shall hire a qualified tortoise biologist to conduct daily inspections of roads and work areas within tortoise habitat during the tortoise season of activity (February 15 to June 15, July 15 to October 15). Tortoises found to be in jeopardy will be removed to a nearby site. Tortoises may be held for short periods, if judged necessary, to allow construction crews to pass through an area. The Holder will provide proper facilities for such temporary holding.</p>	<p>B-28. The Holder shall hire a qualified tortoise biologist to conduct daily inspections of roads and work areas within tortoise habitat during the tortoise season of activity (February 15 to June 15, July 15 to October 15). Tortoises found to be in jeopardy will be removed to a nearby site. Tortoises may be held for short periods, if judged necessary, to allow construction crews to pass through an area. The Holder will provide proper facilities for such temporary holding.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>6. The Holder shall restrict the speed on all roads within tortoise habitat to a maximum of 25 miles per hour. The Holder is responsible for ensuring compliance with this limit by its employees.</p>	<p>B-29. The Holder shall restrict the speed on all roads within tortoise habitat to a maximum of 25 miles per hour. The Holder is responsible for ensuring compliance with this limit by its employees.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>7. Within tortoise habitat in California, spur roads shall not be bladed except where necessary to allow access for construction vehicles. Required vehicles shall enter on one pathway which is flagged and developed only by the passage of vehicles crushing vegetation. The spur shall be flagged by a qualified tortoise biologist prior to use. The spur shall avoid tortoise burrows and large perennial plants, yet be as short as possible within these requirements. Due to the presence of silty soils in Arizona, blading may occur.</p>	<p>B-30. Within tortoise habitat in California, spur roads shall not be bladed except where necessary to allow access for construction vehicles. Required vehicles shall enter on one pathway which is flagged and developed only by the passage of vehicles crushing vegetation. The spur shall be flagged by a qualified tortoise biologist prior to use. The spur shall avoid tortoise burrows and large perennial plants, yet be as short as possible within these requirements. Due to the presence of silty soils in Arizona, blading may occur.</p>	<p><u>This condition is contrary to CAISO requirements that SCE has access to every tower. This includes the ability to reach every tower in the event of an emergency. This mitigation measure will require revision.</u></p>	<p>←E2-30</p>
<p>8. Any desert tortoise observed on access roads or work areas will be moved immediately <u>100 yards</u> away from the roadway into safe areas.</p>	<p>B-31. Any desert tortoise observed on access roads or work areas will be moved immediately <u>100 yards</u> away from the roadway into safe areas.</p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined. It would be better to leave the distance unspecified so as to allow for placing tortoises closer or further away depending on terrain, vegetation, shade, etc.</u></p>	<p>←E2-31</p>
<p>9. In areas considered to comprise suitable tortoise habitat, or other areas where tortoise are observed, all access roads and tower construction sites will be surveyed by a qualified biologist to delineate burrows or individuals for protection. Burrows near construction sites will be clearly delineated on the ground. Road, footing, and work area alignments should be modified to the extent possible to avoid adversely affecting any tortoise burrows encountered during these surveys. Where tortoise burrows will be unavoidably destroyed, they should be excavated carefully using hand tools, under the supervision of a field biologist with demonstrated prior experience with this species. See Map 11-AZ in Appendix F in the Draft EIS and Figure 4.5-2 in the Devers-Palo Verde #2 EIR. Also see Appendix E for link and milepost descriptions and mitigation measures.</p>	<p>B-32. In areas considered to comprise suitable tortoise habitat, or other areas where tortoise are observed, all access roads and tower construction sites will be surveyed by a qualified biologist to delineate burrows or individuals for protection. Burrows near construction sites will be clearly delineated on the ground. Road, footing, and work area alignments should be modified to the extent possible to avoid adversely affecting any tortoise burrows encountered during these surveys. Where tortoise burrows will be unavoidably destroyed, they should be excavated carefully using hand tools, under the supervision of a field biologist with demonstrated prior experience with this species. See Map 11-AZ in Appendix F in the Draft EIS (1988) and Figure 4.5-2 in the Devers–Palo Verde No. 2 EIR (1987). Also see Appendix E for link and milepost descriptions and mitigation measures.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>10. If possible, no new roads, tower sitings, or spur roads will be built in blow sand areas. However, if new spur roads are required through wind-blow sand habitat, the road will be returned to natural conditions and effectively closed (gated or bermed) following construction. Pre-construction surveys will identify wind-blown sand dune habitats.</p>	<p>B-33. If possible, no new roads, tower sitings, or spur roads will be built in blow sand areas. However, if new spur roads are required through wind-blown sand habitat, the road will be returned to natural conditions and effectively closed (gated or bermed) following construction. Pre-construction surveys will identify wind-blown sand dune habitats.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>11. Where the project crosses through the Coachella Valley Preserve, the Holder will cooperate with the preserve in closing (gating) existing access roads. (a) A qualified biologist will also be present with work crews to survey and clear work areas daily for Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard (CVFTL), flat-tailed horned lizard (FTHL), and other sensitive species in the Preserve and sand dune communities from Link 14 (milepost 7.6) to Link 16 (milepost 5.0) to identify if any additional areas of occupied CVFTL or FTHL habitat are present along the route or at construction staging areas. (b) This survey will be conducted during appropriate seasons (March 15 to May 15) and conditions for species identification. For any areas of suitable habitat, mitigation measure number 11 will apply.</p> <p>In the Coachella Valley, compacted soils should be scarified and seeded with a mix of native plant seeds, including bugseed (<i>Dicoria canescens</i>), to promote revegetation of plant species valuable to the lizard.</p> <p>Construction activity and surface disturbance will be prohibited during the period from January 1 to March 31 for the protection of the bighorn sheep lambing areas. These areas along the proposed route include Link 2 (milepost 29.0 to 34.0) and Link 6 (milepost 0.0 to 6.0).</p>	<p>B-34. Where the project crosses through the Coachella Valley Preserve, the Holder will cooperate with the Preserve in closing (gating) existing access roads. (a) A qualified biologist will also be present with work crews to survey and clear work areas daily for Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard (CVFTL), flat-tailed horned lizard (FTHL), and other sensitive species in the Preserve and sand dune communities from Link 14 (Milepost 7.6) to Link 16 (Milepost 5.0) to identify if any additional areas of occupied CVFTL and FTHL habitat are present along the route or at construction staging areas. (b) This survey will be conducted during appropriate seasons (March 15 to May 15) and conditions for species identification. For any areas of suitable habitat, this measure will apply.</p> <p>In the Coachella Valley, compacted soils should be scarified and seeded with a mix of native plant seeds, including bugseed (<i>Dicoria canescens</i>), to promote revegetation of plant species valuable to the lizard.</p> <p>Construction activity and surface disturbance will be prohibited during the period from January 1 to March 31 for the protection of the bighorn sheep lambing areas. These areas along the proposed route include Link 2 (Milepost 29.0 to 34.0) and Link 6 (Milepost 0.0 to 6.0).</p>	<p><u>New gates have already been installed. Based on discussions with the Preserve Manager, the area of construction of the transmission line does not constitute habitat for the CVFTL, and it is considered unlikely habitat for the FTHL. Is this mitigation measure really necessary in light of this?</u></p> <p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>SCE does not agree with this measure. The requirements seem to be in excess of what KOFA NWR personnel have recommended.</u></p>

←E2-32

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>15. Holder shall take all necessary precautions to protect wildlife species. By advance written notice from the Authorized Officer, key wildlife areas may be closed to construction activities for specified periods of time to protect designated wildlife species. No firearms shall be allowed on the project under any circumstance(s), and employees shall be instructed to refrain from needlessly harming wildlife. The advance written notice to the Holder shall be within 30 days after submittal by the Holder of the final preconstruction wildlife surveys.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>16. The Holder, its contractors or employees are requested to report to the District Biologist observations of any threatened or endangered animals, through the Holder's biologist.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>17. Avoid upland areas where desert tortoises might occur and/or have a biologist present during construction activities that involve earth moving in order to move any tortoises (in burrows or cover-sites, or on the surface) that would likely be impacted.</p>	<p>B-35. Avoid upland areas where desert tortoises might occur and/or have a biologist present during construction activities that involve earth moving in order to move any tortoises (in burrows or cover-sites, or on the surface) that would likely be impacted.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>18. Avoid construction activities that would tend to create wind barriers that might result in sand stabilization in order to minimize impacts to populations of the Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard.</p>	<p>B-36. Avoid construction activities that would tend to create wind barriers that might result in sand stabilization in order to minimize impacts to populations of the Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard.</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>EIR/EIS</p>	<p>Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>B-5a Conduct pre-construction surveys and monitoring for breeding birds</p>		<p><u>B-5a: SCE believes that this measure is not necessary. Please refer to SCE's earlier comments about this mitigation measure under Biological Resources-Wildlife, BLM ROW Grant Item #B-5.</u></p>

←E2-33

Comment Set E2
Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
(SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>B-1a. Prepare and implement a Habitat Restoration/Compensation Plan</p> <p>B-7a. Avoid Colorado River</p> <p>B-7b. Conduct pre-construction tortoise surveys</p>		<p><u>B-1a: See earlier comments on Biological Resources – Vegetation Item B-1a.</u></p> <p><u>B-7a: We assume this measures means to avoid placing structures within the river, and does not prohibit spanning the river.</u></p> <p><u>B-7b: SCE believes that there are aspects of this mitigation measure that cannot be complied with or are excessive. For example, it should not be necessary to avoid moving equipment until a tortoise monitor is summoned. The worker should be allowed to move the vehicle with assistance from another worker to ensure the tortoise is not crushed or injured. Additionally, it is physically impossible to construct a tortoise burrow that replicates an existing burrow. The best SCE can do is construct an artificial burrow to move the tortoises to temporarily.</u></p>	<p>←E2-34</p>
<p>B-7c. Purchase mitigation lands for impacts to tortoise habitat.</p> <p>B-7d. Purchase mitigation lands for impacts to fringe-toed lizard habitat</p> <p>B-7e. Conduct focused surveys for California gnatcatchers</p> <p>B-7f. Conduct focused surveys for Stephens' kangaroo rat and San Bernardino kangaroo rat</p> <p>B-8a. Conduct surveys for listed plant species.</p>		<p><u>B-7c: See earlier comments with respect to this mitigation measure.</u></p> <p><u>B-7d: This mitigation measure is unnecessary and onerous. Most of the Critical Habitat for the CVFTL through which this line passes does not possess FTL's. Instead, this portion of the CH has been so designated in order to protect the flow of sand necessary for Aeolian sand deposits. The T/L will not interfere with the movement of sand. Therefore, is mitigation required? SCE needs additional discussion of this matter.</u></p> <p><u>B-7e. SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>B-7f: SCE has no comment on this measure:</u></p> <p><u>B-8a: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	<p>←E2-35</p>

Comment Set E2
Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
(SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>B-9a. Conduct pre-construction surveys</p> <p>B-9b. Conduct biological monitoring</p> <p>B-9c. Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program</p> <p>B-9d. Conduct pre-construction reptile surveys</p> <p>B-9e. Conduct pre-construction surveys and owl relocation</p> <p>B-9f. Perform construction outside of breeding and lambing period</p> <p>B-9g. Conduct pre-construction surveys and relocation for American badger</p>		<p><u>B-9a: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>B-9b: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>B-9c: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>B-9d: Acceptable, if this can be done as part of</u></p> <p><u>B-9e: Why is there only a 246 ft. buffer for this sensitive species and 500 ft. for all other breeding bird species, which are not considered to be sensitive?</u></p> <p><u>B-9f: The recommended avoidance period seems to be in excess of what is required by AG&FD or USFWS: What is rationale? Has AG&FD identified Burnt Mountain as bighorn habitat?</u></p> <p><u>B-9g: SCE does not agree with this measure: Digging up an active badger den could be very dangerous</u></p>	<p>←E2-36</p>
<p>B-9h. Conduct pre-construction surveys for roosting bats</p> <p>B-9i. Schedule construction when the Coachella Valley round-tailed squirrel is dormant</p>		<p><u>B-9h: SCE requests information on where this may occur: What provisions of state or federal law requires this?</u></p> <p><u>B-9i: SCE requests information on where this may occur: What provisions of state or federal law requires this?</u></p>	<p>←E2-37</p>
<p>B-13a. Demonstrate compliance with the Western Riverside County MSHCP. SCE shall provide documentation that it has complied with the provisions of the MSHCP</p> <p>B-13b. Implement the Best Management Practices required by the Western Riverside County MSHCP</p>		<p><u>B-13a: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>B-13-b: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>B-15a. Utilize collision-reducing techniques in installation of transmission lines</p>		<p><u>B-15a: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>B-16a. Prepare and implement a raven control plan</p>		<p><u>SCE believes this measure is not feasible to implement. What is the value of this measure when there are existing transmission lines nearby that provide nest sites for ravens. Moreover, it is important to recognize that not all ravens feed on tortoises. In order to remove raven nests, SCE would be required to move continuously up and down the transmission line for 5+ months in perpetuity. Additionally, SCE will not be placed in a position of killing raven chicks. SCE's experience has been that it is difficult if not impossible to get rehabilitation centers to accept raven chicks. We need to have additional discussion on this mitigation measure, because as currently written, this is overly burdensome and has limited practical benefits.</u></p>	<p>←E2-38</p>
--	--	--	---------------

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

Visual		
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
1. Nonspecular conductors will be used.	V-1 (500 kV). Non-specular conductors will be used [to reduce glare and visual contrast]. (BLM B-6.1)4 [bracketed text added by SCE]	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
2. For the proposed alignment, tower spacing will correspond to the spacing of the existing transmission line structures, where feasible, except where other resource concerns warrant. Additionally, <u>where feasible</u> , new tower heights will be adjusted such that the top elevations of each set of towers (new and existing) are horizontal with each other. This will visually coordinate perceptions of towers and conductors as one element. Site specific conditions will determine when such mitigation is feasible. Other exceptions to these two measures are where towers will be sited to avoid sensitive features and/or to allow conductors to clearly span the features.	V-2 (500 kV). For the proposed alignment, tower spacing will correspond to the spacing of the existing transmission line structures, <u>where feasible</u> . Additionally, <u>where feasible</u> , new tower heights will be adjusted such that the top elevations of each set of towers (new and existing) are horizontal with each other. This will coordinate perceptions of towers and conductors as one element. Site-specific conditions will determine when such mitigation is feasible. Other exceptions to these two measures are where towers will be sited to avoid sensitive features and/or to allow conductors to clearly span features. (BLM B-6.2) [PEA adds: "SCE will comply with the above mitigation measure to the extent possible. However, the ISO has specified that the capacity of the line be 2700 amps under normal conditions and 3600 amps under emergency conditions. This capacity rating is an increase from the 1988 DPV2 capacity rating. This capacity rating necessitates that the heights of some of the proposed Devers-Harquahala towers be slightly taller than [adjacent towers], and in some locations tower spacing may not correspond to the adjacent DPV1 structures, to provide adequate ground clearance." (PEA, p. 6-31)]	<u>The new towers may be slightly taller in some areas depending on factors such as engineering design and landforms. SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined</u>
3. At all highway and recreation routes-of-travel crossings, including the Colorado River, towers will be placed at the maximum feasible distance, and when feasible at right angles, <u>to</u> the crossing.	V-3 (500 kV). At all highway and recreation routes-of-travel crossings, including the Colorado River, towers will be placed at the maximum feasible distance, and when feasible, <u>[except in locations where matching existing tower spacing is deemed appropriate]</u> . (BLM B-6.3) [From "and where feasible," the BLM text reads "...at right angles, from the crossing." SCE has replaced this phrase in the bracketed text.]	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined</u>

←E2-39

←E2-40

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>4. <u>Orocopia Mountains (Link 13, Milepost 52 to 53.5)</u>. As depicted in Figure 5.7-4 of the Devers-Palo Verde #2 EIR, existing access road and fill areas which create a significant visual impact will be treated with Eonite or similar treatments. This will reduce the visual contrast created by the light-valued disturbed soils with the darker-valued, vegetated surroundings. The Holder will consult with the Authorized Officer on a site by site basis for the use of Eonite. No new access roads will be constructed or upgraded. No widening or upgrading of existing roads will be constructed or upgraded. No widening or upgrading of existing roads will be undertaken. New towers in this section will ideally be constructed downhill from existing towers to avoid the potential for skylining. Towers will be placed to avoid sensitive features.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>5. <u>Interstate 10 Crossing (Link 13, Milepost 65)</u>. Where feasible, new towers will be aligned such that the top alignment of the towers is horizontal to the eye. To the extent possible, towers immediately adjacent to the highway at the crossing will be placed <u>to match the existing towers to the extent possible</u> at right angles to the existing towers and as parallel to the Interstate as possible to avoid a "scalloping" effect of the conductors crossing over the highway.</p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	← E2-41
<p>6. Holder shall provide for the protection and enhancement of aesthetic values in the planning, construction, and maintenance of the line. Support facilities will be constructed in a manner that harmonizes with their natural setting or as otherwise approved by the Authorized Officer.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>7. The Authorized Officer may require any additional reasonable measures he deems necessary to protect the aesthetic values in critical areas.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	

**Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company**

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>8. Several general mitigation measures to reduce the visual impact of the proposed project have been suggested by the holder in the PEA. These measures are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Standard tower spacing would be modified to correspond with spacing of existing transmission line towers where feasible and within limits of standard tower design to reduce visual contrast. b. Towers would be placed so as to avoid features and/or to allow conductors to clearly span the feature (within limits of standard tower design) to minimize the amount of sensitive feature disturbed and/or reduce visual contrast (e.g., avoiding skyline situations through placement of tower to one side of a ridge or adjusting tower location to avoid highly visible locations and utilize screening of nearby landforms). c. Conductors will be nonspecular. 		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>9. Where the existing corridor crosses Interstate 10, or where the line is close to residential areas, non-specular wire would be used to decrease the visibility of the conductors. In the few locations where new construction access may be required, grading would be done to minimize visual impacts; and where roads are not required for maintenance, they would be returned to pre-construction conditions.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
<p>V-1a. Reduce visibility of construction activities and equipment. Substation construction sites and all staging and material and equipment storage areas, including storage sites for excavated materials shall be appropriately located away from areas of high public visibility. If visible from nearby roads, residences, public gathering areas, or recreational areas, facilities, or trails, <u>substation</u> construction sites and staging and storage areas shall be visually screened using temporary screening fencing. Fencing will be of an appropriate design and color for each specific location. Additionally, avoid construction in areas visible from recreation facilities and areas during holidays and periods of heavy recreational use. This measure encompasses BLM permit requirements B-7.1 and B-7.2. <u>(SCE will be notified by the Authorized Officer 30 days in advance of curtailment in specified areas)</u>. SCE shall submit final construction plans demonstrating compliance with this measure to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction.</p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>

←E2-42

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>V-1b. Reduce construction night lighting impacts. SCE shall design and install all lighting at construction and storage yards and staging areas such that light bulbs and reflectors are not visible from public viewing areas; lighting does not cause reflected glare; and illumination of the project facilities, vicinity, and nighttime sky is minimized. SCE shall submit a Construction Lighting Mitigation Plan to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 90 days prior to the start of construction or the ordering of any exterior lighting fixtures or components, whichever comes first. SCE shall not order any exterior lighting fixtures or components until the Construction Lighting Mitigation Plan is approved by the BLM and CPUC. The Plan shall include but is not necessarily limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lighting shall be designed so exterior light fixtures are hooded, with lights directed downward or toward the area to be illuminated and so that backscatter to the nighttime sky is minimized. The design of the lighting shall be such that the luminescence or light sources is shielded to prevent light trespass outside the project boundary ■ All lighting shall be of minimum necessary brightness consistent with worker safety ■ High illumination areas not occupied on a continuous basis shall have switches or motion detectors to light the area only when occupied. 		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>V-2a. In those areas where views of land scars are unavoidable, the boundaries of disturbed areas should be aggressively revegetated to create a less distinct and more natural appearing line to reduce visual contrast. Reduce in-line views of land scars. Construct access or spur roads at appropriate angles from the originating, primary travel facilities to minimize extended, in-line views of newly graded terrain. Contour grading should be used where possible to better blend graded surfaces with existing terrain. SCE shall submit final construction plans demonstrating compliance with this measure to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction.</p>		<p><u>V-2a: SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>

← E2-43

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>V-2b. Reduce visual contrast from unnatural vegetation lines. All graded roads and areas not required for on-going operation, maintenance, or access shall be returned to pre-construction conditions. This measure partially encompasses BLM permit requirement BLM B-6.9. SCE shall submit final construction and restoration plans demonstrating compliance with this measure to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction.</p>		<p><u>V-2b: SCE requests the addition of the following note:</u></p> <p><u><i>Note: "Construction and Restoration plans" should indicate mitigation to reduce scarring and the need for restoration and/or re-seeding where warranted at specific locations where water is available. Revegetation is not feasible and typically has a low rate of success in desert areas where irrigation is not available. Alternative mitigation (e.g., overland travel) may be advised by BLM to avoid the introduction of invasive species in the seed mix.</i></u></p> <p><u>SCE requests that the CPUC replies to and approves the required SCE Compliance and Restoration plans within 30 days of submittal by SCE.</u></p>	<p>←E2-43 cont.</p>
<p>V-2c. Reduce color contrast of land scars. In those areas where views of land scars from sensitive public viewing locations are unavoidable, disturbed soils shall be treated with Eonite or similar treatments to reduce the visual contrast created by the lighter-colored disturbed soils with the darker vegetated surroundings. SCE will consult with the Authorized Officer on a site-by-site basis for the use of Eonite. This measure partially encompasses BLM permit requirement BLM B-6.4. SCE shall submit final construction and restoration plans demonstrating compliance with this measure to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction.</p>		<p><u>V-2c: SCE requests that the CPUC replies to and approves the required Construction and Restoration plans within 30 days of submittal by SCE</u></p>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>V-3a. Reduce visual contrast of towers and conductors. The following design measures shall be applied to all new structures and conductors in order to reduce the degree of visual contrast caused by the new facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ All new and replacement structures are to be paired as closely as possible, where feasible, with the existing structure(s) in the corridor in order to avoid or reduce the number of off-setting (from existing structures) tower placements. ■ All new and replacement structures are to match the heights of the existing DPV1 structures to the extent feasible possible as dictated by variation in terrain and engineering requirements. ■ All new and reconducted spans are to match existing conductor spans as closely as feasible possible in order to avoid or reduce the occurrence of unnecessary visual complexity associated with asynchronous conductor spans, particularly at sensitive crossings such as Salome Highway, I-10, U.S. 95, Colorado River, SR 78, Dillon Road, SR 62, Whitewater Canyon Road, and San Timoteo Canyon Road. ■ All new conductors are to be non-specular in design in order to reduce conductor visibility and visual contrast. ■ To the extent feasible, no new access roads are to be constructed downhill from existing or proposed towers to reduce the potential for structure skylining. 		<p><u>V-3a: SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-44</p>
--	--	--	---------------

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>V-6a. Reduce visual contrast associated with ancillary facilities. SCE shall submit to BLM and CPUC a Surface Treatment Plan describing the application of colors and textures to all facility structures, buildings, walls, fences, and components comprising all ancillary facilities including substations/switchyards, series capacitor banks, and optical repeater stations. The Surface Treatment Plan must reduce glare and minimize visual intrusion and contrast by blending the facilities with the landscape. The Treatment Plan shall be submitted to BLM and CPUC for approval at least 90 days prior to (a) ordering the first structures that are to be color treated during manufacture, or (b) construction of any of the ancillary facility component, whichever comes first. If the BLM or CPUC notifies SCE that revisions to the Plan are needed before the Plan can be approved, within 30 days of receiving that notification, SCE shall prepare and submit for review and approval a revised Plan. The Surface Treatment Plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Specification, and 11"x17" color simulations at life size scale, of the treatment proposed for use on project structures, including structures treated during manufacture ■ A list of each major project structure, building, tower and/or pole, and fencing specifying the color(s) and finish proposed for each (colors must be identified by name and by vendor brand or a universal designation) ■ Two sets of brochures and/or color chips for each proposed color ■ A detailed schedule for completion of the treatment ■ A procedure to ensure proper treatment maintenance for the life of the project. <p>SCE shall not specify to the vendors the treatment of any buildings or structures treated during manufacture, or perform the final treatment on any buildings or structures treated onsite, until SCE receives notification of approval of the Treatment Plan by the BLM and CPUC. Within 30 days following the start of commercial operation, SCE shall notify the BLM and CPUC that all buildings and structures are ready for inspection.</p>		<p><u>V-6a: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
---	--	---

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>V-6b. Screen ancillary facilities. SCE shall provide a Screening Plan for screening vegetation, walls, and fences that reduces visibility of ancillary facilities (except Devers Substation) and helps the facility blend in with the landscape. The use of berms to facilitate project screening may also be incorporated into the Plan. SCE shall submit the Plan to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 90 days prior to installing the landscape screening. If the BLM or CPUC notifies SCE that revisions to the Plan are needed before the Plan can be approved, within 30 days of receiving that notification, SCE shall prepare and submit for review and approval a revised Plan. The plan shall include but not necessarily be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An 11"x17" color simulation of the proposed landscaping at 5 years ■ A plan view to scale depicting the project and the location of screening elements ■ A detailed list of any plants to be used; their size and age at planting; the expected time to maturity, and the expected height at five years and at maturity. <p>SCE shall complete installation of the screening prior to the start of project operation. SCE shall notify the BLM and CPUC within seven days after completing installation of the screening, that the screening components are ready for inspection.</p>		<p><u>V-6b: SCE requests that this measure be required only for new facilities that would be constructed in areas of high public visibility and where significant visual impacts may result. No additional screening would be required at existing ancillary facilities including Devers Substation, Harquahala Switchyard, Valley Substation, series capacitor banks, and other existing substations where new equipment is installed within SCE's substation properties.</u></p>	<p>←E2-45</p>
---	--	--	---------------

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>V-6c. Reduce night lighting impacts. SCE shall design and install all permanent lighting such that light bulbs and reflectors are not visible from public viewing areas; lighting does not cause reflected glare; and illumination of the project facilities, vicinity, and nighttime sky is minimized. SCE shall submit a Lighting Mitigation Plan to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 90 days prior to ordering any permanent exterior lighting fixtures or components. SCE shall not order any exterior lighting fixtures or components until the Lighting Mitigation Plan is approved by the BLM and CPUC. The Plan shall include but is not necessarily limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lighting shall be designed so exterior light fixtures are hooded, with lights directed downward or toward the area to be illuminated and so that backscatter to the nighttime sky is minimized. The design of the lighting shall be such that the luminescence or light sources is shielded to prevent light trespass outside the project boundary ■ All lighting shall be of minimum necessary brightness consistent with worker safety <p>High illumination areas not occupied on a continuous basis shall have switches or motion detectors to light the area only when occupied.</p>		<p><u>V-6c: SCE requests that this measure be required only for new facilities where permanent night lighting is needed. It will only be implemented for those facilities that would be constructed in areas of high public visibility.</u></p>	<p>←E2-46</p>
--	--	---	---------------

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>V-19a. Reduce visual contrast by painting towers with appropriate colors. Existing and proposed transmission towers within the DPV1/DPV2 corridor from proposed tower location 2209 to 2239 in the vicinity of the Indio Hills shall be painted an appropriate color to more effectively blend the structures with the light tan color of the background vegetation and soils of the Indio Hills. This measure is limited to only the 31 tower locations (2209 to 2239) because the Indio Hills provide an immediate light-tan backdrop to sensitive views from residences and recreational facilities to the immediate south of the corridor. It is recommended that a light-tan color be used to match the background soils. SCE shall submit a Tower Painting Plan demonstrating compliance with this measure to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to (a) the start of construction or (b) ordering the first structures that are to be color treated during manufacture, whichever comes first. If the BLM or CPUC notifies SCE that revisions to the Plan are needed before the Plan can be approved, within 30 days of receiving that notification, SCE shall prepare and submit for review and approval a revised Plan.</p> <p>The Tower Painting Plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specification, and 11"x17" color simulations at life size scale, of the treatment proposed for use on project structures, including structures treated during manufacture A map showing the towers to be painted Two sets of brochures and/or color chips for each alternative color A detailed schedule for completion of the treatment A procedure to ensure proper treatment maintenance for the life of the project. 		<p>V-19a: <u>SCE recommends that this measure not be implemented. This measure would be ineffective for the following reasons:</u></p> <p><u>(1) The proposed DPV2 towers would be constructed to match the critical visual design elements of the existing DPV1 towers including color, line, form, and texture. Matching tower designs would result in a unified appearance and is consistent with mitigation measure V-3a. From the analysis presented in the EIR/EIS, and documented in the simulation (Figure D.3-14A/14B), the visual impact in these locations is characterized as "moderate;" the proposed DPV2 towers would not add a substantially higher level of visual contrast or visual impact in general.</u></p> <p><u>(2) An unpainted or dulled galvanized steel finish is the most appropriate technique for the proposed towers to match the visual elements of the existing setting, and thereby minimize visual impacts. If the DPV2 towers are painted, the new towers would contrast with the existing DPV1 towers to a greater degree. The towers shown in the simulation from the viewpoint presented in Figure D.3-14A/14B are backdropped by the hills, and therefore the contrast level is minimal. This viewpoint is referred to as "representative of project views from other residential and golf developments." However, where the towers appear above the hills (skylined), or are backdropped by hills of different colors, the level of contrast would be particularly heightened where tan-colored structures are installed.</u></p>	<p>←E2-47</p>
--	--	---	---------------

Comment Set E2
Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
(SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>SCE shall not specify to the vendors the treatment of towers or tower components treated during manufacture, or perform the final treatment on any towers until SCE receives notification of approval of the Tower Painting Plan by the BLM and CPUC. Within 30 days following the start of commercial operation, SCE shall notify the BLM and CPUC that the towers are ready for inspection.</p>		<p><u>(3) Painted steel structures require periodic re-painting because of deterioration from the elements. In between re-painting cycles, the steel surfaces can fade and peel, resulting in a low quality aesthetic appearance. Because the proposed galvanized steel surfaces don't require re-painting, the aesthetic quality improves as the surface dulls and glare is reduced over time.</u></p>	<p>←E2-47 cont.</p>
Park and Recreation Area			
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
<p>1. Construction will be curtailed during heavy recreational use periods, including major holidays, at the discretion of the Authorized Officer. The Holder will be notified by the Authorized Officer 30 days in advance of construction curtailment.</p>		<p><u>SCE requests that recreational areas affected by this measure be identified.</u></p>	<p>←E2-48</p>
<p>2. Schedule construction activities to avoid major holiday periods where the route crosses Indio Palm's State Park in Link 14.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
Acoustic Considerations			
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
<p><u>Construction Noise.</u> To substantially reduce the short-term noise impacts during construction, the mitigation measures are as follows:</p>			
<p>1. Limit the hours of construction occurring within 500 feet of noise sensitive receptors (human occupied facilities such as residences and hospitals) to between 7:00 am and 5:00 pm during weekdays.</p>		<p><u>Construction will need to be implemented on weekends as well as weekdays. SCE requests clarification on hours of construction allowed on weekends.</u></p>	<p>←E2-49</p>
<p>2. Locate construction yards at least 500 feet away from residences.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>3. Minimize the use of helicopters within 500 feet of residences</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
<p>4. Notify residents within 500 feet of any upcoming noisy construction activities and schedule the activities, when possible, to minimize conflicts with the neighbors.</p>		<p><u>SCE will prepare and implement a resident notification program.</u></p>	<p>←E2-50</p>
EIR/EIS			
<p>N-1a. Implement best management practices for construction noise.</p>		<p><u>SCE asks for a copy of best management practices (BMP) manual for construction noise.</u></p>	<p>←E2-51</p>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

Cultural Resources		
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
The following tasks shall be carried out to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations in accordance with Programmatic Memoranda of Agreement for California and Arizona among the BLM, the State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).		
1. Prior to construction and all other surface disturbing activities, the Holder shall have conducted and submitted for approval by the Authorized Officer an inventory of cultural resources within the project's area of potential effects. The nature and extent of this inventory shall be determined by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate SHPO and shall be based upon project engineering specifications.	C-1. Prior to construction and all other surface disturbing activities, the Holder shall have conducted and submitted for approval by the Authorized Officer an inventory of cultural resources within the project's APE. The nature and extent of this inventory shall be determined by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and shall be based upon project engineering specifications. (BLM B-9.1) (Reference in parentheses denotes the origin of the APM. "(SCE)" is a Proponent's mitigation measure. "(BLM)" is a Proponent's measure derived from a requirement in the BLM Right-of-Way Grant 1989. Numbers such as B-4.1 refer to the specific BLM measure in the 1989 Grant.)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
2. As part of the inventory, the Holder shall conduct field surveys of sufficient nature and extent to identify cultural resources that would be affected by/from tower pad construction, access road installation, and transmission line construction and operation. At a minimum, field surveys shall be conducted along newly proposed access roads, new construction yards, and any other projected impact areas outside of the previously surveyed corridor. Site-specific field surveys shall also be undertaken at all projected areas of impact within the previously surveyed corridor that coincide with previously recorded cultural resource locations. The selected right-of-way shall be staked prior to the cultural resource field surveys.	C-2. As part of the inventory, the Holder shall conduct field surveys of sufficient nature and extent to identify cultural resources that would be affected by tower pad construction, access road installation, and transmission line construction and operation. At a minimum, field surveys shall be conducted along newly proposed access roads, new construction yards, and any other projected impact areas outside of the previously surveyed corridor. Site-specific field surveys also shall be undertaken at all projected areas of impact within the previously surveyed corridor that coincide with previously recorded cultural resource locations. The selected right-of-way shall be staked prior to the cultural resource field surveys. (BLM B-9.2)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>3. As part of the inventory report, the Holder shall evaluate the significance of all affected cultural resources and provide recommendations with regard to their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. Determinations of National Register eligibility will be made by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate SHPO.</p>	<p>C-3. As part of the inventory report, the Holder shall evaluate the significance of all affected cultural resources and provide recommendations with regard to their eligibility for the NRHP. Determinations of NRHP eligibility will be made by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate SHPO. (BLM B-9.3)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>4. Upon approval of the inventory report by the Authorized Officer, the Holder shall prepare and submit for approval a cultural resource treatment plan for National Register-eligible cultural resources to mitigate identified impacts. Avoidance, recordation, and data recovery will be used as mitigation alternatives.</p>	<p>C-4. Upon approval of the inventory report by the Authorized Officer, the Holder shall prepare and submit for approval a cultural resource treatment plan for NRHP-eligible cultural resources to mitigate identified impacts. Avoidance, recordation, and data recovery will be used as mitigation alternatives. (BLM B-9.4)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>5. The Authorized Officer may require the relocation of the line, ancillary facilities, or temporary facilities or work areas, if any, where relocation would avoid or reduce damage to cultural resource values.</p>	<p>C-5. The Authorized Officer may require the relocation of the line, ancillary facilities, or temporary facilities or work areas, if any, where relocation would avoid or reduce damage to cultural resource values. (BLM B-9.5)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>6. If avoidance of specific cultural resources is not feasible, treatment shall be carried out as determined by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate SHPO.</p>	<p>C-6. If avoidance of specific cultural resources is not feasible, treatment shall be carried out as determined by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the appropriate SHPO. (BLM B-9.6)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>7. When necessary to relocate the proposed line, ancillary facilities, temporary facilities, or work areas as a result of inventory, on-site avoidance decisions, or the Holder's approved request for relocation, the Holder shall inventory the proposed new locations for cultural resources and provide inventory results to the Authorized Officer prior to construction. Any mitigation deemed necessary by the Authorized Officer shall be completed prior to undertaking any surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>C-7. When necessary to relocate the proposed line, ancillary facilities, temporary facilities, or work areas as a result of inventory, onsite avoidance decisions, or the Holder's approved request for relocation, the Holder shall inventory the proposed new locations for cultural resources and provide inventory results to the Authorized Officer prior to construction. Any mitigation deemed necessary by the Authorized Officer shall be completed prior to undertaking any surface disturbing activities. (BLM B-9.7)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>8. All cultural resource work undertaken by the Holder on public lands shall be carried out by qualified professionals designated on a currently valid Cultural Resource Use Permit for the appropriate state.</p>	<p>C-8. All cultural resource work undertaken by the Holder on public lands shall be carried out by qualified professionals designated on a currently valid Cultural Resource Use Permit for the appropriate State. (BLM B-9.8)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>

**Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company**

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

9. Notices to proceed will be issued following completion, and approval by the Authorized Officer, of any field work determined necessary through the inventory, evaluation and consultation process described below.	C-9. Notices to proceed will be issued following completion, and approval by the Authorized Officer, of any fieldwork determined necessary through the inventory, evaluation, and consultation process described above. (BLM B-9.9)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
10. Vehicles and equipment shall be confined and operated only within areas specified by the Authorized Officer. Off-road travel by employees will not be allowed except in areas previously approved by the Authorized Officer.	C-10. Vehicles and equipment shall be confined and operated only within areas specified by the Authorized Officer. (BLM B-9.10)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
11. Unauthorized collection of artifacts or other cultural materials on or off the right-of-way by the Holder, his representatives or employees will not be allowed. Violators will be subject to prosecution under the appropriate State and Federal laws. Unauthorized collection may constitute grounds for the issuance of a stop work order.	C-11. Unauthorized collection of artifacts or other cultural materials on or off the right-of-way by the Holder, his representatives, or employees will not be allowed. Violators will be subject to prosecution under the appropriate State and federal laws. Unauthorized collection may constitute grounds for the issuance of a stop work order. (BLM B-9.11)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
C-1a. Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in Final APE 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		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
C-2a. Consult agencies and Native Americans		<u>The BLM has informed SCE that the BLM will consult with Native Americans. SCE will consult with the BLM.</u>
Paleontological Resources		
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
1. Prior to construction and all other surface-disturbing activities, the Holder shall have conducted and submitted for approval an inventory of paleontological resources within highly sensitive areas that will be affected by the project as determined by the Authorized Officer.	P-1. Impacts to significant paleontological resources will be mitigated by conducting a preconstruction survey in areas of high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity to identify and collect surface specimens that could be affected by project construction. Paleontological monitoring of earth-disturbing construction activities and salvage of significant specimens will occur in project areas of high sensitivity. (SCE)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>

←E2-52

**Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company**

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

2. As part of the inventory report, the Holder will evaluate the significance of the paleontological resources that will be affected.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
3. Upon approval of the inventory report by the Authorized Officer, the Holder shall prepare and submit for approval a plan to mitigate identified impacts. Avoidance, recordation and data recovery will be used as mitigation alternatives.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
4. If avoidance of significant paleontological resources is not feasible or appropriate, treatment shall be carried out as determined by the Authorized Officer.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
5. All paleontological work undertaken by the Holder on public lands shall be carried out by qualified professionals designated on a currently valid Paleontological Collecting Permit for the appropriate state.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
6. Notices to Proceed will be issued following completion, and approval by the Authorized Officer, of any field work determined necessary through the inventory and evaluation process described above.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
C-1a. Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in Final APE 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		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u> <u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
C-2a. Consult agencies and Native Americans		<u>The BLM has informed SCE that the BLM will consult with Native Americans. SCE will consult with the BLM.</u>

←E2-53

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

Land Use			
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
	G-1. The line will be located to minimize the disruption of any active mining operations. (BLM B 2.1) (Reference in parentheses denotes the origin of the APM. "(SCE)" is a Proponent's mitigation measure. "(BLM)" is a Proponent's measure derived from a requirement in the 1989 Bureau of Land Management Right-of-Way Grant for the DPV2 project. Numbers such as B 4.1 refer to the specific Bureau of Land Management measure in the 1989 Right-of-Way Grant.)	<u>There may be some disruption where the proposed line crosses Granite Construction north of Palm Springs.</u>	←E2-54
	V-9. Towers would be located adjacent to existing structures where feasible. Exceptions are at locations where the tower heights and/or spans would be modified based on terrain features allowing for adequate conductor clearance to ground and other facilities within the right-of-way. (SCE)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	L-2. Although the Holder may restore and maintain existing access roads, they cannot be either widened or upgraded without approval of the Authorized Officer. (BLM B 1.1)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	L-3. New access road construction will be kept to a minimum. (BLM B 1.2)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	L-4. Where feasible, the following additional mitigation measures would be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matching of tower spans • Aligning towers adjacent to or parallel to agricultural field boundaries • Using <u>H-frame towers in the Blythe farmlands. Using either tubular steel pole structures or H-frame towers in all other agricultural fields instead of lattice steel towers to reduce the footprint of the structure with the exception of the Devers-Valley route where lattice towers will be used to match existing towers.</u> • Specific tower placement to avoid span-sensitive features. (SCE) 	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>	←E2-55

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

	<p>L-7. Link 10 crosses an (unoccupied) single-family dwelling unit at Milepost 5.3. Two additional single-family dwelling units and one mobile home would be impacted due to the alignment of Link 10 at Milepost 6.2. Mitigation measures would include purchase of the parcel and relocation or, if practical, adjusting the transmission line alignment and placing towers to avoid the affected dwelling units. (SCE)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>EIR/EIS</p>	<p>Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>L-1a. Prepare Construction Notification Plan</p> <p>L-1b. Coordinate with the Central Arizona Project regarding canal crossings.</p> <p>L-1c. Provide proof of resolution of land acquisition issues for crossing of Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians tribal lands. SCE shall ascertain the legal requirements for the crossing of Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians tribal lands, and shall provide documentation of the resolution of this issue to the CPUC and the BLM thirty days prior to the start of construction. SCE shall document its coordination with the Tribe and submit specific locations where the Proposed Project will cross tribal lands, and shall include any items that have been agreed to between the SCE and the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians.</p>		<p><u>L-1a: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>L-1b: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>L-1c: Appendix 8 of the DEIR/DEIS includes a December 16, 2005, letter from Thomas J. Davis, Chief Planning Officer of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, to the CPUC and BLM. The letter contends that the "proposed alignment [of the DPV2 project] crosses the exterior boundaries of the [Agua Caliente] Reservation." As a result, the letter asserts that the project required a conditional land use permit under a 1979 tribal ordinance that regulates development of public utilities within the Reservation. The letter concludes by requesting that the CPUC and BLM impose on the project a mitigation measure requiring approval of a Tribal conditional use permit prior to construction of the project.</u></p> <p><u>SCE disagrees with the contention that the proposed alignment of the DPV2 project crosses the exterior boundaries of the reservation. The proposed alignment does cross over the land of one property owned by one or more Agua</u></p>

←E2-56

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

		<p><u>Caliente allottee. However, SCE disagrees that a Tribal conditional use permit is required to cross allotted lands whether such land is located inside or outside the reservation. Under federal law, there are two ways to acquire a right-of-way across allotted Indian lands. The first is a grant of right-of-way by the Secretary of Interior under 25 U.S.C. § 323 and the implementing regulations at 25 CFR Part 169, which require the consent of the landowner (the allottee) but not the tribe. The second is condemnation of allotted lands under 25 U.S.C. § 357. The requirement of a Tribal conditional use permit would be inconsistent with federal law, and is therefore inapplicable and should not be identified as a mitigation measure in the Final EIR/EIS for this project. This conclusion is supported by the prior actions of the agencies in approving the DPV1 project and by federal case law established due to litigation regarding DPV1 crossing tribal allottee lands.</u></p> <p>See, <i>Southern California Edison Co. v. Rice</i>, 685 F.2d 354, 1982 U.S. App. LEXIS 16318 (9th Cir. Cal. 1982) petition for cert. denied, <i>Rice v. Southern California Edison</i>, 460 U.S. 1051, 103 S. Ct. 1497, 75 L. Ed. 2d 929, 1983 U.S. LEXIS 4300, 51 U.S.L.W. 3703 (1983).</p> <p>(" With respect to condemnation actions by state authorities, Congress explicitly afforded no special protection to allotted lands beyond that which land owned in fee already received under the state laws of eminent domain. See 25 U.S.C. § 357. Thus, consistent with its assimilation policy, Congress placed Indian allottees in the same position as any other private landowner <i>vis-a-vis</i> condemnation actions.")</p>
--	--	---

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>L-1d. Coordinate with affected business owners. Where private parking lots serving businesses would be blocked or partially blocked during construction, SCE shall either make prior arrangements with the business owner(s) to provide alternative parking within a reasonable walking distance (i.e., no more than 1,000 feet), or shall coordinate with affected business owners to arrange the construction schedule to ensure that the functions of the business(es) are not disrupted. Thirty days prior to construction, SCE shall submit documentation to the CPUC and the BLM that outlines the course of action that was taken to reduce impacts to businesses near construction areas.</p>		<p><u>L-1d: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>L-1e. Coordinate construction schedule with public and community facilities. SCE shall coordinate with the public and community facilities and services listed below regarding the construction schedule and duration in order to minimize impacts to these land uses. The purpose of this measure is to work with sensitive land uses that would be impacted by construction and to identify construction times/periods that would have the least impact to peak use of these public and community facilities. This coordination could result in limiting or avoiding construction during school sessions, identifying hauling routes that do not conflict with school commute routes, or working with the memorial parks to address funeral procession routes and noise sensitivities. Thirty days prior to construction, SCE shall document its coordination efforts including contact persons, information provided, and comments received, and submit this documentation to the CPUC and BLM.</p> <p>Schools near the project route: Beaumont Middle School and High School, Calvary Christian School, Chavez Elementary School, Terrace View Elementary School, public elementary school on East Canyon Vista Drive San Gorgonio Memorial Park Desert Lawn Memorial Park Banning Municipal Airport Grandview Baptist Church</p>		<p><u>L-1e: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

Agriculture		
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
	L-3. New access road construction will be kept to a minimum. (BLM B 1.2)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>
	L-4. Where feasible, the following additional mitigation measures would be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matching of tower spans • Aligning towers adjacent to or parallel to agricultural field boundaries • Using <u>H-frame towers in the Blythe farmlands. Using either tubular steel pole structures or H-frame towers in all other agricultural fields</u> instead of lattice steel towers to reduce the footprint of the structure <u>with the exception of the Devers-Valley route where lattice towers will be used to match existing towers.</u> • Specific tower placement to avoid span-sensitive features. (SCE) 	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u> ←E2-57
	L-5. Along Link 10 in the Palo Verde Valley, H-frame structures, similar to the existing DPV1 structures, would be installed in this segment to reduce the amount of farmland permanently removed from production and minimize impacts to farm operations. Where feasible, additional mitigation measures would include matching tower spans, and aligning towers adjacent or parallel to field boundaries. (SCE)	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure</u>
	L-6. In the agricultural area of the Palo Verde valley, <u>SCE will coordinate with the Palo Verde Irrigation District to place towers to minimize potential project effects on dredging operations. Towers should be located to allow for canal dredging by the Palo Verde Irrigation District. This could include canal modifications.</u>	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u> ←E2-58

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
<p>AG-1a. Establish agreement and coordinate construction activities with agricultural landowners. Sixty (60) days prior to the start of project construction, Southern California Edison (SCE) shall secure a signed agreement with property owners of Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland) and Williamson Act lands that will be used for construction and operation of the project, access and spur roads, staging areas, and other project-related activities. The purpose of this agreement will be to set forth the use of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Williamson Act lands during construction in order to: (1) schedule proposed construction activities at a location and time when damage to agricultural operations would be minimized, and (2) ensure that any areas damaged or disturbed by construction are restored to a condition mutually agreed upon by the landowner and SCE. SCE shall coordinate with the agricultural landowners in the affected areas where Farmland or Williamson Act land will be temporarily disturbed in order to determine when and where construction should occur in order to minimize damage to agricultural operations. This includes avoiding construction during peak planting, growing, and harvest seasons. If damage or destruction does occur, SCE shall perform restoration activities on the disturbed area in order to return the area to a pre-determined condition or the pre-construction condition, whichever option is agreed upon by the landowner and SCE. This could include activities such as soil preparation, regrading, and reseeding. This measure applies to agricultural landowners with land that is impacted by the Proposed Project. SCE shall provide proof of the continued use of Farmland and/or Williamson Act lands through the submittal of a signed agreement between an individual property owner and SCE. The signed agreements shall be submitted to the CPUC and BLM for review and approval prior to the start of construction.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

L-1a. Prepare Construction Notification Plan.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
<p>AG-4a. <u>Locate transmission towers and pulling/splicing stations to avoid agricultural operations.</u> SCE shall site transmission towers and pulling/splicing stations in locations that minimize impacts to active agricultural operations. Specifically, SCE shall comply with the following measures when siting transmission towers and splicing/pulling stations within areas where active cultivated farmland would be removed through the presence of structures:</p> <p>SCE shall avoid orchards, vineyards, row crops, and furrow-irrigated crops where towers would interfere with irrigation and harvest activities, <u>where feasible.</u></p> <p>SCE shall minimize impacts to irrigation canals and ditches, <u>where feasible.</u></p> <p>SCE shall align towers adjacent to field boundaries and parallel to rows (if located in row crops), and shall avoid diagonal orientations and angular alignments within agricultural land, <u>where feasible.</u></p> <p>SCE shall match tower spans with existing DPV1 towers within agricultural land, <u>where feasible.</u></p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined</u></p>	←E2-59
<p>L-6. In the agricultural area of the Palo Verde valley, SCE will coordinate with the Palo Verde Irrigation District to place towers to minimize potential project effects on dredging operations.</p> <p><u>Towers should be located to allow for canal dredging by the Palo Verde Irrigation District. This could include canal modifications.</u></p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined</u></p>	←E2-60
Transportation and Traffic			
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
	<p>A-7. Site construction workers would be staged offsite at or near paved intersections and workers would be shuttled in crew vehicles to construction sites. As part of the construction contract, SCE would require bidders to submit a construction transportation plan describing how workers would travel to the job site.</p>	<p><u>All workers will report to marshalling yards to minimize trips to the construction sites. SCE does not consider marshalling yards part of the construction site. SCE considers the work site to be on the right-of-way.</u></p>	←E2-61

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

	V-3. At all highway and recreation routes-of-travel crossings, including the Colorado River, towers will be placed at the maximum feasible distance, and when feasible, [except in locations where matching existing tower spacing is deemed appropriate]. (BLM B-6.3) [From "and where feasible," the BLM text reads "...at right angles, from the crossing." SCE has replaced this phrase in the bracketed text.]	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	V-10. At all highway and recreation routes-of-travel crossings, including the I-10 crossing, towers would be placed at the maximum feasible distance, except in locations where matching existing tower spacing is deemed appropriate, and when feasible, at 90 degree angles from the crossing.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
T-7a. Repair roadways damaged by construction activities. If roadways, sidewalks, medians, curbs, shoulders, or other such features are damaged by the project's construction activities, as determined by the CPUC Environmental Monitor or the affected public agency, SCE shall coordinate repairs with the affected public agencies and ensure that any such damage is repaired to the pre-construction condition within 30 days from the end of the construction period.		<u>SCE requests for more time to coordinate repairs with the affected public agencies since engineering and permit acquisition can take longer than 30 days. SCE requests at least 60 days. Also SCE requests a definition of "construction period".</u>	←E2-62
L-1e. Coordinate with business owners.		<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
Public Health and Safety			
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
	P-1. Soil contamination <u>could as a result from of</u> improper handling and/or storage of hazardous materials during construction activities	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u>	←E2-63
	P-2. Residual pesticides and or herbicides could be encountered during grading or excavation in agricultural areas	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	P-3. Previously unknown contamination could be encountered during grading or excavation	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	P-4. Soil contamination could result from accidental spill or release of hazardous materials during operations and maintenance	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>Best Management Practices, as identified in the project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and the Hazardous Substances Control and Emergency Response Plan, shall be implemented during the construction of the project to minimize the risk of an accidental release and provide the necessary information for emergency response.</p> <p>P-1c. Ensure proper disposal of construction waste <u>including all non-hazardous</u> construction and demolition waste including trash, litter, garbage <u>and</u> other solid waste. Petroleum products <u>and</u> other potentially hazardous materials shall be removed to a hazardous waste facility permitted or otherwise authorized to treat, store, or dispose of such materials.</p> <p>P-1d. Maintain emergency spill supplies and equipment. Hazardous material spill kits shall be maintained at all construction sites for small spills. This shall include oil-absorbent material, tarps, and storage drums to be used to contain and control any minor releases. Emergency spill supplies and equipment shall be kept adjacent to all work areas and staging areas, and shall be clearly marked. Detailed information for responding to accidental spills and for handling any resulting hazardous materials shall be provided in the project's Hazardous Substances Control and Emergency Response Plan.</p>		<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p>	<p>←E2-64</p>
--	--	--	---------------

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>P-2a. Identify pesticide/herbicide contamination. Soil samples shall be collected in construction areas where the land has historically or is currently being farmed to identify the possibility of and to delineate the extent of pesticide and/or herbicide contamination. Excavated materials containing elevated levels of pesticide or herbicide will require special handling and disposal procedures. Standard dust suppression procedures (as defined in Mitigation Measure AQ-1a) shall be used in construction areas to reduce airborne emissions of these contaminants and reduce the risk of exposure to workers and the public. Regulatory agencies for the states of Arizona or California (as appropriate) and the appropriate county shall be contacted to provide oversight regarding the handling, treatment, and/or disposal options.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>P-3a. Observe exposed soil for evidence of contamination. During grading or excavation work, the construction contractor shall observe the exposed soil for visual evidence of contamination. If visual contamination indicators are observed during construction, the contractor shall stop work until the material is properly characterized and appropriate measures are taken to protect human health and the environment. The contractor shall comply with all local, State, and federal requirements for sampling and testing, and subsequent removal, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials. Additionally, in the event that evidence of contamination is observed, the contractor shall document the exact location of the contamination and shall immediately notify the CPUC or BLM, describing proposed actions. A weekly report listing encounters with contaminated soils and describing actions taken shall be submitted to the CPUC or BLM.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>P-4a. Prepare Spill Prevention, Countermeasure, and Control Plans. To minimize, avoid, and/or clean up unforeseen spill of hazardous materials during operation of the proposed facilities, SCE shall update or prepare, if necessary, the Spill Prevention, Countermeasure, and Control plan for each substation, series capacitors, and the switchyard. SCE shall document compliance by providing a copy of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures plans to the CPUC or BLM, as appropriate, for review and approval at least 60 days before the start of operation.</p>		<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
Socioeconomics			
EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
<p>S-2a. Recycle construction waste. To comply with the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, during project construction SCE and/or its construction contractor shall recycle a minimum of 50 percent of the waste generated during construction activities. Prior to the start of construction, SCE shall provide the CPUC/BLM with a letter explaining how it will comply with this requirement.</p>		<p><u>SCE believes that the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 applies to municipal governments and not to projects such as DPV2. The project area encompasses nearly 300 miles including over 200 miles in the desert area. SCE believes it would be onerous to require SCE to recycle 50% of the waste generated during DPV2 construction activities. SCE will maintain recycling containers wherever feasible and will recycle steel and other construction materials whenever feasible. SCE requests that this mitigation measure be revised.</u></p>	←E2-65
Air Quality			
BLM Right-of-Way Grant	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment	
	<p>A-1. Heavy duty off-road diesel engines would be properly tuned and maintained to manufacturers' specifications to ensure minimum emissions under normal operations. (SCE)</p>	<p><u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>	
	<p>A-2. Water or chemical dust suppressants would be applied to unstabilized disturbed areas and/or unpaved roadways in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface, <u>where needed.</u></p>	<p><u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined</u></p>	←E2-66

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

	A-3. Water or water-based chemical additives would be used in such quantities to control dust on areas with extensive traffic including unpaved access roads; water, organic polymers, lignin compounds, or conifer resin compounds would be used depending on availability, cost, and soil type.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	A-4. Surfaces permanently disturbed by construction activities would be covered or treated with a dust suppressant after completion of activities at each site of disturbance, <u>where needed.</u>	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined</u>	← E2-67
	A-5. Vehicle speeds on unpaved roadways would be restricted to 15 miles per hour <u>where required to minimize dust, depending on the condition of the road.</u>	<u>SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined</u>	← E2-68
	A-6. Vehicles hauling dirt would be covered with tarps or by other means.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	A-7. Site construction workers would be staged offsite at or near paved intersections and workers would be shuttled in crew vehicles to construction sites. As part of the construction contract, SCE would require bidders to submit a construction transportation plan describing how workers would travel to the job site.	<u>All workers will report to marshalling yards to minimize trips to the construction sites. SCE does not consider marshalling yards part of the construction site. SCE considers the work site to be on the right-of-way.</u>	← E2-69
	A-8. Emissions credits would be purchased to offset any emissions levels which are over the emissions thresholds.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	A-9. Visible emission from all heavy duty off road diesel equipment shall not exceed 40 percent opacity for more than three minutes in any hour of operation.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	
	A-10. A comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all heavy-duty off road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) than will be used an aggregate of 40 hours per week or more during the duration of the construction project will be submitted to the Districts.	<u>SCE has no comment on this measure.</u>	

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

EIR/EIS	Applicant Proposed Mitigation Measures	Comment
<p>AQ-1a. Develop and Implement a Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan. SCE shall develop and implement a Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan (FDECP) for construction work. Measures to be incorporated into the plan include, but are not limited to the APMs (A-1 and A-5 through A-7) and the following, which also incorporate and revise the requirements of APMs A-2 through A-4 to make them definitive and enforceable:</p> <p>CARB certified non-toxic soil binders shall be applied to all active unpaved roadways, unpaved staging areas, and unpaved parking area(s) throughout construction (as allowed by responsible agencies such as the USFWS) in amounts meeting manufacturer's recommendations to meet the CARB certification fugitive dust reduction efficiency of 84 percent.</p> <p>Water the disturbed areas of the active construction sites, where CARB certified soil binders have not been applied, at least three times per day.</p> <p>Enclose, cover, water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders according to manufacturer's specifications to exposed piles with a five percent or greater silt content.</p> <p>Install wheel washers/cleaners or wash the wheels of trucks and other heavy equipment where vehicles exit the site or unpaved access roads and sweep paved streets daily with water sweepers if visible soil material from the construction sites or unpaved access roads are carried onto adjacent public streets.</p> <p>Establish a vegetative ground cover or allow natural revegetation to occur on temporarily disturbed areas following the completion of construction (in compliance with biological resources impact mitigation measures), or otherwise create stabilized surfaces on all unpaved areas at each of the construction sites within 21 days after active construction operations have ceased.</p> <p>Increase the frequency of watering, or implement other additional fugitive dust mitigation measures, to all disturbed fugitive dust emission sources when wind speeds (as instantaneous wind gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour (mph).</p>		<p><u>Please refer to Section 1.0 (Arizona Impacts) and Section 2.0 (Fugitive Emissions Dust Control Plan) of Attachment A for SCE comments on Measure AQ-1a.</u></p>

←E2-70

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>Travel route planning will be completed to identify required travel routes to minimize unpaved road travel to each construction site to the extent feasible.</p>		
<p>AQ-1b. Use ultra low-sulfur diesel fuel. CARB-certified ultra low-sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel containing 15 ppm sulfur or less shall be used in all diesel-powered construction equipment.</p>		<p><u>AQ-1b: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>AQ-1c. Restrict engine idling. Diesel engine idle time shall be restricted to no more than a 10 minutes duration.</p>		<p><u>AQ-1c: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>AQ-1d. Use lower emitting offroad diesel-fueled equipment. All off road construction diesel engines not registered under CARB's Statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program, which have a rating of 50 hp or more, shall meet, at a minimum, the Tier 2 California Emission Standards for Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines as specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, section 2423(b)(1) unless that such engine is not available for a particular item of equipment. In the event a Tier 2 engine is not available for any offroad engine larger than 100 hp, that engine shall be equipped with a Tier 1 engine. In the event a Tier 1 engine is not available for any offroad engine larger than 100 hp, that engine shall be equipped with a catalyzed diesel particulate filter (soot filter), unless certified by engine manufacturers that the use of such devices is not practical for specific engine types. Equipment properly registered under and in compliance with CARB's Statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program are considered to comply with this mitigation measure.</p>		<p><u>AQ-1d: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p>
<p>AQ-1e. Use onroad vehicles that meet California onroad standards. All onroad construction vehicles working within California shall meet all applicable California onroad emission standards and shall be licensed in the State of California. This does not apply to construction worker personal vehicles.</p>		<p><u>AQ-1e: SCE has no comment on this measure</u></p>

←E2-70
 cont.

Comment Set E2
 Southern California Edison Company

DPV2 DEIR/DEIS – SCE COMMENTS ON MITIGATION MEASURES - THIRD SCE SET OF COMMENTS AUGUST 2006
 (SCE Comments Shown in Bold and Underlined)

<p>AQ-1f. Use lower emitting offroad gasoline-fueled equipment. All offroad stationary and portable gasoline powered equipment shall have EPA Phase 1/Phase 2 compliant engines, where the specific engine requirement shall be based on the new engine standard in effect two years prior to the initiating project construction.</p> <p>AQ-1g. Reduce helicopter use during construction. Helicopter use shall be limited to that necessary for conductor installation, using helicopters of the smallest practical size. Helicopters shall not be used for delivering supplies or personnel within any federal or State criteria pollutant nonattainment areas except as otherwise specified by the CPUC or BLM.</p>		<p><u>AQ-1f: SCE has no comment on this measure.</u></p> <p><u>AQ-1g: SCE requests that Measure AQ-1g c be removed. Due to the expanse of the project, helicopters are needed for transporting workers and supplies. Helicopter use will also be required in environmentally sensitive areas to minimize impacts.</u></p>	<p>←E2-71</p>
<p>AQ-1h. <u>When feasible</u>, schedule deliveries outside of peak hours. For marshalling and construction yards west of the eastern border of the City of Indio, all material deliveries to the yards and from the yards to the construction sites shall be scheduled to occur outside of peak "rush hour" traffic hours (7:00 to 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 7:00 pm) to the extent feasible, and other truck trips during peak traffic hours shall be minimized to the extent feasible.</p> <p>AQ-1i. Obtain NOx emission offsets. SCE shall obtain NOx emission reduction credits or offsets in sufficient quantities to offset construction emissions of NOx that exceed the South Coast Air Basin ozone nonattainment area federal General Conformity Rule applicability threshold as determined in the General Conformity analysis for the project. The emission offset method shall comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations, and offsets shall be obtained by SCE prior to construction.</p>		<p><u>AQ-1h: SCE requests revisions be made to this measure as shown to the left in bold and underlined.</u></p> <p><u>AQ-1i: Please refer to Section 3.0 (2008 On-Roads/Off-Road emissions within the South Coast Air Basin) and Section 4.0 (Localized Significance Thresholds) Impacts) and Section 2.0 (Fugitive Emissions Dust Control Plan) of Attachment A for comments on Measures AQ-1h, AQ 1i, AQ-1e, AQ-1f and AQ 1-g.</u></p>	<p>←E2-72</p>

Comment Set E2, cont.
Southern California Edison Company

**ATTACHMENT A TO SCE COMMENTS ON THE DPV2 DEIR/DEIS
AIR QUALITY MITIGATION MEASURES**

E2-73

Section 1.0: Arizona Impacts

In Draft EIR/EIS Sections D.11.3.1, D.11.4.1 and D.11.4.2 “significance” thresholds of 250 tpy are used for characterizing impacts in Arizona. As correctly noted in Section D.11.3.1, Arizona has not established “significance” threshold for use in NEPA analyses. The only regulatory thresholds in Arizona for industrial activity are typically for stationary sources causing emissions at single locations. There are no generally used regulatory thresholds for short-term construction activities occurring over many dispersed locations within an airshed in Arizona. Arizona’s air regulations generally rely on the use of fugitive dust rules and dust control permits to regulate short-term construction activities. Thus, the use of a 250 tpy threshold for determining NEPA “significance” has no basis in any Arizona regulatory or policy document. Further, 40 CFR 51.853(b) and 40 CFR Part 93.153(b) do not contain any conformity determination thresholds for areas that are in attainment of all standards.

While the comment in the previous paragraph is equally applicable to Maricopa County, it is particularly important in the context of Section D.11.4.2 which concludes that construction related PM10 emissions above 250 tpy in La Paz County can be “potentially significant.” The general intent of the NEPA process is to verify that projects do not interfere with local air quality plans or contribute to violations of ambient air quality standards. Section D.11.4.2 does not provide any demonstration that this project will interfere with local plans or that it will contribute to violations of ambient standards. A review of relevant documents shows that this project does not violate air quality requirements in La Paz County. First, nothing in the local plans (the Arizona State Implementation Plan in the case of La Paz County) prohibits construction nor do they have any quantitative thresholds for construction related PM10 emissions. Thus, as long as the project complies with fugitive dust requirements in AAC R18-2- Article 6, it will not violate local air quality requirements. Second, PM10 emissions from this project will not cause or contribute to violations of the PM10 standard. La Paz County is well in compliance with PM10 standards – so much so that ADEQ does not even conduct monitoring in La Paz County. In addition, because all the construction related emissions will not occur at any single location but will be distributed over many different locations, there is no possibility of any “hot spot” type of a situation. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to conclude that the project will not interfere with air quality plans nor will it contribute to any ambient standard violations in La Paz County.

Based on the explanation provided, the conclusion of “potentially significant” in Section D.11.4.2 is unjustified and should be appropriately modified. Using the conclusion of “potentially significant,” Section D.11.4.2 proceeds to list a set of “mitigation” measures. Since, as argued above, there will be no violations of local air quality standards the need for “mitigation” measures over and above local dust control requirements is not justified for Arizona locations. The next comment expands this observation further.

Comment Set E2, cont.
Southern California Edison Company

Section 2.0: Fugitive Emissions Dust Control Plan

E2-73

Mitigation Measure AQ-1a on Page D.11-41 mandates (“...SCE “shall”...”) that SCE should create a Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan (FEDCP) for use in construction work in all air quality jurisdictions that DPV2 will traverse. A list of “definitive and enforceable” measures is also provided.

SCE and its contractors will fully comply with all local dust control rules. These include ADEQ R18-2-Article 6; MCAQD Rule 301, 310, 310.01; MDAQMD Rules 401-403; and SCAQMD Rules 401-403.1. Each of these rules contains dust control requirements that are specific to the particular air quality control region. The list provided in the Draft EIR/EIS is not necessarily consistent with the region-specific control measures. The list also imposes unnecessarily stringent and restrictive control requirements in areas that are in compliance with all air quality standards. For example, the requirement to use wheel washers does not feature in existing dust control requirements for La Paz County. In addition, some local dust control requirements contain a menu of control options rather than restrictive single control mandates.¹

SCE and its contractors will have to comply with all local control requirements, and in some cases, have to procure local dust control permits² before commencing activities. Local regulators will issue stringent penalties for any instances of non-compliance. Thus, local requirements are already “definitive” and most definitely “enforceable.” Creating a separate FEDCP as suggested in the Draft EIR/EIS is redundant, will result in conflicting requirements and additional paperwork burdens in return for limited air quality benefit. In addition, it is not clear who would “enforce” the requirements provided in the Draft EIR/EIS – inspectors from local air agencies would have the authority to enforce only those regulations adopted by their specific jurisdictions.

For this project, the only areas where CEQA “mitigation” measures are relevant are those within the South Coast and Salton Sea Air Basins. For these areas, complying with SCAQMD Rules 403 and 403.1 is equivalent to complying with the measures proposed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Thus, re-writing Mitigation Measure AQ-1a to specify that SCE should comply with all local air quality dust control standards and permitting requirements will achieve the overall goal of ensuring that the project will not interfere with local air quality plans. By averting the imposition of redundant conditions, this approach will also help to reduce the ultimate costs of construction.

¹ For example, see Tables 1-20 in MCAQD, rule 310. MDAQMD Rule 403 specifies “reasonable precautions,” as do regulations in ADEQ R18-2-Article 6. SCAQMD Rule 403(d)(5) provides a menu of options for reducing trackout emissions.

² For example, MCAQD Rule 310/Section 303.1 requires dust control permits for sites over 0.1 acre in surface area. SCAQMD Rule 403.1 requires that an approved dust control plan is needed for disturbed surface areas greater than 5,000 square feet in Coachella Valley.

Comment Set E2, cont. Southern California Edison Company

Section 3.0: 2008 On-road/Off-road emissions within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB)

E2-73

On-road Heavy Duty

The first table in Page Ap.9-14 lists a 2008 mileage of 652,602 for Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDV) within SCAB. The derivation of this number is not self-evident from the information provided in Appendix 9. The sum of HDV mileage for West of Devers (WOD) in 2008 as calculated in Page Ap.9-12 is 323,492. Assuming that **all** equipment for the East of Devers (EOD) segments originates and ends in the Port of Los Angeles, some of the East of Devers emissions would be emitted in SCAB. Assuming that East bound equipment deliveries emit for 200 miles into SCAB (assuming a 1-way distance of 100 miles from Port of LA to western boundary of SCAB), and 982 total 2008 trips (as assumed on page Ap.9-6), an additional 196,560 miles would have to be added to the WOD total. This leads to a sum of 520,052 miles within SCAB, which is significantly lesser than the value of 652,602 on Page Ap. 9-14.

The assumption that all major equipment deliveries originate at the Port of Los Angeles is overly conservative. It would be more reasonable to assume that half the deliveries originate from Phoenix. This would reduce the EOD delivery traffic mileage in SCAB from 196,560 miles to about 98,280 miles.

On road construction vehicle mileage

The assumptions for on-road mileage traveled by heavy and medium duty vehicles are provided in the table on page Ap.9-8. The assumption for heavy duty is 8,125 trips and for medium duty is 15,517 trips. The round trip mileage for both types of vehicles is assumed to be 30 miles. The number of trips is overly conservative. They are almost the same as the number of trips assumed for EOD construction (see Page Ap.9-6). Clearly, EOD segments will involve a much higher degree of construction activity. The assumed number of trips for WOD should be reduced by at least three quarters.

Miscellaneous/Support/Passenger vehicle mileage

Vehicular mileage assumptions provided on pages Ap.9-7 and Ap.9-8 include an exhaustive and sometimes duplicative listing. Specifically, “support” activities (78,000 miles on Page Ap.9-7), and “miscellaneous” (10,000 miles for heavy duty and 46,980 miles for medium duty) are redundant. Other entries already include activities which might be classified as “support” or “miscellaneous,” namely, sanitary waste, fuel transportation, dump trucks, shuttling, etc. Therefore, the entries for “miscellaneous” and “support” should be removed.

For passenger vehicles, 100 mile round trips are assumed for 9 people for every working day in 2008. This is an overly conservative assumption. First, while on some days 9 people may be traveling on purely WOD related activities for 100 miles, on most days only a few will be traveling, likely for distances less than 100 miles. Second, even if the project was not going to be built, some or all of the same 9 people would be traveling on other work related activities. Such travel is already incorporated into the SCAQMD’s vehicular emissions projections and would occur regardless of WOD activities.

Comment Set E2, cont.
 Southern California Edison Company

Making the changes discussed above changes the annual emissions totals for all pollutants. The effect on NOx emissions is provided below.

E2-73

NOx emissions in SCAB 2008

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Miles</i>	<i>NOx lbs/year</i>
Heavy Duty		
Steel	62,400	2,024
Material delivery sites	11,700	380
Concrete	36,373	1,180
Waste	0	0
Steel	1,963	64
Conductors	7,120	231
Wood	10,331	335
Dump Trucks	18,750	608
<i>Misc</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Equipment delivery	8,000	260
Equipment Shuttle	865	28
Fuel Transport	730	24
Water Transport	5,740	186
<i>On road Construction Eq.</i>	<i>74,760</i>	<i>2,425</i>
<i>EOD Traffic</i>	<i>98,280</i>	<i>3,188</i>
TOTAL HEAVY	337,012	10,934
Medium Duty		
<i>Support</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
Fueling	26,000	603
<i>On road Construction Eq.</i>	<i>142,935</i>	<i>3,316</i>
Sanitary Waste	7,500	174
<i>Misc. Deliveries</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
	176,435	4,093
Passenger Vehicles		1,120
TOTAL NOx lbs		16,147
TOTAL 2008 NOx tons		8.07

As indicated in the table above, the total on-road/off-road NOx emissions in SCAB for 2008 can be reasonably calculated to be 8.07 tons. The calculations in the Draft EIR/EIS come out to 16.07 tons (see Page Ap.9-14). When carried through, the annual emissions for 2008 in SCAB can reasonably be calculated to be 25 tpy, rather than the 33 tpy calculated in the draft EIR/EIS. The result of this calculation is that the project will be compliant with the General Conformity threshold of 25 tpy. Finally, it should be pointed out that some overly conservative assumptions were also identified in the off-road emission calculations. With more appropriate assumptions, the total 2008 NOx emissions within SCAB would be reduced even further below the 25 tpy threshold. Thus, the Draft EIR/EIS should be appropriately modified to indicate that the 25 tpy threshold will not be exceeded in SCAB.

Comment Set E2, cont.
Southern California Edison Company

Section 4.0: Localized Significance Thresholds

Potential localized construction impacts are discussed on Page D.11-45 of the Draft EIR/EIS, with calculations provided in Table D.11-20. A key assumption in these calculations is the distance of the closest receptor. The Draft EIR/EIS uses a receptor distance of 25 meters, and concludes that there will be “significant and unavoidable” localized PM10 impact from the project. This is an unreasonably extreme conclusion. A receptor distance of 25 meters is certainly not a good assumption for all construction sites within the SCAQMD jurisdiction. A receptor distance of 50 meters is a good assumption for the vast majority of sites. At a distance of 50 meters, the calculated PM 10 emissions (10.37 lbs/day in Table D.11-20) will be lesser than the relevant threshold (11 lbs/day from Table C-4 in the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology document of the SCAQMD). The discussion on page D.11-45 should be revised to indicate that localized impacts will not be necessarily significant in all areas of SCAQMD. In some stretches, project construction may occur in close proximity to residential areas (e.g. around San Bernardino and Vista Substations). In those areas, SCE’s compliance with Rule 403 dust control requirements will ensure that there will be no interference with air quality plans nor will there be any nuisance dust generated.

E2-73

Responses to Comment Set E2 Southern California Edison Company

- E2-1 SCE's comments regarding the origin of APM G-1 are noted. Note that the Indio Aggregates, Hot Mix and Recycling Facility owned by Granite Construction Incorporated is located within the Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation segment as described in Section D.4.2.7 of the EIR/EIS. In addition, as acknowledged by Impact L-2 in EIR/EIS Section D.4.6.7, Proposed Project construction would temporarily disturb the land uses it traverses or adjacent land uses within the Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation segment, including the Granite Construction site. These impacts are classified as significant, but mitigable with the implementation of Mitigation Measure L-1a (Prepare Construction Notification Plan), which requires SCE to coordinate its construction activities with the affected land uses to ensure that construction conflicts are minimized. Therefore, although APM G-1's intent is to minimize disruptions to any active mining operations, the EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure L-1a has been proposed to help further ensure that disruptions are minimized as well.
- E2-2 APM G-2 in Table D.13-11 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Geology, Mineral Resources, and Soils) and in Table B-15 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:
- Individual Transmission towers will not be sited on nor straddle the mapped traces of any known fault that has been designated active or potentially active. In areas where known faults are present, the Holder will visually check the tower site area before clearing, and will check the tower footing holes for any trace of a previously unmapped fault. If manifestations of a fault are found, construction will immediately stop at that site and the Holder will consult with the Holder's Geologist and the BLM Authorized Officer. The Holder's Geologist and the BLM Authorized Officer will determine if it is a fault trace and if so, will ascertain if it is active, potentially active, or inactive.
- E2-3 APM G-3 in Table D.13-11 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Geology, Mineral Resources, and Soils) and in Table B-15 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:
- Where this is not feasible, the Holder will incorporate slack spans to bridge the fault(s) such that the projected lateral surface displacement, as forecast by the Holder's geologist Geologist and accepted by the BLM Authorized Officer, will not structurally affect the associated towers.
- E2-4 APM G-4 in Table D.13-11 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Geology, Mineral Resources, and Soils) and in Table B-15 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:
- ~~Appropriate tower design will be used to mitigate the potential for very strong seismic groundshaking.~~ In general, an appropriate tower design, which accounts for lateral wind loads and conductor loads, ~~during line stringing~~ exceeds any credible seismic loading (groundshaking).

E2-5 APM G-6 in Table D.13-11 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Geology, Mineral Resources, and Soils) and in Table B-15 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

Wherever ~~possible~~ feasible to minimize the potential for slope instability, towers will be located to avoid gullies or active drainages, and over-steepened slopes.

E2-6 APM G-7 in Table D.13-11 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Geology, Mineral Resources, and Soils) and in Table B-15 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

SCE will provide a list of sites where helicopter construction is recommended. The Authorized Officer may require, on a site-specific basis, helicopter assisted construction in sensitive areas. Sensitive areas are those that exhibit both (1) high erosion potential and/or slope instability; and (2) a lack of existing ~~access-stub~~ roads within a reasonable distance of the tower site (~~generally no more than ¼ mile~~), or existing access that is not suitable for upgrading to accommodate conventional tower construction or line stringing equipment, and where it is determined that, after field review, the issues of erosion and/or slope instability cannot be successfully mitigated through implementation of accepted engineering practices.

E2-7 APM G-8 in Table D.13-11 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Geology, Mineral Resources, and Soils) and in Table B-15 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

Mitigation of potentially significant impacts to the western end of the proposed transmission line due to (1) potential surface fault rupture along the Banning, Mission Creek, and Mecca Hills faults, and (2) potential for severe seismic shaking can be achieved by standard design methods listed below:

a. Individual Towers will be sited so as not to straddle active fault traces.

E2-8 Please refer to Response E2-59 regarding the addition of “to the extent feasible.” Mitigation Measure G-1a in Section D.13.6.1 and throughout the EIR/EIS has been modified as follows:

G-1a Protect desert pavement. Grading for new access roads or work areas in areas covered by desert pavement shall be avoided if possible. If avoidance of these areas is not possible, the desert pavement surface shall be protected from damage or disturbance from construction vehicles by use of temporary mats on the surface, ~~or by other suitable means.~~

E2-9 Mitigation Measure G-2a in Section D.13.6.1 and throughout the EIR/EIS has been modified as follows:

G-2a Conduct geotechnical studies for ~~problematic~~ soils to assess characteristics and aid in appropriate foundation design.

E2-10 Mitigation Measure G-5a in Section D.13.6.3 and throughout the EIR/EIS has been modified as follows:

G-5a Protect Design project facilities to avoid impact from ground failure.

E2-11 APM G-12 in Table D.13-11 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Geology, Mineral Resources, and Soils) and in Table B-15 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

Side casting of soil during grading will be minimized. Excess soil and excavated soil will be properly stabilized or, ~~if necessary, end hauled to an approved disposal site dispersed around tower construction sites or on stub or access roads.~~

E2-12 Please refer to Response E2-8.

E2-13 Please refer to Response E2-9.

E2-14 Please refer to Response E2-10.

E2-15 APM W-5 in Table D.12-3 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Hydrology and Water Resources) and in Table B-14 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

Towers will be located to the extent feasible to avoid active drainage channels, especially downstream of steep hillslope areas, to minimize the potential for damage by flash flooding and mud and debris flows

E2-16 APM W-6 in Table D.12-3 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Hydrology and Water Resources) and in Table B-14 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

Diversion dikes or other structural enhancements will be required to divert runoff around a tower structure if (a) the location in an active channel cannot be avoided; and (b) where there is a very significant flood scour/deposition threat, unless specifically exempted by the BLM Authorized Officer.

E2-17 Mitigation Measure H-6a in Section D.12.7.1 (and other occurrences of this text) has been modified as follows:

H-6a Design diversion dikes or other site remediations to avoid damage to adjacent property.

E2-18 The comment that additional surveys are scheduled to be performed in Spring 2007 has been noted.

E2-19 The EIR/EIS preparers used the APMs as written by SCE in its PEA and did not change the language of these APMs when they were presented in the EIR/EIS. Where an APM did not fully help mitigate particular impacts to less than significant levels, the EIR/EIS preparers recommended specific mitigation measures associated with each significant impact (as applicable) to supplement the APMs and help reduce impacts. Therefore, the EIR/EIS preparers can accept changes the language of SCE's APMs only in cases where these changes do not affect the impact analysis completed in the EIR/EIS. In the case of APM B-14, the change was not made. Note that Section D.2 (Biological Resources) provides thorough analysis of Proposed Project impacts and applicable mitigation measure for biological resources.

- E2-20 SCE had no comments on this measure, but only notes that there are different requirements for Arizona and California and SCE may be required to buy Arizona plants of this type.
- E2-21 Please refer to Response E2-19 regarding edits to APMs that were proposed by SCE as part of the Proposed Project. APM B-11 has not been changed. Note that Section D.2 (Biological Resources) provides thorough analysis of Proposed Project impacts and applicable mitigation measure for biological resources.
- E2-22 Please refer to Response E2-19 regarding edits to APMs that were proposed by SCE as part of the Proposed Project. APM B-12 has not been changed. Note that Section D.2 (Biological Resources), provides thorough analysis of Proposed Project impacts and applicable mitigation measure for biological resources.
- E2-23 Please refer to Response E2-59 regarding the addition of “to the greatest extent feasible.”
- E2-24 The requirement that SCE “coordinate with the BLM and USFWS” does mean the Kofa NWR, with respect to the USFWS.

Hydroseeding or drill seeding with native desert plants does work if planned correctly, (i.e., timing and good seed choice) and has been required on other BLM projects in the region. However, the Mitigation Measure B-1a (Prepare and implement a Habitat Restoration/Compensation Plan) in Section D.2.6.1.1 will be modified as follows to allow flexibility in the use of restoration techniques:

B-1a Prepare and implement a Habitat Restoration/Compensation Plan. SCE shall restore all areas disturbed by project construction, including temporary disturbance areas around tower construction sites, laydown/staging areas, temporary access and spur roads, and existing tower locations that are removed during construction of the Proposed Project. Where onsite restoration is planned for mitigation of temporary impacts to sensitive vegetation communities, SCE shall identify a qualified Habitat Restoration Specialist to be approved by the CPUC/BLM. Hydroseeding, drill seeding, or an otherwise approved restoration technique shall be utilized on all disturbed surfaces using a locally endemic native seed mix approved by the CPUC/CDFG/ADGF/FWS and BLM (on BLM lands). SCE shall flag the limits of disturbance at each construction site. In project areas that occur in the WRCMSHCP plan area, SCE shall use the applicable Best Management Practices identified in the WRCMSHCP.

- E2-25 The 500 area around each tower is not intended to be a buffer where activities cannot occur. The 500 foot area is intended to ensure that vehicles do not stop or drive in areas that support populations of noxious weeds. The mitigation will be clarified to this effect. Previous BLM projects have required that all known populations of noxious weeds be flagged for avoidance along access roads to prevent the spread or establishment of new populations. The weed list utilized by the project would consist of the BLM and ADA list for noxious plants.

Mitigation, including washing vehicles before and after entering all project sites, has been utilized on previous projects to reduce the potential for the spread of noxious weeds. However, the mitigation has been modified to indicate that washing vehicles will occur unless otherwise authorized by the BLM. In addition, in response to the USFWS the mitigation has been modified to address their concerns regarding weed abatement in the Coachella Valley Preserve. Mitigation Measures B-2a and B-2b in Section D.2.6.1.2 have been modified as follows:

B-2a Conduct invasive and noxious weed inventory. SCE shall survey the project corridor, including access roads, for populations of invasive and noxious weeds prior to the start of construction. All populations of invasive and noxious weeds located along access or spur roads within 500 feet of each tower location shall be flagged prior to construction unless otherwise directed by the BLM.

B-2b Implement control measures for invasive and noxious weeds. SCE shall adhere to the BLM management guidelines for reducing the potential for the introduction of noxious weeds and invasive, non-native plant species ~~on the BLM lands~~ by implementation of the following standards:

- **Wash all equipment and vehicles.** Vehicles and all equipment must be washed BEFORE AND AFTER entering all project sites unless otherwise directed in writing by the BLM. This includes wheels, undercarriages, bumpers and all parts of the vehicle. In addition, all tools such as chain saws, hand clippers, pruners, etc., must also be washed BEFORE AND AFTER entering all project sites. For example, vehicles traveling into contaminated areas are the main dispersal mechanism for yellow star-thistle. All washing must take place where rinse water is collected and disposed of in either a sanitary sewer or a landfill.
- **Keep written logs.** When vehicles and equipment are washed, a daily log must be kept stating the location, date and time, types of equipment, methods used and staff present. The log shall contain the signature of the responsible crewmember.
- **Written logs will be available** for CPUC/BLM inspection and shall be turned in to BLM on a weekly basis.
- **Post-construction weed abatement on the Coachella Valley Preserve. Post-construction follow-up weed abatement will be conducted on the work areas within the Coachella Valley Preserve and Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. Weed abatement will be conducted during the spring following construction and prior to when the weeds establish flowers or produce seeds.**

E2-26 This measure is intended to address both impacts to common and sensitive nesting birds. The 500 foot buffer is common practice and is routinely implemented for projects in California. The 500 foot buffer is intended to ensure that impacts to sensitive species do not occur. This distance, however, is site dependent and may change based on existing conditions including ambient noise, level of disturbance, and site topography. For common birds this buffer can be reduced; however, for listed species this distance protects SCE from having incidental “Take” of a listed species. Mitigation Measure B-5a for Impact B-5 (Construction activities during the breeding season would result in a potential loss of nesting birds) in Section D.2.6.1.5 has been modified to reflect that difference:

B-5a Conduct pre-construction surveys and monitoring for breeding birds. SCE shall conduct protocol level surveys for nesting birds if construction activities are scheduled to occur during the breeding season for raptors and other migratory birds. Surveys shall be conducted in areas within 500 feet of tower sites, laydown/staging areas, substation sites, and access road/spur road locations. SCE shall be responsible for designating a CPUC/BLM-approved qualified biologist who can conduct pre-construction surveys and monitoring for breeding birds. If State or federally listed birds ~~If breeding birds~~ with active nests are found, a biological monitor shall establish a 500-foot buffer around the nest and no activities will be allowed within the buffer until the young have fledged from the nest or the nest

fails. The biological monitor shall conduct regular monitoring of the nest to determine success/failure and to ensure that project activities are not conducted within the 500-foot buffer until the nesting cycle is complete or the nest fails. The biological monitor shall be responsible for documenting the results of the surveys and the ongoing monitoring. A 300 foot buffer shall be implemented in the event that raptors or other species protected under the MBTA are located. This buffer will be evaluated after consultation with the CPUC/BLM/CDFG and USFWS.

E2-27 Mitigation Measure B-6a does not require or insinuate that common plant species will be transplanted. This measure is intended to address the plant species identified by the ADA and the BLM and has been addressed in APM Bio-9, Bio-10, Bio-11, and Bio-12. Therefore, Mitigation Measure B-6a (Develop a transplanting plan) in Section D.2.6.1.6 has not been revised.

E2-28 APM B-15 in Table D.2-14 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Biological Resources) and in Table B-10 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

In the vicinity of the Colorado River, existing tower spacings and conductor heights will be matched to the greatest extent practical.

E2-29 The measure referenced by SCE was originally a provision of the BLM permit for the DPV2 right-of-way. The changes are not accepted, but may be negotiated with BLM as to the appropriateness for new permit conditions that would be issued following a Record of Decision on the DPV2 Project. The specifics of land purchase transactions must be handled with BLM directly outside of the EIR/EIS process.

E2-30 SCE states that this measure is contrary to requirements of the CAISO. However, this measure was presented by SCE itself in its PEA, and the impact analysis in the EIR/EIS was done assuming that this measure would be implemented. Please refer to Response E2-19 regarding edits to APMs that were proposed by SCE as part of the Proposed Project. APM B-30 has not been changed. Note that Section D.2 (Biological Resources) provides thorough analysis of Proposed Project impacts and applicable mitigation measure for biological resources.

E2-31 APM B-31 in Table D.2-14 (Applicant Proposed Measures – Biological Resources) and in Table B-10 (see Section B.5) has been updated as follows and will be incorporated into project design:

Any desert tortoise observed on access roads or work areas will be moved immediately ~~100 yards~~ away from the roadway into safe areas.

E2-32 The EIR/EIS preparers utilized the APMs as proposed by SCE in its PEA and did not change the language of these APMs from that presented in the PEA. Where an APM did not fully help mitigate particular impacts to less than significant levels, the EIR/EIS preparers recommended specific mitigation measures for each significant impact (as applicable) to supplement the APMs and help reduce impacts. Therefore, the EIR/EIS preparers will not change the language of SCE's APMs based on these comments given that the text of these measures were part of SCE's Application to the CPUC. Therefore, APM B-34 has not been modified. Note that Section D.2 (Biological Resources) provides thorough analysis of Proposed Project impacts and applicable mitigation measure for biological resources. Mitigation Measure B-9f (Table D.2-14) was developed based on consultation with the BLM regarding this issue and is consistent with the APM B-34.

E2-33 Please refer to Response E2-26 regarding Mitigation Measure B-5a (Conduct pre-construction surveys and monitoring for breeding birds).

E2-34 Please refer to Response E2-24 regarding Mitigation Measure B-1a (Prepare and implement and Habitat Restoration/Compensation Plan).

Mitigation Measure B-7a (Avoid Colorado River) does not prohibit SCE from spanning the river.

Mitigation Measure B-7b (Conduct pre-construction tortoise surveys) has not been changed. Only a qualified desert tortoise monitor can move the animal if encountered under a vehicle. In addition, there is no requirement to construct anything other than a man made burrow based on the professional judgment of the biologist. The intent is to match where possible the direction of the opening and other physical factors.

E2-35 It is not clear which issue is referenced in “see earlier comments” but the response to Comment E2-29 may be appropriate. There were no earlier comments specific to Mitigation Measure B-7c (Purchase mitigation lands for impacts to tortoise habitat) and no revisions have been made.

No change has been made to Mitigation Measure B-7d (Purchase mitigation lands for impacts to fringe-toed lizard habitat). The document only requires the purchase of mitigation lands if directed to by the USFWS. In addition, this measure has been modified at the direction of the USFWS.

E2-36 No change has been made to Mitigation Measure B-9e (Construct pre-construction surveys and owl relocation); instead, Mitigation Measure B-5a (Conduct pre-construction surveys and monitoring for breeding birds) has been modified to reflect SCE’s comment (see Response E2-26).

Mitigation Measure B-9f has been modified regarding Burnt Mountain and this area will be removed. The avoidance period is based on consultation with the USFWS. Mitigation Measure B-9f (Perform construction outside of breeding and lambing period) revisions are as follows:

B-9f **Perform construction outside of breeding and lambing period.** Construction activities conducted within suitable habitat near Burnt Mountain, Harquahala Mountain, and Kofa NWR shall not occur during the period of the year when bighorn sheep are lambing (from January 1 to April 30). A pre-construction survey for bighorn sheep shall be conducted on Forest Service lands prior to construction and maintenance of the transmission lines. If bighorn sheep are found, then SCE shall consult with the Forest Service, USFWS, and Bighorn Institute to identify appropriate avoidance measures.

It is acknowledged that capturing or relocating wildlife can pose risks to the biologist. Mitigation Measure B-9g (Conduct pre-construction surveys and relocation for American badger) has been modified in accordance with this comment as follows to require consultation with the CDFG and BLM regarding the procedures utilized to reduce impacts to badgers if avoidance is not possible:

B-9g Conduct pre-construction surveys and relocation for American badger. Prior to construction, SCE shall conduct pre-construction surveys for American badger. Surveys will be conducted prior to ground disturbance activities in areas that contain habitat for this species. Badger dens located outside the project area shall be flagged for avoidance. Unoccupied dens located in the right of way shall be covered to prevent the animal from re-occupying the den prior to construction. If occupied dens are identified in the area of the ROW that must be disturbed, the CDFG/BLM/Forest Service shall be consulted regarding options for action. Hand-excavation is an option if occupied dens cannot be avoided, but alternatives shall be considered due to potential danger to biologists. ~~Occupied dens in the ROW shall be hand-excavated if avoidance is not possible.~~ Dens shall be hand-excavated only before or after the breeding season (February 1–May 30). Any relocation of badgers shall take place after consultation with the BLM, Forest Service, and CDFG.

E2-37 In regards to the comment about Mitigation Measure B-9h (Conduct pre-construction surveys for roosting bats), all bat species are protected by Arizona State Law and any bats residing in caves or caverns are protected by AGFD under Arizona Revised Statutes §13-3702; bats are protected by AGFD under Arizona State Law from “take” as defined by Arizona Revised Statutes §17-101.

In addition, SCE will conduct pre-construction surveys in habitat suitable for the Coachella Valley round-tailed squirrel species in the Coachella Valley. Mitigation Measure B-9i (Schedule construction when the Coachella Valley round-tailed squirrel is dormant) is only required where colonies of this species have been identified.

E2-38 Mitigation Measure B-16a (Prepare and implement a raven control plan) is based on APM B-20 (see Table B-10 in Section B.5). This measure does not identify nor set an exact schedule for the removal of nests. Removing raven nests would require coordination with the USFWS as indicated in the mitigation measure. Therefore, Mitigation Measure B-16a has not been revised.

E2-39 It is understood that steep slopes may make implementation of this measure infeasible in certain situations. In fact, the measure already includes the statement that “Site-specific conditions will determine when such mitigation is feasible.” No change is required.

E2-40 SCE’s comment relates to language from the original ROW Grant from BLM that was repeated in SCE’s PEA in the mitigation chapter. The language may or may not be used by BLM in the ROW Grant for the DPV2 line.

E2-41 See response to Comment E2-40.

E2-42 Construction sites are not limited to substations. In addition to substations, construction sites include communication facilities sites, series capacitor sites, and optical repeater sites. No change has been made to Mitigation Measure V-1a (Reduce visibility of construction activities and equipment) specifying construction sites. Regarding the request for notification, it is not appropriate for a measure to impose requirements on the Lead Agency. It will be the responsibility of SCE to coordinate with BLM during construction on these issues.

E2-43 No basis has been provided for the request to modify the language of Mitigation Measure V-2a. Given the potential persistence of land scars in arid environments, it will likely be necessary in a number of areas to aggressively revegetate in order mitigate the impact of land scars. SCE's concerns regarding the success of revegetation in the desert environment are acknowledged; however, the measure has not been modified. The determination of success will be defined with BLM staff in developing the revegetation plan.

Regarding the requested changes to Mitigation Measures V-2b and V-2c with regard to CPUC/BLM response timeframes, measures do not include performance requirements for the Lead Agencies, as suggested by SCE so the suggested change has not been included. Timeframes for review will be addressed in the establishment of the mitigation monitoring program with SCE, CPUC, and BLM.

E2-44 Please refer to Response E2-59 regarding the addition of “where feasible” to Mitigation Measure V-3a (Reduce visual contrast of towers and conductors).

E2-45 Mitigation Measure V-6b (Screen ancillary facilities) throughout Section D.3 (Visual Resources) has been deleted except for its application to Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative under Impact V-35 [Increased structure contrast, industrial character, view blockage, and skylining when viewing the Harquahala Junction Switchyard Alternative site from Key Viewpoint 29 on Salome Highway (VS VC)] in Section D.3.8.3.

E2-46 Control of night lighting is crucial to ensure that night lighting impacts do not occur, particularly in rural low light environments. Therefore, Mitigation Measure V-6c has not been changed. This measure applies only to facilities specifically defined in impact titles; for example, as mitigation for Impact V-17, the measure would apply to the California Series Capacitor Bank. The measure is not applied to the Devers or Valley Substations.

E2-47 Because Impact V-19 is a Class III impact and would be less than significant with or without the implementation of Mitigation Measure V-19a, and given the concerns raised in this comment, Mitigation Measure V-19a (Reduce Visual Contrast by Painting Towers with Appropriate Colors) is hereby deleted from the Draft EIR/EIS and Table D.3-11. Text under Operational Impacts in Section D.3.6.7 (Cactus City Rest Area to Devers Substation) has been modified as follows:

Mitigation Measure V-3a is recommended to reduce the visual impact along this portion of the project. ~~One additional measure (V-19a) is also recommended to reduce the visual contrast and industrial character of this route segment from proposed tower location 2209 to 2239 in the vicinity of the Indio Hills.~~ While Impact V-19 would be less than significant, mitigation is recommended in compliance with NEPA requirements (please see the explanation of mitigation for less than significant impacts in Section D.1.2)...

~~**V-19a Reduce visual contrast by painting towers with appropriate colors.** Existing and proposed transmission towers within the DPV1/DPV2 corridor from proposed tower location 2209 to 2239 in the vicinity of the Indio Hills shall be painted an appropriate color to more effectively blend the structures with the light tan color of the background vegetation and soils of the Indio Hills. This measure is limited to only the 31 tower locations (2209 to 2239) because the Indio Hills provide an immediate light tan backdrop to sensitive views from residences and recreational facilities to the immediate south of the corridor. It is recom-~~

~~mended that a light tan color be used to match the background soils. SCE shall submit a Tower Painting Plan demonstrating compliance with this measure to the BLM and CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to (a) the start of construction or (b) ordering the first structures that are to be color treated during manufacture, whichever comes first. If the BLM or CPUC notifies SCE that revisions to the Plan are needed before the Plan can be approved, within 30 days of receiving that notification, SCE shall prepare and submit for review and approval a revised Plan. The Tower Painting Plan shall include:~~

- ~~• Specification, and 11”x17” color simulations at life size scale, of the treatment proposed for use on project structures, including structures treated during manufacture~~
- ~~• A map showing the towers to be painted~~
- ~~• Two sets of brochures and/or color chips for each alternative color~~
- ~~• A detailed schedule for completion of the treatment~~
- ~~• A procedure to ensure proper treatment maintenance for the life of the project.~~

~~SCE shall not specify to the vendors the treatment of towers or tower components treated during manufacture, or perform the final treatment on any towers until SCE receives notification of approval of the Tower Painting Plan by the BLM and CPUC. Within 30 days following the start of commercial operation, SCE shall notify the BLM and CPUC that the towers are ready for inspection.~~

- E2-48 Note that Mitigation Measure WR-1a (Coordinate construction schedule and activities with the authorized officer of the recreation area) in Section D.5 (Wilderness and Recreation) and WR-1c (Coordinate with local agencies to identify alternative recreation areas) specifically provide a list identifying the recreational areas and resources that would be affected by the Proposed Project.
- E2-49 Mitigation Measure N-1a (implement best management practices for construction noise) allows SCE to create construction noise on weekends according to “an alternative schedule established by the local jurisdiction.” The prohibitions on weekend construction noise, if any, for each local jurisdiction are shown in Section D.8.4.3 (Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards: Local).
- E2-50 Mitigation Measure L-1a (prepare construction notification plan) identifies a requirement that SCE must submit its proposed resident notification program, which would help to avoid noise complaints during construction activities.
- E2-51 Mitigation Measure N-1a (implement best management practices for construction noise) identifies the best management practices (BMP) that must be implemented to avoid a potentially significant noise impact during construction. There is no separate manual of BMPs for construction noise.
- E2-52 Regarding comments on Mitigation Measure C-2a, SCE is not expected to initiate consultation with Native American groups or individuals. The BLM, as lead federal agency, and in accordance with Executive Memorandum of April 29, 1994 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation, will conduct required government-to-government consulta-

tion with interested Native American tribes and individuals. Nonetheless, as set forth in this mitigation measure, and Mitigation Measure C-3a, the Applicant shall provide assistance and support, as requested and directed by the BLM. This may include drafting correspondence, mailings, telephone follow-ups, interviews, attending meetings, and other activities as requested. The Applicant shall also undertake required treatments, studies, or other actions that result from the BLM’s consultation with Native Americans.

E2-53 Please refer to Response E2-52.

E2-54 Please refer to Response E2-1.

E2-55 Please see response to Comment E2-19 regarding changes to APMs. APM L-4 has not been modified; however, note that the Project Description correctly characterizes the types of towers to be installed in agricultural land. Note that Section D.6 (Agriculture) provides thorough analysis of Proposed Project impacts and applicable mitigation measure for agricultural resources.

E2-56 The comment is unclear, and it appears that no change to Mitigation Measure L-1c has been requested. In preparing the land use analysis, the EIR/EIS preparers assumed that any land crossing and/or acquisition issues between SCE and the Agua Caliente Tribe would be negotiated by the two parties prior to implementation of the project. The EIR/EIS land use impact analysis (in Section D.4.6.7) discussion’s intent is to merely present the information regarding these issues as provided by SCE and the Tribe. In fact, Section D.4.6.7 on page D.4-36, acknowledges that as of the writing of the Draft EIR/EIS, “SCE and the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians still need to resolve issues of land acquisition for the Proposed Project.” Mitigation Measure L-1c merely requires SCE to provide proof of their negotiations with the Tribe to CPUC and BLM. Therefore, no changes to Mitigation Measure L-1c have been made based on the comment.

E2-57 Please refer to Response E2-55.

E2-58 See Response E2-19 above. In addition, Mitigation Measure L-1a (Prepare Construction Notification Plan) has been proposed to ensure coordination of proposed project impacts on all affected land uses, including the Palo Verde Irrigation District. Therefore, for the reasons enumerated above under the response to SCE’s comments on APM L-4, and the fact that Mitigation Measure L-1a would be implemented to ensure coordination between SCE and affected land owners, no changes have been made to APM L-6.

E2-59 It is unnecessary to include the phrase “where feasible” into mitigation measures, because mitigation measures, by definition have to be feasible. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 (a)(1), “An EIR shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts...” Therefore, if SCE feels that this measure is not feasible, SCE needs to enumerate the specific reasons why this measure needs to be revised. Therefore, the Mitigation Measure has not been revised.

E2-60 See Response E2-58.

E2-61 Please refer to Response E2-19. APM A-7 has not been modified. Regarding whether or not the “marshalling yards” would be considered to be part of the construction site, this would depend on whether SCE is required to modify the site in any way (e.g., grading, graveling,

- paving) for use in this project and on whether construction equipment would be stored at the site. In establishing the mitigation monitoring program, this type of issue will be defined between SCE, the CPUC, and BLM.
- E2-62 Mitigation Measure T-7a (Repair roadways damaged by construction activities) in Section D.9.6.1 and Table D.9-18 has been modified as follows:
- T-7a Repair roadways damaged by construction activities.** If roadways, sidewalks, medians, curbs, shoulders, or other such features are damaged by the project’s construction activities, as determined by the CPUC Environmental Monitor or the affected public agency, SCE shall coordinate repairs with the affected public agencies and ensure that any such damage is repaired to the pre-construction condition within 60-30 days from the end of all-the construction period-within each affected county.
- E2-63 Impact P-1 throughout Section D.10 (Public Health and Safety) and the rest of the EIR/EIS has been updated as follows:
- Impact P-1: Soil contamination ~~as a result of~~ could result from improper handling and/or storage of hazardous materials during construction activities***
- E2-64 Mitigation Measure P-1C has been modified in Section D.10.6.1 and in Table D.10-9 as follows:
- P-1c Ensure proper disposal of construction waste.** All non-hazardous construction and demolition waste, including trash and litter, garbage, and other solid waste shall be disposed of properly. ~~→p~~Petroleum products, and other potentially hazardous materials, shall be removed to a hazardous waste facility permitted or otherwise authorized to treat, store, or dispose of such materials.
- E2-65 Although the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 applies to municipal governments, it also applies to State agencies. The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) states that, “State agencies should be an example for others and a force around California in the area of recycling and resource conservation.” In 1997, the CIWMB identified construction and demolition materials, along with organic materials, as making up half of the State’s waste stream, the recycling of which is a key element to achieving 50 percent diversion of waste. AB 939, which enacted the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, states in PRC §40001 that “the responsibility for solid waste management is a shared responsibility between the state and local governments. The state shall exercise its legal authority in a manner that ensures an effective and coordinated approach to the safe management of all solid waste generated within the state...” PRC §40001 of AB 939 goes on to state that, “it is the policy of the state to assist local governments in minimizing duplication of effort, and in minimizing the costs incurred, in implementing this division through the development of regional cooperative efforts and other mechanisms which comply with this division.” As the Proposed Project traverses lands for which city and county waste management agencies are responsible for solid waste disposal, by requiring this mitigation measure as written, the CPUC is assisting these municipal governments in their compliance with AB 939 and the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989. No changes have been made to Mitigation Measure S-2a (Recycle construction waste).
- E2-66 Please refer to Response E2-19. APM A-2 has not been modified.

- E2-67 Please refer to Response E2-19. APM A-4 has not been modified.
- E2-68 Please refer to Response E2-19. APM A-5 has not been modified.
- E2-69 Please refer to Response E2-19. APM A-7 has not been modified. Regarding the definition of offsite marshalling areas, please see Response E2-61.
- E2-70 Please see Response E2-73. No revisions to this condition have been made.

E2-71 This mitigation measure requires that helicopter use be minimized to the extent practical in the federal and state ozone non-attainment areas within California, only. The project route through Arizona, where the most remote tower sites are located, is not subject to this mitigation measure. Where conditions are such that helicopter delivery of supplies or personnel are required, or preferred due to other environmental issue concerns, they can be allowed at the discretion of the CPUC. Additionally, this condition provides assurance for the General Conformity findings for the Salton Sea Air Basin and reasonable accuracy for the South Coast Air Basin NOx emissions and associated offset requirements, which both assume minimal helicopter use. Unfettered helicopter use could drastically increase the NOx emissions for the project.

Due to the apparent confusion regarding the applicability, and to correct the regulatory override authority noted within this condition, this condition is has been revised for clarity as follows:

AQ-1g Reduce helicopter use during construction. Helicopter use in California shall be limited to that necessary for conductor installation, using helicopters of the smallest practical size-; and Hhelicopters shall not be used for delivering supplies or personnel within California any federal or State ozone criteria pollutant nonattainment areas except as specifically excepted by the otherwise specified by the CPUC due to limitations in road access and/or to reduce other adverse environmental impacts associated with road construction/travel (such as to biological resources or cultural resources) or BLM.

E2-72 Please refer to E2-59 regarding the addition of “when feasible” to Mitigation Measure AQ-1h (Schedule deliveries outside of peak hours).

Please see response to Response E2-73 regarding Mitigation Measure AQ-1i (Obtain NOx emissions offsets). There is no direct comment on this condition and it will not be revised. If a separate General Conformity analysis is performed prior to the ROD and the emission estimates for NOx within the SCAB are revised then the applicability of this condition may be affected at that time.

E2-73 **Section 1.0: Arizona Impacts.** Selecting air quality impact significance criteria for Arizona portions of the project depended on first determining whether the local jurisdictions (MDAQD or ADEQ) have any recommended NEPA air quality significance criteria. Because these local jurisdictions do not have any such recommended criteria, the second step of selection of appropriate significance thresholds lies with the BLM. Note that no other governmental agencies (local, state, or federal) commented on the significance criteria used in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The air quality impact thresholds used for the NEPA analysis within Arizona were based on BLM's review of precedence set by other NEPA documents. This is in contrast to the CEQA thresholds that are published by local air quality management agencies. NEPA documents that cover large linear or area source projects like the Proposed Project are not frequently published (i.e., non-point source projects¹). The comment correctly notes that non-point source projects are difficult to assess because of their disperse nature, but the comment does not support its assertion that project-related construction emissions would not cause or contribute to a potential violation of the standards. This could only be demonstrated with a dispersion modeling analysis. A 250 tons/year threshold was selected as appropriate for an emission-based criteria for the attainment areas based on the federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration program thresholds and the review of other NEPA documents, including the 2002 FEIS for the Lake Mead National Park – Lake Management Plan² that in part use 250 tons/year. The Lake Mead National Park – Lake Management Plan project is similar to DPV2 as it involves emissions over a large area that is also in attainment with all pollutant standards.

Section 2.0: Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan. Compliance with regulations is a base assumption in the Draft EIR/EIS because SCE is required by law to comply with all appropriate air quality regulations. However, compliance with all regulations does not guarantee that a project is properly mitigated.

The intent of the mitigation is to provide “definitive” instruction on how to avoid the potential impact. Therefore, the purpose of the Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan (FDECP) required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1a is to *define and specify precisely* the methods that will be used to mitigate the fugitive dust emissions. Some of these requirements are already defined precisely in Mitigation Measure AQ-1a in order to provide the necessary amount of emission control dictated by the impact analysis. As noted by the comment, “some local dust control requirements contain a menu of options rather than restrictive single control mandates”. The mitigation measure aims to provide specific direction because the Proposed Project has an extremely high fugitive dust emission potential, primarily due to the extensive unpaved road travel required to reach the remote tower sites (particularly true in La Paz County, Arizona). Project emissions could cause or contribute to potential violations of the standards in the absence of specific dust control measures.

For example, the specified requirement to use the CARB certified non-toxic soil binders on unpaved roads is required because watering will be highly ineffective to control fugitive dust on the large network of unpaved roads that will be used to construct DPV2. The use of the recommended soil binder would significantly reduce wind-related and traffic-related soil erosion potential on the unpaved roads during and after the project construction. Use of this specific mitigation measure is necessary to reduce PM10 air quality impacts to levels that would not be likely to cause or contribute to potential violations of the standards, to reduce other significant air quality impacts to the extent feasible, and to maintain PM10 emissions below General Conformity thresholds in non-attainment areas.

¹ NEPA documents for large point source projects normally include dispersion modeling results to determine the potential for significant impacts. Dispersion modeling could be done but would be very difficult for large linear or area wide projects. The DPV2 Draft EIR/EIS did not include modeling due to the multiple difficulties involved with modeling such a large scale project. Therefore, emission-based criteria were used for the significance determination.

² The FEIS for the Lake Mead National Park – Lake Management Plan can be found on the National Park Service Website <http://www.nps.gov/lame/planning/toc.htm>.

Requiring a FDECP would not be redundant or significantly increase regulatory compliance costs because the FDECP could be used to fulfill the local requirements for dust control plans. The CPUC and the BLM are the responsible agencies for the enforcement of all adopted mitigation measures. Local enforcement of fugitive dust control regulations is also possible; however, compliance with local requirements would be guaranteed by complying with the FDECP, as the mitigation methods specified in the FDECP would have to meet or exceed the local rule requirements.

Section 3.0: 2008 Onroad/Offroad emissions within the South Coast Air Basin. In response to this comment, the Final EIR/EIS includes revisions the onroad emission calculations and assumptions needed to adjust the road travel by year and jurisdiction. The apportionment of heavy-duty trip mileage within the SCAB for 2008 was too high in the Draft EIR/EIS. Other issues have also been addressed with the annual WOD mileage apportionment which increased the passenger and delivery/work vehicle mileage in the SCAB for 2008. With the re-apportioned vehicle mileage the 2008 SCAB NO_x emission are shown at a lower level of 32.55 tons/year. This is still above the 25 ton/year General Conformity applicability threshold. Other annual emissions have also been corrected as necessary in the Final EIR/EIS air quality analysis including the Air Quality Appendix.

SCE provides comments on the validity of assumptions used in the Draft EIR/EIS analysis. While SCE is entitled to an opinion regarding other specific technical assumptions used in the emission calculations, the following responses provide the rationale for the assumptions showing that they are reasonable.

Onroad Heavy Duty. The assumptions regarding the origination and travel requirements of the non-concrete tower construction supplies are reasonable worst case assumptions. An assumption that all steel and cable supplies would originate from the Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach is reasonable assumption given the current situation for heavy manufacturing locations. It is not unreasonable to assume that the fabricated steel and cable will come from Pacific Rim nations such as Korea or China. SCE in this comment has provided no information on likely equipment suppliers, manufacturing locations, and likely travel routes to justify changing these assumptions.

Onroad Construction Vehicle Mileage. The trip basis for construction of the WOD components was determined after critical review of an elaborate WOD project schedule provided by SCE and the manpower and equipment estimate provided separately for WOD. The number of days in each type of construction/demolition operation were determined directly from the supplied schedule (see Ap.9-4 for the detailed assumptions drawn from the SCE provided materials shown in the emission appendix) and multiplied by the manpower and onroad trip requirements (passenger and medium duty vehicles types using SCE's Table 8.9.05 WOD Table 3-8). It should also be noted that several activities identified in the WOD schedule (see Ap.9-4) were not explicitly quantified in the WOD emission estimate since SCE did not provide any corresponding crew or equipment lists for these activities. The heavy duty vehicle types were determined in part through the aforementioned method with the addition of necessary supply trips and waste trips generated from WOD activities. Therefore, any overestimate of trips for WOD work elements comes directly from SCE's schedule and crew/equipment information. If SCE believes these estimates to be as much as three-quarters too high, an updated project schedule and equipment/personnel list for WOD that justifies the assumption would need to be provided by SCE. While the construction of the new transmission towers for WOD is significantly less than that for EOD, there are many other activities proposed for WOD (see Ap.9-4) that increase the total equipment use and vehicle miles traveled for WOD.

Miscellaneous/Support/Passenger Vehicle Mileage. The support vehicles in the personnel and private vehicle category are taken directly from the listed personnel equipment in tables provided by SCE and shown as “support” (SCE’s 8.9.05 EOD Table 3-7.xls and 8.9.05 WOD Table 3-8.xls). The miscellaneous medium and heavy duty vehicles assumed would include any and all vehicle activities missed in the aforementioned SCE tables and not otherwise accounted for as delivery or waste types, including but not limited to unidentified material delivery/waste trips, vehicle accident repair/towing, broken offroad equipment replacement, other contingencies, and primarily the numerous miscellaneous substation work elements identified in the project schedules that are not quantified in the tables.

The 2008 SCAB annual NO_x emission estimate provided in the Draft EIR/EIS is well below the original estimates provided by SCE in the PEA and subsequent air quality data responses and is based on fuel usage estimates that are substantially lower than the SCE’s estimates. Therefore, in light of these significantly higher estimates provided by SCE, it seems incongruous that this comment should claim that the Draft EIR/EIS activity and emissions estimates are too high.

The Applicant Proposed Measure (APM) A-8 provided in the PEA states “Emissions credits would be purchased to offset any emissions levels which are over the emissions thresholds.” However, this APM did not specify that it only applies to conformity emission thresholds, in fact the PEA did not discuss general conformity nor provide the general conformity emission thresholds. SCE did not specify whether this APM should apply to offsets for NO_x and PM₁₀ for emissions over the CEQA daily emission significance thresholds in the MDAQMD and NO_x, PM₁₀ and VOC offsets for emissions over CEQA daily emissions significance thresholds in the SCAQMD. Mitigation Measure AQ-1i addresses the lack of specificity in this APM. The relatively small amount of NO_x emission offsets that would be required for 2008 in the SCAB by Mitigation Measure AQ-1i should be readily obtainable by SCE in the form RECLAIM Trading Credits (RTCs).

In summary, the trip estimates provided by SCE did not differentiate vehicle type, did not appear to have correctly linked calculations, and were otherwise extremely difficult to interpret and use for calculating the project-related onroad emissions. A revised emission estimate could only be completed to re-evaluate the project emissions versus the General Conformity applicability thresholds with SCE providing well-documented assumptions for the project schedules, activities, equipment, onroad travel, etc.

Section 4.0: Localized Significance Thresholds. The Draft EIR/EIS clearly states that the significant impacts (Impact AQ-1 within the SCAQMD) are limited to the affected sensitive receptors, and the Final EIR/EIS includes edits to clarify that the impacts would extend to just less than 50 meters rather than “within and just over 50 meters of the tower sites.” This correction along with additional language to clarify that the impact is limited only to the affected nearby receptors has been added to the paragraph following Table D.11-20 in Section D.11.4.4.