

DPV2 Colorado River Substation Expansion Project Supplemental EIR Team

From: Joan Taylor [palmcanyon@mac.com]
Sent: Friday, April 08, 2011 12:51 PM
To: dpv2@aspeneq.com
Subject: attn: Billie Blanchard re SCE Colorado River Substation SEIR

April 7, 2011

Billie Blanchard, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street
Suite 935 San Francisco, CA 94104
BY EMAIL TO: dpv2@aspeneq.com

Re: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Colorado River Substation Expansion Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line Project

Dear Ms Blanchard:

I'm writing on behalf of the Sierra Club with regard to the SEIR for the above-referenced project. As you know, the Club supports the transition to renewable energy, and supported the approval of the Devers to Palo Verde 2 transmission project as an acceptable project to deliver renewable energy to load centers. However, the change of location of the substation has necessitated additional environmental review and we wish to ensure that the optimal location is chosen for this facility.

We concur with the Center for Biological Diversity that, while Avoidance Alternatives 1-3 and the Southern Alternative all achieve the goal of moving the project out of the sand transport corridor and presumably reduce impacts to MFTL, the SEIR's baseline information, analysis and proposed mitigation are not adequate to address potential impacts to other species.

Sierra Club would generally support an alternative that removes impacts to the sand transport corridor, but absent a full analysis of impacts to species that do not rely on the sand transport corridor, it is impossible to tell which alternative is most environmentally benign and does the best job of avoiding impacts to sensitive species.

Very truly yours,

Joan Taylor, Chair

Calif/Nevada Desert Energy Ctee, Sierra Club