

## **SOUTH BAY RELOCATION PROJECT FINAL EIR ERRATA**

### **Introduction**

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) published the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the South Bay Relocation Project on April 22, 2013. Following publication, the following minor errors were identified and it was determined that these would be published as an errata to the Final EIR. This errata item merely clarifies existing text in the EIR and does not raise important new issues about significant effects on the environment. Such changes are insignificant as the term is used in Section 15088.5(b) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

### **Errata Items**

Table 1 lists errata items identified for the Final EIR.

**Table 1**  
**Final EIR Errata Items**

Final EIR Location – Section, Page, Line No.	Revision <sup>1</sup>	Summary
<i>Volume 1 Final EIR Text</i>		
Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-34, Impact Class column, Impact AES-3	Class III	Impact AES-3 has been modified from Class II to Class III to reflect correct impact category.
Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-34, Mitigation Measure column, Mitigation Measure AES-1	<del>AES-1: Prior to construction, the City shall be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the landscaping plan and design of the substation perimeter wall for consistency with the City's landscape manual and design manual. The landscaping plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect. CPUC shall have full approval authority for any recommendations made by the City in its review to ensure that there are no conflicts with design requirements for substation construction and operation.</del>	Impact AES-3 was determined to be less than significant (Class III) and therefore, no mitigation is required.
Executive Summary, Table ES-1, pages ES-53 and ES-54, Impact column, Impact LU-3	Impact LU-3: <del>The project</del> Does not apply to the Proposed Project or No Project Alternative. Applies to only the Alternative Project locations that would locate the proposed substation within the PMP boundary. These would conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Impact LU-3 has been modified as shown for clarification.
Executive Summary, Section ES.1, page ES-3, first paragraph, last sentence	<del>Therefore, in accordance with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, given the comprehensive nature of the alternatives analysis, the CPUC has determined in the Final EIR that besides the No Project Alternative, there is no other clear alternative among the other alternatives considered in the EIR as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the Proposed Project and the Existing South Bay Substation Alternative rank equally, including the Existing South Bay Substation Site Alternative, that avoids or substantially reduces identified adverse effects of the Proposed Project without creating a significant effect in addition to those that would be caused by the Proposed Project.</del>	This paragraph has been modified to clarify that both the Proposed Project and the Existing South Bay Substation Alternative are ranked equally.
Section A, Introduction, Subsection A.3.1, CPUC Process, second paragraph, page A-7	A decision is expected by the Commission in <del>February</del> 2013.	Updated to reflect anticipated decision date by the CPUC.
Section C, Alternatives, Subsection C.5.1, Gas Insulated Substation Technology Alternative; last paragraph on page C-41, under subheading <i>69 kV Relocation</i>	Under the Gas Insulated Substation Alternative, TL 644 would <del>either remain in its current position or</del> be relocated from the Bay Boulevard ROW (south of Telegraph Creek) to the ROW vacated by TL 13823 and 13824, which would be installed underground.	This clarification has been added to the Gas Insulated Substation Technology Alternative discussion.
Section D.2, Aesthetics, Subsection D.2.3.5, Transmission Interconnections, page D.2-42	Under the Proposed Project, several existing <del>wooden</del> structures along Bay Boulevard and within the Bay Boulevard Substation site area would be removed and/or replaced with <del>steel</del> other structures, which would result in an overall reduction in the number of overhead transmission lines (see Figure D.2-2a, Visual Simulation).	This clarification has been added to Section D.2.
Section D.2, Aesthetics, Subsection D.2.3.3, Bay Boulevard Substation, page, D.2-34, and Subsection D.2.5, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting, Table D.2-2, page D.2-96	<del>AES-1 Prior to construction, the City shall be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the landscaping plan and design of the substation perimeter wall for consistency with the City's landscape manual and design manual. The landscaping plan shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architect. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) shall have full approval authority for any recommendations made by the City in its review to ensure that there are no conflicts with design requirements for substation construction and operation.</del>	Impact AES-3 was determined to be less than significant (Class III) and therefore, Mitigation Measure AES-1 is not required.
Section D.5, Biological Resources, Subsection D.5.3.3, Bay Boulevard Substation, page D.5-40, Table D.5-4	Temporary and permanent impacts to vegetation communities resulting from construction and operation of the Bay Boulevard Substation as presented in Table D.5-4 have been revised to reflect a worst-case impact scenario. The revised impact acreages are reflected in Table 2 of the Final EIR Errata below.	Revisions reflect a worst-case scenario where SDG&E would utilize their entire easement for construction purposes.
Section D.5, Biological Resources, Subsection D.5.3.3, Bay Boulevard Substation, page D.5-58	The mitigation areas provided for the proposed impacts will include adequate buffers for the wetland areas, that will equal or exceed 100 feet, <u>or as otherwise determined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Coastal Commission, and Regional Water Quality Control Board.</u>	Clarification has been added that resource agencies will be consulted in determination of adequate buffers required for wetland protection.
Section D.5, Biological Resources, Subsection D.5.5, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting, Table D.5-7 MMCRP for Biological Resources, page D.5-115, Impact column	Impact <u>BIO-5</u> :	The impact listed as Impact 5 has been revised to indicate Impact <u>BIO-5</u> .
Section D.5, Biological Resources, Subsection D.5.3.3, page D.5-45, and Subsection D.5.5, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting, Table D.5-7, MMCRP for Biological Resources, page D.5-119–D.5-121, Mitigation Measure BIO-4	California Exotic Plant Pest Council should be revised to California Invasive Plant Council	California Exotic Plant Pest Council no longer exists. Revision updates organization name.
Section D.5, Biological Resources, Subsection D.5.3.3, page D.5-50, and Subsection D.5.5, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting, Table D.5-7, MMCRP for Biological Resources, pages	A survey shall be conducted within 30 days and not less than 14 days prior to initiation of construction by a qualified biologist in accordance with the <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i> (CDFG 2012) to determine the presence or absence of the burrowing owl in the <del>Proposed Project</del> site limits, <u>plus and to the extent practicable, suitable habitat located within 250 feet beyond of the project boundary.</u> The survey results shall be provided to the CPUC within 14 days	Revision updates new protocol for surveys methods, avoidance, and mitigation.

**Table 1**  
**Final EIR Errata Items**

Final EIR Location – Section, Page, Line No.	Revision <sup>1</sup>	Summary
D.5-122–D.5-125, Mitigation Measure BIO-6	<p>following completion of the surveys. In addition, the burrowing owl shall be looked for opportunistically as part of other surveys and the monitoring required during project construction. If the burrowing owl is absent from the survey area, then no mitigation or avoidance measures are required.</p> <p>If the burrowing owl is present, no <u>project-related</u> disturbance shall occur within 160 feet of occupied burrows from October 16 through March 31. <del>October 16 through March 31</del>. If burrowing owls are found within the project area or within 250 feet of the project area during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a no-construction or project-related disturbance buffer will be established around the active burrow until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist. A 660-foot (200-meter) no-disturbance buffer of occupied burrows is recommended from April 1 through October 15 (CDFG 2012); however, an appropriately sized buffer will be established in writing with concurrence from the CDFW, <del>or within 660 feet of occupied burrows from April 1 through October 15 (CDFG 2012).</del></p> <p>During construction, any pipe or similar construction material that is stored on site for one or more nights shall be inspected for burrowing owls by a qualified biologist before the material is moved, buried, or capped.</p> <p>If burrowing owls are present within the project site and/or work areas, and those occupied burrows cannot be avoided during the non-breeding season (September 1 to January 31), temporary or permanent burrow exclusion and/or burrow closure can be implemented if the following conditions are satisfied: 1) a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan is developed and approved by the local CDFW office; 2) permanent or temporary loss of occupied burrows and habitat is mitigated in accordance with the <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i> (CDFG 2012) recommendations; 3) site monitoring is conducted to ensure that take is avoided; and 4) excluded burrowing owls are documented using artificial or natural burrows on an adjacent site, consistent with requirements as established in the <i>Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan</i> (CDFG 2012). Passive relocation of owls shall be implemented prior to construction only at the direction of CDFW and only if the previously described occupied burrow disturbance absolutely cannot be avoided (e.g., due to physical or safety constraints). <del>Relocation of owls shall only be implemented during the nonbreeding season (October 16 through March 31; CDFG 2012). Passive relocation is defined as encouraging owls to move from occupied burrows to alternate natural or artificial burrows that are beyond 160 feet from the impact zone and that are within or contiguous to a minimum of 6.5 acres of preserved (or acquired and preserved, if not already preserved) foraging habitat for each relocated owl (single owl or owl pair). Passive relocation is accomplished by first creating two artificial burrows in contiguous, preserved foraging habitat (if no natural burrows exist) for each occupied burrow that would be impacted; and second, installing one-way doors on occupied burrow entrances so owls can leave the burrow but not reenter it. Following passive relocation, the area of impact and the preserved foraging habitat with alternate burrows are surveyed daily for 1 week to confirm owl use of alternate burrows before excavating burrows in the impact zone. All passive relocation shall be conducted by a biologist approved by CDFG. If the alternate burrows are not used by the relocated owls, then the applicant shall work with CDFW to provide alternate mitigation for burrowing owls. If the alternate burrows are used, no other mitigation shall be required. If it is not possible to preserve contiguous habitat on which to provide alternate burrows (e.g., on private land), and occupied owl burrows would be directly impacted, then the owls shall be passively relocated without the creation of alternate burrows prior to construction (relocation should only be implemented during the nonbreeding season (September 1 through January 31)). The loss of occupied owl habitat shall be mitigated by acquiring and preserving other occupied habitat elsewhere per the <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i> (CDFG 2012), or as otherwise determined in consultation with the CDFG.</del></p> <p>Implementation Action: SDG&amp;E to implement measure as defined <u>and in concurrence with the CDFW, as required and incorporate commitments into construction contracts.</u></p>	
Section D.5, Biological Resources, Subsection D.5.3.3, Bay Boulevard Substation, page D.5-53, and Subsection D.5.5, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting, Table D.5-7, MMCRP for Biological Resources, page D.5-126, Mitigation Measure BIO-7	<p>If construction activities including but not limited to grading or site disturbance are to occur between February 15 and September 15, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist to determine the presence of nests or nesting birds within 500 feet of the construction activities. The nesting bird surveys shall be completed no more than 72 hours prior to any construction activities. The survey will focus on special-status species such as but not limited to California horned lark, California least tern, western snowy plover, Caspian tern, gull-billed tern, and other nesting birds that may be disturbed by human activity. All ground-disturbance activity within 500 feet of an active nest will be halted until that nesting effort is finished. <u>However, the buffer may be reduced at the discretion of a qualified, on-site biologist with the concurrence of the CPUC and Resource Agencies. If a buffer request reduction is granted, a qualified biologist will monitor the nest to make certain that construction activities are not disturbing the nesting bird(s). If the qualified biologist determines that the construction activities are disturbing the nesting bird(s), the original buffer will be reinstated.</u> The on-site biologist will review and verify compliance with these nesting boundaries and will verify that the nesting effort has finished. Work can resume when no other active nests are found. Upon completion of the survey and any follow-up construction avoidance management, a report shall be prepared and submitted to CPUC.</p>	Clarification has been added that during construction nest buffers may be reduced at the discretion of a qualified, on-site biologist with the concurrence of the CPUC and Resource Agencies.
Section D.5, Biological Resources, Subsection D.5.3.3, Bay Boulevard Substation, page D.5-69, and Subsection D.5.5, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting, Table D.5-7, MMCRP for Biological Resources, page D.5-131, last sentence of Mitigation Measure BIO-11	Documentation of USFWS-approved helicopter use shall be provided to CPUC prior to helicopter activities occurring in the event that USFWS determines helicopter activities are permitted between February 15 and <del>August 31</del> <u>September 15.</u>	This date has been revised to September 15.

**Table 1**  
**Final EIR Errata Items**

Final EIR Location – Section, Page, Line No.	Revision <sup>1</sup>	Summary
Section D.8, Public Health and Safety, Subsection D.8.3.3, Bay Boulevard Substation, and Table D.8-7, pages D.8-20 and D.8-90, first sentence of Mitigation Measure HAZ-4	<del>Wild</del> Fires shall be prevented or minimized by exercising care when operating utility vehicles within the right-of-way and access roads and by parking vehicles away from dry vegetation where hot catalytic converters can ignite a fire.	This clarification has been added to Mitigation Measure HAZ-4.
Section D.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Subsection D.9.3.3, Bay Boulevard Substation, third sentence under Impact HYD-5, page D.9-15	The project proposes construction of a water quality basin along the western limits of the Bay Boulevard Substation, <del>as well as an engineered wetland to the south.</del>	This clarification has been added to Impact HYD-5.
Section D.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Subsection D.9.4.6.1, Goodrich South Campus Site – Air Insulated Substation Alternative, pages D.9-38 and D.9-42	Pages D.9-38 and D.9-42 Mitigation Measures <del>H-5a and H-5b</del> <u>HYDRO-2a</u> and <u>HYDRO-2b</u> would ensure the groundwater discharges are in accordance with regulations governed by the RWQCB and would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level (Class II).	Text has been revised to clarify cross-references to Mitigation Measures HYDRO-2a and HYDRO-2b.
Section D.10, Land Use and Planning	No revisions made	The Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan (CVBMP) boundary depicted in the Final EIR is consistent with the CVBMP boundary depicted in both the Draft Port Master Plan Precise Plan for the Chula Vista Bayfront and the Certified Final EIR for the CVBMP Project. In both instances, the CVBMP boundary included the Bay Boulevard Substation site and the site was designated for Industrial Business Park use. Prior to adoption of the Port Master Plan by the California Coastal Commission, the CVBMP boundary was amended to exclude the Bay Boulevard Substation site and as a result, the site now appears to be located within the City of Chula Vista LCP Planning Area and the relevant land use designation is General Industrial. As the proposed substation site is located on lands designated for industrial uses and the General Industrial designation specifically allows for public utility development, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the underlying land use designation as well as with the relevant LCP policies previously analyzed in Section D.10 of the Final EIR. Therefore, because the amended CVBMP boundary does not change the land use impact conclusions of the Final EIR, no changes have been made to the document.
Section D-10, Land Use and Planning, Subsection D.10.5, Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting, Table D.10-4, page D-10-68, Impact column, Impact LU-3	Impact LU-3 <del>does not apply to the Proposed Project or No Project Alternative. Applies to</del> Alternative Project locations <u>that would locate the proposed substation within the PMP boundary and</u> would conflict with an applicable land use plan.	Impact LU-3 has been modified as shown for clarification.
<i>Volume 2, Final EIR Response to Comments</i>		
Response to Comment E1-82, San Diego Gas & Electric Company David Geier, VP-Electric Operations	In response to this comment, Figures B-3 and B-3a have been modified in the Final EIR by incorporating by reference project information illustrated in Figure D-1 as provided in this comment.	Figure D-1 provided with the SDG&E comment letter provides additional project detailed information that is hereby incorporated by reference into the Final EIR.

**Notes:** <sup>1</sup> Revisions to text in the Final EIR are presented in ~~strike through~~ (signifying a deletion) and underline (signifying an addition).

**Table 2**  
**Summary of Impacts on Vegetation Communities (Bay Boulevard Substation)**

Vegetation Community	Summary of Acreages	
	Acreage of Temporary Impact	Acreage of Permanent Impact
Seasonal Pond/Seasonal Wetland	0	0.61
Disturbed Wetland Scrub	0	1.75
Mulefat Scrub	0	0.06
Emergent Wetland	<u>0.040.03</u>	0.03
Non-Native Grassland	<u>0.984.57</u>	<u>9.468.74</u>
Disturbed Coyote Brush Scrub	<u>4.071.45</u>	<u>5.034.94</u>
Eucalyptus Woodland	<u>0.26</u>	0
Ornamental Vegetation	<u>0.065.26</u>	<u>&lt;0.040.05</u>
Disturbed Habitat	<u>0.1522.87</u>	0.18
Developed Land	<u>0.0515.82</u>	0.204
<b>Total</b>	<u>2.3250.26</u>	<u>17.3616.55</u>

**Source:** SDG&E 2010; Dudek 2010bSDG&E 2013

**Note:** To calculate permanent impacts, Dudek utilized geographic information system (GIS) data for vegetation communities and permanent impacts associated with the Bay Boulevard Substation provided by SDG&E as well as transmission pole footprint and foundation data included in the SDG&E PEA. Temporary impacts were calculated by utilizing GIS data provided by SDG&E and the project's temporary workspace requirements identified in the SDG&E PEA.