

Decision 14-03-006 March 13, 2014

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for a Permit to Construct Electrical Facilities with Voltages Between 50 kV and 200 kV: Presidential Substation Project.

Application 08-12-023
(Filed December 22, 2008)

**DECISION GRANTING PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE
PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
DECISION GRANTING PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT	1
1. Summary	2
2. Background	2
3. Scope of Issues	5
4. Environmental Review Process	6
5. Proposed Project and Project Alternatives	7
5.1. Proposed Project	7
5.2. Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1.....	8
5.3. Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2.....	8
5.4. Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 3.....	8
5.5. Alternative Substation Site B	9
5.6. System Alternative A	9
5.7. System Alternative B.....	9
5.8. No Project Alternative	9
6. Environmental Impacts	9
7. Environmentally Superior Alternative	10
8. CEQA Compliance and Certification.....	11
9. Infeasibility of Environmentally Superior Alternative and Mitigation Measures	11
10. Overriding Considerations	12
11. EMF Policy Compliance.....	12
12. Comments on Proposed Decision	13
13. Assignment of Proceeding.....	14
Findings of Fact	14
Conclusions of Law	15
ORDER	16
Attachment A	

DECISION GRANTING PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT

1. Summary

This decision grants Southern California Edison Company a permit to construct the Presidential Substation project, configured as "System Alternative A," with mitigation identified in the Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting and Compliance Program attached to this order. As the lead agency for environmental review of the project, we find that the Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

This proceeding is closed.

2. Background

By this application, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) seeks a permit to construct the Presidential Substation project which, as proposed, includes a new 66/16 kilovolt (kV) substation to be located in the City of Thousand Oaks near the city limits of the City of Simi Valley, and the replacement of existing subtransmission lines on approximately 79 wood distribution poles with a new overhead 66 kV subtransmission line (approximately 3.5 miles in length) on approximately 83 tubular steel poles and lightweight steel poles to connect the Presidential Substation to the existing Moorpark-Royal No. 2 and Moorpark-Thousand Oaks No. 2 66 kV subtransmission lines.

SCE filed this application on December 22, 2008. The City of Thousand Oaks, Center for Biological Diversity, and a number of local residential ratepayers filed protests, to which SCE filed a response. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) conducted an initial prehearing conference on June 25, 2009, at

which it was determined that further process would await the issuance of the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) by the Commission's Energy Division.

The Energy Division issued the draft EIR on September 16, 2011. According to the draft EIR, the proposed project and several of the alternatives would have unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts on air quality, noise, and aesthetic resources. The draft EIR considered two "System Alternative" scenarios under which a new substation and associated subtransmission lines would not be constructed. The draft EIR identified "System Alternative B" as the environmentally superior alternative, which would not result in significant unavoidable impacts on any resources, and rejected "System Alternative A" as an alternative because it would not meet reliability needs beyond 2014.

The assigned Commissioner thereupon issued a scoping memo and ruling on November 8, 2011, identifying the issues to be determined by the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) in resolving the proceeding and setting a schedule for addressing those issues. The schedule provided for service of prepared testimony and set an evidentiary hearing for March 2012 to take evidence on, among other things, the feasibility of the project alternatives identified in the draft EIR.

By ruling dated February 28, 2012, upon information from the Energy Division that it was considering revisions to the draft EIR to reconfigure "System Alternative B" and/or to put forth "System Alternative A" as a viable alternative, which could potentially render some of the prepared testimony moot and require supplemental testimony, the ALJ removed the evidentiary hearings from the calendar pending issuance of such revisions.

The Energy Division issued the final EIR on March 27, 2013, which eliminated "System Alternative B" as a viable alternative and identified a combination of "Alternative Substation Site B with Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 3" as the environmentally superior alternative. The final EIR determined that this project alternative had unavoidable temporary adverse impacts on air quality and noise. By ruling dated April 3, 2013, the ALJ set the time for supplemental prepared testimony to address these revisions and re-set the evidentiary hearing for June 2013.

By ruling dated May 20, 2013, upon information from the Energy Division that, based on new information on projected electrical demand in Electrical Needs Area, it was possible that the final EIR would be amended to put forth "System Alternative A" as a feasible alternative, which could potentially render some of the prepared testimony moot and require additional supplemental testimony, the ALJ again removed the evidentiary hearings from the calendar pending issuance of such amendment.

The Energy Division issued an amendment to the final EIR on November 26, 2013, analyzing "System Alternative A" and identifying it as the environmentally superior alternative.

On December 24, 2013, SCE, City of Simi Valley, Center for Biological Diversity, Substation Transmission Towers Opposition Project, and (jointly) Teresa, Deziderio and Marco Todesco jointly moved for the admission of prepared testimony without cross-examination or briefing and filed a stipulation in support of the issuance of a permit to construct the project as "System Alternative A." The ALJ received the prepared testimony by ruling dated January 6, 2014, upon which the matter was submitted.

3. Scope of Issues

Pursuant to General Order (GO) 131-D, in order to issue a permit to construct, the Commission must find that the project complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA requires the lead agency (the Commission in this case) to conduct a review to identify environmental impacts of the project, and ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage, for consideration in the determination of whether to approve the project or project alternative. CEQA precludes the lead agency from approving a proposed project or project alternative unless it requires the project proponent to eliminate or substantially lessen all significant effects on the environment where feasible, and determines that any unavoidable remaining significant effects are acceptable due to overriding considerations.

In addition, pursuant to GO 131-D and Decision (D.) 06-01-042, the Commission will consider whether the project (or project alternative) design is in compliance with the Commission's policies governing the mitigation of electromagnetic field (EMF) effects using low-cost and no-cost measures.

Accordingly, the scoping memo and ruling determined the following issues to be within the scope of the proceeding:

1. What are the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project?
2. Are there potentially feasible mitigation measures that will eliminate or lessen the significant environmental impacts?
3. As between the proposed project and the project alternatives, which is environmentally superior?
4. Was the environmental impact report (EIR) completed in compliance with CEQA, did the Commission review and consider the EIR prior to approving the project or a project alternative, and does the EIR reflect the Commission's independent judgment?

5. Are the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible?
6. To the extent that the proposed project and/or project alternatives result in significant and unavoidable impacts, are there overriding considerations that nevertheless merit Commission approval of the proposed project or project alternative?
7. Is the proposed project and/or project alternative designed in compliance with the Commission's policies governing the mitigation of EMF effects using low-cost and no-cost measures?

4. Environmental Review Process

The Commission's Energy Division staff issued and distributed the Notice of Availability of the draft EIR on September 16, 2011, and held a public informational meeting on October 13, 2011, in Thousand Oaks.

Energy Division received oral comments from 18 people at the public meeting, and also received 57 written comment letters (including one form letter received from multiple people).¹ Many commenters requested additional consideration of alternatives, including alternatives that were either considered or rejected by the draft EIR or new alternatives not previously considered. A number of commenters expressed concerns related to electrical demand for the proposed project. Energy Division responded to all of the comments in the final EIR, which it issued on March 17, 2013.

In June 2013, SCE prepared revised load forecasts for the Electrical Needs Area for its 10-year planning period (2013 through 2022), which showed that

¹ The 45-day comment period, which ended October 31, 2011, was extended to November 15, 2011. Some comments were received after the comment period and were accepted.

projected load growth has declined compared to the prior projections used in preparation of the draft and final EIR. After consideration of this new information, Energy Division determined that "System Alternative A" was now feasible and required further analysis. On November 26, 2013, Energy Division issued an amendment to the final EIR describing "System Alternative A" and analyzing its potential environmental effects, and identifying "System Alternative A" as the environmentally superior alternative.

5. Proposed Project and Project Alternatives

CEQA requires the consideration of a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives including the "No Project" alternative. The EIR considers the impacts of the Proposed Project, the "No Project" alternative, and eight project alternatives described below.

5.1. Proposed Project

As stated previously, the Proposed Project includes, among other components, a new 66/16 kV substation to be located in the City of Thousand Oaks near the city limits of the City of Simi Valley, and the replacement of existing subtransmission lines on approximately 79 wood distribution poles with a new overhead 66 kV subtransmission line (approximately 3.5 miles in length) on approximately 83 tubular steel poles and lightweight steel poles to connect the Presidential Substation to the existing Moorpark-Royal No. 2 and Moorpark-Thousand Oaks No. 2 66 kV subtransmission lines. The first source line would originate from the Moorpark-Thousand Oaks No. 2 subtransmission line, extend east along Read Road, and terminate at the substation site entering

from the west. The second source line would follow Sunset Valley Road to connect the two subtransmission lines.

5.2. Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1

In Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1, the first source line would be constructed in the same path as the Proposed Project source line connecting the substation to the Moorpark-Thousand Oaks No. 2 subtransmission line, but would be constructed as a single-circuit subtransmission line. The second source line would originate from the Moorpark-Royal No. 2 subtransmission line at the intersection of Tierra Rejada Road and Esperanza Road and terminate at the substation site entering it from directly north.

5.3. Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2

In Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2, the first source line would originate from the Moorpark-Thousand Oaks No. 2 subtransmission line near the intersection of East Olsen Road and Sunset Hills Boulevard in the City of Thousand Oaks and follow East Olsen Road to terminate at the substation. The second source line would originate at the Moorpark-Royal No. 2 subtransmission line northeast of the substation near the intersection of Madera Road and Tierra Rejada Road in the City of Simi Valley to terminate at the substation.

5.4. Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 3

In Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 3, the origination point and general route of the source lines would be the same as in the Proposed Project. However, the portion of the first source line between Sunset Valley Road and the substation would be underground, and some sections of the existing 16 kV distribution line would not need to be relocated.

5.5. Alternative Substation Site B

In Alternative Substation Site B, the new substation would be constructed on an approximate 2.3-acre parcel of land located on the north side of Madera Road in the City of Simi Valley. This substation location is capable of being served by the Proposed Project subtransmission line alignment and by Alternative Subtransmission Alignments 1, 2 and 3, with minor modifications.

5.6. System Alternative A

System Alternative A would consist of upgrading Potrero and Royal Substations by replacing the existing transformers and 16 kV station capacitor banks with higher capacity equipment and adding additional 16 kV distribution circuits. The alternative would increase the combined substation capacity in the Electrical Needs Area by 16.8 MVA.

5.7. System Alternative B

System Alternative B would consist of upgrading the Royal, Thousand Oaks, and Potrero Substations by replacing the existing 16.8 MVA transformers with larger ones in the 25 to 30 MVA range. However, as determined in the final EIR, this alternative is technically infeasible and not capable of meeting reliability and flexibility objectives, and is therefore eliminated from consideration.

5.8. No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Proposed Project would not be implemented.

6. Environmental Impacts

The Proposed Project, Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1 and Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2 would have significant unavoidable impacts on aesthetic resources due to substantial damage to scenic resources and

substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality and surroundings from public views.

The Proposed Project and all alternatives would have significant unavoidable air quality impacts due to construction activities that would generate ozone precursor emissions that could contribute substantially to a violation of ozone air quality standards and criteria pollutant emissions of nitrous oxide that would be cumulatively considerable. However, impacts under System Alternative A and System Alternative B would be substantially lower than under the other Proposed Project and other alternatives.

The Proposed Project, Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1 and Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2 would have significant unavoidable noise impacts due to construction activities that would exceed Ventura County construction noise threshold criteria in unincorporated areas.

The Proposed Project and all alternatives would not have any other significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting, and Compliance Program (MMRCP).

7. Environmentally Superior Alternative

System Alternative A is the environmentally superior alternative. Its impacts to aesthetic resources would be less than significant, and construction-related impacts from noise would be less than significant with mitigation. Although temporary impacts related to air quality would be significant and unavoidable, the intensity and duration of those impacts would

be less than under the Proposed Project and alternatives, other than System Alternative B.²

8. CEQA Compliance and Certification

CEQA requires the lead agency to certify that the EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA, that the agency has reviewed and considered it prior to approving the project, and that the EIR reflects the agency's independent judgment. As previously discussed, the EIR was completed after notice and opportunity for public comment on the scope of the environmental review and the draft EIR, as required by CEQA. The final EIR documents all comments made on the draft EIR and responds to them, as required by CEQA. The final EIR, as completed by the amendment to the final EIR, identifies the proposed project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, mitigation measures that will avoid or substantially lessen them, and the environmentally superior alternative. We certify that the EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA, that we have reviewed and considered the information contained in it, and that it reflects our independent judgment.

9. Infeasibility of Environmentally Superior Alternative and Mitigation Measures

CEQA Guidelines § 15091 requires the environmentally superior alternative and all identified mitigation measures absent a finding that specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make them

² Impacts from System Alternative B would be similar. However, as stated in Part 5.7, System Alternative B has been determined to be technically infeasible and not capable of meeting reliability and flexibility objectives.

infeasible. There is no evidence that either System Alternative A or any of the mitigation measures identified in the MMRCP is infeasible.

10. Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15093, the Commission may only approve a project that results in significant and unavoidable impacts upon a finding that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project that outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. The Presidential Substation project is needed to provide sufficient transformation capacity to ensure that safe and reliable electric service is available to meet the long-term forecasted electrical demand in the Cities of Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks and adjacent areas of unincorporated Ventura County without overloading existing and planned facilities, and to improve electrical and operational flexibility. Specifically, future peak demand in the Electrical Needs Area (ENA) is expected to exceed 95% of the planned capacity at the three existing substations in the ENA by 2020, and peak demand on the one substation is projected to exceed 100% of its capacity by 2019. We find that the Presidential Substation project's benefits of accommodating forecasted load demand in the ENA and providing additional operating flexibility outweigh the project's unavoidable impact on air quality.

11. EMF Policy Compliance

The Commission has examined EMF impacts in several previous proceedings.³ We found the scientific evidence presented in those proceedings was uncertain as to the possible health effects of EMFs and we did not find it

³ See D.06-01-042 and D.93-11-013.

appropriate to adopt any related numerical standards. Because there is no agreement among scientists that exposure to EMF creates any potential health risk, and because CEQA does not define or adopt any standards to address the potential health risk impacts of possible exposure to EMFs, the Commission does not consider magnetic fields in the context of CEQA and determination of environmental impacts.

However, recognizing that public concern remains, we do require, pursuant to GO 131 D, Section X.A, that all requests for a permit to construct include a description of the measures taken or proposed by the utility to reduce the potential for exposure to EMFs generated by the proposed project. We developed an interim policy that requires utilities, among other things, to identify the no cost measures undertaken, and the low cost measures implemented, to reduce the potential EMF impacts. The benchmark established for low cost measures is 4% of the total budgeted project cost that results in an EMF reduction of at least 15% (as measured at the edge of the utility right of way).

SCE identified low-cost and no-cost measures for the Proposed Project including utilizing pole heights and configurations to reduce phase-to-phase distance and locating new facilities away from residences and existing property lines. As System Alternative A would not construct any new facilities, there are no apparent low-cost and no-cost measures for reducing the potential for exposure to EMFs generated by it. Accordingly, we find that System Alternative A complies with the Commission's EMF decisions.

12. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of ALJ Hallie Yacknin in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Pub. Util. Code § 311 and comments were allowed

pursuant to Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. No comments were filed. The Commission hereby adopts the ALJ's proposed decision.

13. Assignment of Proceeding

Commissioner Michel P. Florio is the assigned commissioner and ALJ Hallie Yacknin is the presiding officer to the proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The Proposed Project, Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1 and Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2 would have significant unavoidable impacts on aesthetic resources due to substantial damage to scenic resources and substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality and surroundings from public views.

2. The Proposed Project and all alternatives would have significant unavoidable air quality impacts due to construction activities that would generate ozone precursor emissions that could contribute substantially to a violation of ozone air quality standards and criteria pollutant emissions of nitrous oxide that would be cumulatively considerable. However, impacts under System Alternative A and System Alternative B would be substantially lower than under the other Proposed Project and other alternatives.

3. The Proposed Project, Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1 and Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2 would have significant unavoidable noise impacts due to construction activities that would exceed Ventura County construction noise threshold criteria in unincorporated areas.

4. The Proposed Project and all alternatives would not have any other significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the MMRCP.

5. System Alternative B is technically infeasible and not capable of meeting reliability and flexibility objectives.

6. System Alternative A is the environmentally superior alternative.

7. System Alternative A and the mitigation measures identified in the MMCRP are not infeasible.

8. The Presidential Substation project will provide additional transformation capacity to accommodate forecasted load demand in the ENA and improve electrical and operational flexibility.

9. There are no apparent low-cost or no-cost measures to reduce possible (within the meaning of D.93-11-013, and D.06-01-042) to reduce possible exposure to EMF.

Conclusions of Law

1. The EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA.

2. The Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR, and the EIR reflects the Commission's independent judgment and analysis.

3. The need to provide additional transformation capacity to accommodate forecasted load demand in the ENA and additional benefit of improved electrical and operational flexibility are overriding considerations that support our approval of the Presidential Substation project, despite its significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality.

4. System Alternative A complies with the Commission's policies governing the mitigation of EMF effects using low-cost and no-cost measures.

5. SCE should be granted a permit to construct the Presidential Substation Project, constructed as System Alternative A, with mitigation set forth in the MMCRP, which is attached to this decision.

6. Application 08-12-023 should be closed.
7. This order should be effective immediately.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Southern California Edison Company is granted a permit to construct the Presidential Substation Project, constructed as System Alternative A, with mitigation set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting and Compliance Program, which is attached to this decision.
2. Energy Division may approve requests by Southern California Edison Company (SCE) for minor project refinements that may be necessary due to final engineering of the Presidential Substation Project so long as such minor project refinements are located within the geographic boundary of the study area of the Environmental Impact Report and do not, without mitigation, result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact based on the criteria used in the environmental document; conflict with any mitigation measure or applicable law or policy; or trigger an additional permit requirement. SCE shall seek any other project refinements by a petition to modify this decision.

3. Application 08-12-023 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated March 13, 2014, at San Francisco, California

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
President
MICHEL PETER FLORIO
CATHERINE J.K. SANDOVAL
CARLA J. PETERMAN
MICHAEL PICKER
Commissioners

ATTACHMENT A

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

**MITIGATION MONITORING,
REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM**

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON'S
PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT
(APPLICATION NO. A.08-12-023)****Introduction**

This document describes the mitigation monitoring, reporting and compliance program (MMRCP) for ensuring the effective implementation of the mitigation measures required for the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approval of the Southern California Edison's (SCE) application to construct, operate and maintain the Proposed Project. All mitigations are presented in Table C-1 provided at the end of this MMRCP.

If the Proposed Project or a project alternative is approved (the 'approved project'), this MMRCP would serve as a self-contained general reference for the Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted by the CPUC for the project. If and when the Proposed Project or a project alternative has been approved by the CPUC, the CPUC will compile the Final Plan from the Mitigation Monitoring Program in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), as adopted.

California Public Utilities Commission – MMRCP Authority

The California Public Utilities Code in numerous places confers authority upon the CPUC to regulate the terms of service and the safety, practices and equipment of utilities subject to its jurisdiction. It is the standard practice of the CPUC, pursuant to its statutory responsibility to protect the environment, to require that mitigation measures stipulated as conditions of approval be implemented properly, monitored, and reported on. In 1989, this requirement was codified statewide as Public Resources Code §21081.6. Public Resources Code §21081.6 requires a public agency to adopt a MMRCP when it approves a project that is subject to preparation of an EIR and where the EIR for the project identifies potentially significant environmental effects. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15097 was added in 1999 to further clarify agency requirements for mitigation monitoring and reporting.

The purpose of a MMRCP is to ensure that measures adopted to mitigate or avoid significant impacts of a project are implemented. The CPUC views the MMRCP as a working guide to facilitate not only the implementation of mitigation measures by the project proponent, but also the monitoring, compliance and reporting activities of the CPUC and any monitors it may designate.

The CPUC will address its responsibility under Public Resources Code §21081.6 when it takes action on SCE's applications. If the CPUC approves the applications, it will also adopt a Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program that includes the mitigation measures ultimately made a condition of approval by the CPUC.

Because the CPUC must decide whether or not to approve the SCE application and because the application may cause either direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect effects on the environment, CEQA requires the CPUC to consider the potential environmental impacts that could occur as the result of its decisions and to consider mitigation for any identified significant environmental impacts.

If the CPUC approves SCE's application for authority to construct the proposed Presidential Substation and subtransmission alignments or one of the project alternatives, SCE would be responsible for implementation of any mitigation measures governing both construction and future operation of the approved project. Though other State and local agencies would have permit and approval authority over construction of the approved project, the CPUC would continue to act as the lead agency for monitoring compliance with all mitigation measures required by this EIR. All approvals and permits obtained by SCE would be submitted to the CPUC for mitigation compliance prior to commencing the activity for which the permits and approvals were obtained.

In accordance with CEQA, the CPUC reviewed the impacts that would result from approval of the Proposed Project or one of its alternatives. Project activities considered include the construction of the proposed Presidential Substation or Alternative Substation Site B, and associated subtransmission alignments, telecommunications connection, and 16 kV distribution getaways, as well as the future operation of these project components. Project activities also considered include an alternative that would increase the capacity of two existing substations using standard transformer sizes, and construct two new distribution circuits.

The attached EIR presents and analyzes potential environmental impacts that would result from construction, operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project and alternatives, and proposes mitigation measures, as appropriate. Based on the EIR, approval of the Proposed Project would have the following impacts:

No Impact or Less-Than-Significant Impacts	Impacts Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	Significant Unavoidable Impacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources • Land Use and Planning • Population and Housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture and Forestry Resources • Biological Resources • Cultural Resources • Greenhouse Gas Emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics • Air Quality • Noise

- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Transportation and Traffic

The EIR indicates that approval of the Environmentally Superior Alternative, System Alternative A, would result in the following impacts:

No Impact or Less-Than-Significant Impacts

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems

Impacts Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Transportation and Traffic
- Noise

Significant Unavoidable Impacts

- Air Quality

SCE has agreed to incorporate all the proposed mitigation measures into the approved project. The CPUC has included the stipulated mitigation measures as conditions of approval of the applications and has circulated a Draft EIR.

Roles and Responsibilities

As the lead agency under CEQA, the CPUC is required to monitor the approved project to ensure that the required mitigation measures and any Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) are implemented. The CPUC will be responsible for ensuring full compliance with the provisions of this MMRCP and has primary responsibility for implementation of the monitoring program. The purpose of the monitoring program is to document that the mitigation measures required by the CPUC are implemented and that mitigated environmental impacts are reduced to the level identified in the Program. The CPUC has the authority to halt any activity associated with the approved project if the activity is determined to be a deviation from the approved project or the adopted mitigation measures.

The CPUC may delegate duties and responsibilities for monitoring to other mitigation monitors or consultants as deemed necessary. The CPUC will ensure that the person(s) delegated any duties or responsibilities are qualified to monitor compliance.

The CPUC, along with its mitigation monitor, will ensure that any variance process, which will be designed specifically for the approved project, or deviation from the procedures identified under the monitoring program is consistent with CEQA requirements; no project variance will be approved by the

CPUC if it creates new significant environmental impacts. As defined in this MMRCP, a variance should be strictly limited to minor project changes that will not trigger other permit requirements, that does not increase the severity of an impact or create a new impact, and that clearly and strictly complies with the intent of the mitigation measure. An approved project change that has the potential for creating significant environmental effects will be evaluated to determine whether supplemental CEQA review is required. Any proposed deviation from the approved project and adopted mitigation measures, including correction of such deviation, shall be reported immediately to the CPUC and the mitigation monitor assigned to the construction for their review and approval. In some cases, a variance may also require approval by a CEQA responsible agency.

Enforcement and Responsibility

The CPUC is responsible for enforcing the procedures for monitoring through the environmental monitor. The environmental monitor shall note problems with monitoring, notify appropriate agencies or individuals about any problems, and report the problems to the CPUC. The CPUC has the authority to halt any construction, operation, or maintenance activity associated with the project if the activity is determined to be a deviation from the approved project or adopted mitigation measures. The CPUC may assign its authority to their environmental monitor.

Mitigation Compliance Responsibility

SCE is responsible for successfully implementing all the adopted mitigation measures in this MMRCP. The MMRCP contains criteria that define whether mitigation is successful. Standards for successful mitigation also are implicit in many mitigation measures that include such requirements as obtaining permits or avoiding a specific impact entirely. Additional mitigation success thresholds will be established by applicable agencies with jurisdiction through the permit process and through the review and approval of specific plans for the implementation of mitigation measures.

SCE shall inform the CPUC and its mitigation monitor in writing of any mitigation measures that are not or cannot be successfully implemented. The CPUC in coordination with its mitigation monitor will assess whether alternative mitigation is appropriate and specify to SCE the subsequent actions required.

Dispute Resolution Process

This MMRCP is expected to reduce or eliminate many of the potential disputes concerning the implementation of the adopted measures. However, in the event that a dispute occurs, the following procedure will be observed:

- **Step 1.** Disputes and complaints (including those of the public) should be directed first to the CPUC's designated Project Manager for resolution. The Project Manager will attempt to resolve the dispute.
- **Step 2.** Should this informal process fail, the CPUC Project Manager may initiate enforcement or compliance action to address deviations from the approved project or adopted Mitigation Monitoring Program.

- **Step 3.** If a dispute or complaint regarding the implementation or evaluation of the MMRCP or the mitigation measures cannot be resolved informally or through enforcement or compliance action by the CPUC, any affected participant in the dispute or complaint may file a written “notice of dispute” with the CPUC’s Executive Director. This notice should be filed in order to resolve the dispute in a timely manner, with copies concurrently served on other affected participants. Within 10 days of receipt, the Executive Director or designee(s) shall meet or confer with the filer and other affected participants for purposes of resolving the dispute. The Executive Director shall issue an Executive Resolution describing his/her decision, and serve it on the filer and other affected participants.
- **Step 4.** If one or more of the affected parties is not satisfied with the decision as described in the Resolution, such party(ies) may appeal it to the CPUC via a procedure to be specified by the CPUC.

Parties may also seek review by the CPUC through existing procedures specified in the CPUC’s Rules of Practice and Procedure for formal and expedited relief.

General Monitoring Procedures

Mitigation Monitor

Many of the monitoring procedures will be conducted during the construction phase of the project. The CPUC and the mitigation monitor are responsible for integrating the mitigation monitoring procedures into the construction process in coordination with SCE. To oversee the monitoring procedures and to ensure success, the mitigation monitor assigned to the construction must be on site during that portion of construction that has the potential to create a significant environmental impact or other impact for which mitigation is required. The mitigation monitor is responsible for ensuring that all procedures specified in the monitoring program are followed.

Construction Personnel

A key feature contributing to the success of mitigation monitoring will be obtaining the full cooperation of construction personnel and supervisors. Many of the mitigation measures require action on the part of the construction supervisors or crews for successful implementation. To ensure success, the following actions, detailed in specific mitigation measures included in the MMRCP, will be taken:

- Procedures to be followed by construction companies hired to do the work will be written into contracts between SCE and any construction contractors. Procedures to be followed by construction crews will be written into a separate agreement that all construction personnel will be asked to sign, denoting agreement.
- One or more pre-construction meetings will be held to inform all and train construction personnel about the requirements of the MMRCP.
- A written summary of mitigation monitoring procedures will be provided to construction supervisors for all mitigation measures requiring their attention.

General Reporting Procedures

Site visits and specified monitoring procedures performed by other individuals will be reported to the mitigation monitor assigned to the construction. A monitoring record form will be submitted to the mitigation monitor by the individual conducting the visit or procedure so that details of the visit can be recorded and progress tracked by the mitigation monitor. A checklist will be developed and maintained by the mitigation monitor to track all procedures required for each mitigation measure and to ensure that the timing specified for the procedures is adhered to. The mitigation monitor will note any problems that may occur and take appropriate action to rectify the problems. SCE shall provide the CPUC with written quarterly reports of the project, which shall include progress of construction, resulting impacts, mitigation implemented, and all other noteworthy elements of the project. Quarterly reports shall be required as long as mitigation measures are applicable.

Public Access to Records

The public is allowed access to records and reports used to track the monitoring program. Monitoring records and reports will be made available for public inspection by the CPUC on request. The CPUC and SCE will develop a filing and tracking system.

Condition Effectiveness Review

In order to fulfill its statutory mandates to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment and to design a MMRCP to ensure compliance during project implementation (CEQA 21081.6):

- The CPUC may conduct a comprehensive review of conditions which are not effectively mitigating impacts at any time it deems appropriate, including as a result of the Dispute Resolution procedure outlined above; and
- If in either review, the CPUC determines that any conditions are not adequately mitigating significant environmental impacts caused by the project, or that recent proven technological advances could provide more effective mitigation, then the CPUC may impose additional reasonable conditions to effectively mitigate these impacts.

These reviews will be conducted in a manner consistent with the CPUC's rules and practices.

Applicant Proposed Measures

The following APMs would be implemented to avoid or reduce potential impacts from the approved project, as applicable.

- **APM-BIO-01: Minimize Impacts to Coastal Sage Scrub.** To the extent feasible, the Proposed Project would be designed to avoid or minimize impacts to coastal sage scrub. Mitigation measures and compensation for impacts to coastal sage scrub would be developed in consultation with USFWS and CDFG to reduce the impacts to less than significant.
- **APM-BIO-02: Minimize Impacts to Jurisdictional Drainages.** A jurisdictional drainage delineation would be conducted during Spring 2014 to describe and map the extent of resources under the jurisdiction of the USACE, the RWQCB, and/or the CDFG following the guidelines

presented in the Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region. As appropriate, SCE would secure a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFG, and Clean Water Act Section 404 and 401 permits from the USACE and LARWQCB, respectively, prior to disturbing the jurisdictional drainage.

- **APM-BIO-03: Additional Biological Resource APMs.** SCE may propose additional biological resource APMs following receipt of results of focused surveys that would be conducted as part of the Proposed Project, and consultation with appropriate agencies.
- **APM CUL-1: Cultural Resources Treatment Plan.** SCE will develop a Cultural Resources Treatment Plan that would define appropriate actions necessary to lessen or avoid potential impacts to sites CA-VEN-1571 and CA-VEN-744.
- **APM CUL-2: Installation of Geotextile Type Fabric along Access Road.** Prior to construction, SCE will address the drivability of the access road leading to site CA-VEN-744. In the event that the road is determined to be inadequate for transporting of equipment, SCE would design and implement the placement of geotextile-type fabric and fill soil along the road prior to access road usage. The placement of the geotextile-type fabric and fill soil would protect the archaeological site from potential impacts such as increased displacing of artifacts of the existing site surface due to vehicle traffic and road maintenance.
- **APM CUL-3: Capping of Archaeological Site on Potential Impact Areas.** Prior to installation of the subtransmission structure located at site CA-VEN-744, SCE will cap the portions of the site that have the potential to be impacted. To cap the site, SCE will place geotextile-type fabric on the surface of the archaeological site and then spread imported fill soil or other suitable material over the geotextile-type fabric. The capping will prevent future erosion of the site surface as a result of SCE's ingress and egress for maintenance and inspection activities. The archaeological site cap will not be removed after construction.
- **APM CUL-4: Construction of Earthen Pad.** SCE will install an earthen pad adjacent to the existing subtransmission structure location. The earthen pad is necessary to support heavy equipment required to install the subtransmission structure safely, while preserving archaeological site CA-VEN-744 from potential construction related impacts. The earthen pad area will be covered by geotextile-type fabric and then overlaid by "honey comb structure." The honey comb structure will be filled with imported fill soil. The earthen pad would not be removed after construction and will be utilized for maintenance activities.
- **APM CUL-5: Fencing of an Environmentally Sensitive Area.** SCE would install an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) fence to protect portions of archaeological sites CA-VEN-744 and CA-VEN-1571 from potential impacts.
- **APM CUL-6: Native American Monitoring.** SCE will retain the services of a Chumash Native American representative to conduct monitoring activities during work carried out within sites CA-VEN-744 and CA-VEN-1571 and in their vicinity. The Native American representative will be present during any archaeological excavations and during project construction in those areas determined by SCE's project archaeologist as having the potential to contain archaeological resources.

- **APM CUL-7: Archaeological Monitoring.** A qualified archaeologist will be on site to monitor ground-disturbing activities within or in the vicinity of sites CA-VEN-744 and CA-VEN-1571. If archaeological resources were identified during construction activities, construction would be halted in that area and away from the discovery, until a qualified archaeologist assesses the significance of the resource. The archaeologist would recommend appropriate measures to record, preserve or recover the resources.
- **APM-PAL-01: Develop and Implement a Paleontological Monitoring Plan.** A project paleontologist meeting the qualifications established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists shall be retained by SCE to develop and implement a Paleontological Monitoring Plan prior to the start of ground disturbing activities at the Proposed Project substation site. As part of the Paleontological Monitoring Plan, the project paleontologist shall establish a curation agreement with an accredited facility prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities. The Paleontological Monitoring Plan shall also include a final monitoring report. If fossils are identified, the final monitoring report shall contain an appropriate description of the fossils, treatment, and curation. The Paleontological Monitoring Plan shall ~~also include a final monitoring report~~ provision for the preparation of a final report at the conclusion of the project. If fossils are identified, the final monitoring report shall contain an appropriate description of the fossils, treatment, and curation.
- **APM-PAL-02: Paleontological Monitoring.** A paleontological monitor shall be on site to observe ground-disturbing activities within the paleontologically sensitive formations at the Proposed Project substation site. If fossils are found during ground-disturbing activities, the paleontological monitor shall be empowered to halt the ground-disturbing activities within 25 feet of the find in order to allow evaluation of the find and determination of appropriate treatment.

Mitigation Monitoring, Reporting and Compliance Program

Table C-1 presents a compilation of all mitigation measures in the EIR. The purpose of the table is to provide a single comprehensive list of impacts, mitigation measures, monitoring and reporting requirements, and timing.

If the CPUC approves System Alternative A, the Environmentally Superior Alternative, only a portion of the mitigation measures presented in Table C-1 would apply. System Alternative A would require the following mitigation measures:

4.3-1	4.5-3	4.8-1d	4.11-1b
4.3-2	4.5-4	4.8-1e	4.11-4
4.3-4	4.5-5	4.8-2	4.15-1a
4.4-3	4.7-2	4.8-3	4.15-1b
4.5-1	4.8-1a	4.8-5	4.15-1d
4.5-2a	4.8-1b	4.8-6	4.15-3
4.5-2b	4.8-1c	4.11-1a	4.15-4

**TABLE C-1
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Aesthetics				
<p>Impact 4.1-2: The Proposed Project would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a county scenic highway. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-2a: For all pole structures that are visible from viewsheds where visual impacts are significant (i.e., Highway 23, Read Road, Underwood Family Farms, and Olsen Road), SCE shall apply surface coatings with appropriate colors, finishes and textures to most effectively blend the structures with the visible backdrop landscape. For structures that are visible from one or more sensitive viewing locations, the darker colors shall be selected, because darker colors tend to blend into landscape more effectively than lighter colors, which may contrast and produce glare. At locations where a tubular steel pole or light-weight steel pole would be silhouetted against the skyline, non-reflective, light-gray colors shall be selected to blend with the sky. SCE shall develop a Structure Surface Treatment Plan for the tubular steel poles, light-weight steel poles, and any other visible structures in consultation with a visual specialist designated by the CPUC, as appropriate, to ensure that the objectives of this measure are achieved. SCE shall submit the Structure Surface Treatment Plan to the CPUC for review and approval at least 90 days prior to the start of construction.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction of new poles/towers.
	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-2b: The subtransmission line conductors shall be non-specular and non-reflective and the insulators shall be non-reflective and non-refractive.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During installation of subtransmission line conductors.
	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-2c: Prior to the start of construction of the retaining wall and reinforced geogrids visible from Highway 23, SCE will submit to the City of Thousand Oaks a landscaping plan and wall design, as part of the grading permit application for the Proposed Project.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to commencement of construction activities.
<p>Impact 4.1-3: The Proposed Project would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a city-designated scenic highway. <i>Significant unavoidable</i> (Class I)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-3a: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-2b. Mitigation Measure 4.1-3b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-2a.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined. SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance. CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During installation of subtransmission line conductors. During construction of new poles/towers.
<p>Impact 4.1-5: Construction of the proposed Presidential Substation could result in a temporary adverse impact to visual quality. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-5: The temporary fencing used during construction at the Presidential Substation site shall incorporate aesthetic treatment through use of appropriate, non-reflective materials, such as chain link fence with light brown or green vinyl slats. SCE shall submit final construction plans demonstrating compliance with this measure to the CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Submit plans to CPUC at least 60 days prior to commencement of construction activities.
<p>Impact 4.1-6: Use of construction pulling/stringing set-up locations during the approximately 13-20 month construction period could result in temporary adverse impacts to visual quality. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-6: SCE shall not place equipment on the pulling/splicing sites any sooner than two weeks prior to the required use.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and installation of pulling/splicing sites.
<p>Impact 4.1-8: The Proposed Project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Proposed Project site and its surroundings from public views. <i>Significant unavoidable</i> (Class I)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-8a: SCE will submit to the City of Thousand Oaks a landscaping plan and perimeter wall design that maximizes screening of the Presidential Substation using trees, shrubs, other landscaping, and appropriate wall design, as part of the grading permit application for the Project. Mitigation Measure 4.1-8b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-2b and Mitigation Measure 4.1-3b.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined. SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance. CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During installation of subtransmission line conductors and new poles and towers. During installation of subtransmission line conductors and new poles and towers.
<p>Impact 4.1-9: The Proposed Project would create new sources of light or glare that could adversely affect views in the project area. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-9a: SCE shall design and install all lighting at project facilities, including construction and storage yards and the staging area, 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 <i>Construction and Operation Lighting Mitigation Plan</i>, which includes a photometric analysis indicating that these objectives would be achieved under SCE's proposed lighting design, to the City of Thousand Oaks and the 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 <i>Construction and Operation Lighting Mitigation Plan</i> is approved by the City of Thousand Oaks and the CPUC. The Plan shall include but is not limited to the following measures:</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	At least 90 days prior to the start of construction or the ordering of any exterior lighting fixtures or components.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighting shall be designed so exterior lighting is 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 are shielded to prevent light trespass outside the project boundary, and to reduce glare. 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 			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
	area only when occupied.			

**TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Aesthetics (cont.)				
Impact 4.1-9 (cont.)	Mitigation Measure 4.1-9b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-9a.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	At least 90 days prior to the start of construction or the ordering of any exterior lighting fixtures or components.
	Mitigation Measure 4.1-9c: Only low profile shaded street lighting, if needed, shall be used to reduce down slope light spillover and night glare.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and operation.
	Mitigation Measure 4.1-9d: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-2b.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During installation of subtransmission line conductors.
Impact 4.1-10: Alternative Substation Site B could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings from public views. <i>Less than significant with mitigation (Class I)</i>	Mitigation Measure 4.1-10: Prior to the start of the substation construction, SCE shall consult with the City of Simi Valley to develop an appropriate landscaping plan and perimeter wall design. The preliminary landscaping plan shall include a mixture of groundcover, shrubs, and trees based on the City of Simi Valley guidelines and standards for landscape plantings. Landscaping at the proposed substation site shall be designed to filter views for the surrounding community and other potential sensitive receptors. Plants shall be installed and maintained outside the south, east and west perimeter walls. ⁴	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to commencement of construction activities.
Agriculture and Forestry Resources				
Impact 6-1	Mitigation Measure 6-1: SCE shall obtain agricultural conservation easements, as defined under Civil Code section 815 <i>et seq.</i> , at a one to one (1:1) ratio for each acre of Farmland that is permanently converted by the Proposed Project. An agricultural conservation easement is a voluntary, recorded agreement between a landowner and a holder of the easement that preserves the land for agriculture. The easement places legally enforceable restrictions on the land. The exact terms of the easement are negotiated, but restricted activities shall include subdivision of that property, non-farm development, and other uses that are inconsistent with agricultural production. The mitigation lands must be of equal or better quality (according to the latest available FMMP data) and have an adequate water supply. In addition, the mitigation lands must be within the same county as the impact.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to commencement of construction activities.
Air Quality				
Impact 4.3-1: Project construction activities would generate ozone precursor emissions that could contribute substantially to a violation of ozone air quality standards. <i>Significant unavoidable (Class I)</i>	Mitigation Measure 4.3-1: For off-road construction equipment of more than 50 horsepower and on-road diesel fueled vehicles, SCE shall make a good faith effort to ensure achievement of a Project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NO _x reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. A Construction Equipment NO _x Reduction Plan to achieve the reductions shall be submitted to CPUC for review and approval prior to commencement of construction activities. Construction activities cannot commence until the plan has been approved. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as such become available. If SCE determines that the 20 percent NO _x reduction cannot feasibly be achieved, the Construction Equipment NO _x Reduction Plan shall include documentation from at least two local heavy construction equipment rental companies that indicates that the companies do not have access to necessary amounts of equipment with late model engines, engine retrofits, after treatment products, etc.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to commencement of construction activities.
Impact 4.3-2: Project construction activities would generate fugitive dust emissions of criteria pollutants that could contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. <i>Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)</i>	Mitigation Measure 4.3-2: SCE shall reduce construction-related fugitive dust emissions by implementing the following VCAPCD dust control measures. SCE shall require all contractors to comply with the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-grading/excavation activities shall include watering the area to be graded or excavated before commencement of grading or excavation operations. Application of water (preferably reclaimed, if available) should penetrate sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust during grading activities. 	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to or during construction activities.

⁴ Mitigation Measure 4.1-10 was included in the Draft EIR but accidentally omitted in the Draft EIR MMRCP Section – the addition in the Final EIR is a typographical correction and does not represent a new impact or mitigation.

**TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All soil and fill haul trucks shall be required to have covered loads. All graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas, and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways, shall be treated to prevent fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally-safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll-compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary and reclaimed water shall be used whenever possible. 			
Air Quality (cont.)				
Impact 4.3-2 (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site shall be monitored by the mitigation monitor at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll-compaction, and environmentally-safe dust control materials, shall be periodically applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area should be seeded and watered until grass growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally-safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust. Signs shall be posted at the proposed Presidential Substation work site limiting traffic to 15 miles per hour or less. During periods of high winds (i.e., wind speed sufficient to cause fugitive dust to impact adjacent properties), all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations shall be curtailed to the degree necessary to prevent fugitive dust created by on-site activities and operations from being a nuisance or hazard, either off-site or on-site. The site superintendent/supervisor shall use his/her discretion in conjunction with the mitigation monitor in determining when winds are excessive. Adjacent public streets and roads shall be swept at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads. Personnel involved in grading operations, including contractors and subcontractors, should be advised to wear respiratory protection in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations. 			
Impact 4.3-4: Construction activities would result in emissions of NOx that would be cumulatively considerable. <i>Significant unavoidable</i> (Class I)	Mitigation Measure 4.3-4: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 (Construction Equipment NOx Reductions) and 4.3-2 (Fugitive Dust Mitigation Plan).	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to commencement of construction activities.
Biological Resources				
Impact 4.4-1: Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could result in adverse impacts to the following federal and/or State-Listed Endangered or Threatened plant species: Braunton's milk-vetch, Agoura Hills dudleya, Conejo dudleya, and Lyon's pentachaeta as well as other non listed special-status species. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: SCE and/or its contractors shall develop and implement a Noxious Weed and Invasive Plant Control Plan consistent with standard BMPs (see for example: Department of Transportation, State of California (Storm Water Quality Handbook - Project Planning and Design Guide [Caltrans, 2010]; and Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual [Caltrans, 2003]). The Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Ventura County Office of the Agricultural Commissioner and the CPUC. At a minimum, the Plan shall address any required cleaning of construction vehicles to minimize spread of noxious weeds and invasive plants.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.
Impact 4.4-2: Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could result in adverse impacts to the following special-status wildlife species, if present: western pond turtle, coast horned lizard, Swainson's hawk, American peregrine falcon, coastal California gnatcatcher, and San Diego desert woodrat. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Within areas that provide potentially suitable habitat, SCE and/or its contractors shall perform preconstruction surveys within 24 hours of initial ground disturbance to identify the potential presence of western pond turtle, coast horned lizard and San Diego desert woodrat within work areas. If any of these species are identified during surveys of the immediate project footprint, individuals shall be relocated from work areas by an individual who is authorized by CDFG to undertake species relocation. A suitable relocation area shall be identified and approved by CDFG prior to preconstruction surveys.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Twenty-four hours prior to initial ground disturbance activities.
	Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Where impacts to coastal sage scrub cannot be avoided (e.g. at the proposed Presidential Substation site and portions of subtransmission alignments), SCE and/or its contractors shall contact CDFG and the USFWS to coordinate coastal scrub avoidance measures that have been incorporated into the project design, and determine if additional measures are needed to reduce impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher habitat. Avoidance measures may include limiting the seasonal timing of work outside the breeding so that active gnatcatcher nesting is not disrupted during construction, limiting project disturbances to the smallest possible area in or near areas with suitable habitat, and providing environmental training to construction workers. In addition, the following actions will be carried out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal sage scrub shall be restored at a 1:1 ratio in areas where it is temporarily disturbed. If permanent impacts are anticipated to coastal sage scrub, SCE shall establish new habitat at a ratio of at least 1:1 (one 	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
	acre of created habitat for each acre lost) to achieve a no-net loss standard. • A qualified ecologist shall prepare a restoration and mitigation plan in coordination with CDFG and USWS to mitigate for temporary impacts to coastal sage scrub habitat with the intention of restoring habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher. The plan shall include a full description of microhabitat conditions necessary			

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.4-2 (cont.)	<p>for target vegetation species, seed germination and planting requirements, a description of the supplemental irrigation system, if needed to support site restoration, restoration techniques for temporarily disturbed occurrences, assessments of potential transplant and enhancement sites, success and performance criteria, and monitoring requirements, as well as measures to ensure long-term sustainability. Restoration sites shall be monitored for a period of at least three years to track mitigation success and identify needed adjustments to the restoration program. Plant survival and growth shall be recorded at the same time each year and reported to CDFG on an annual basis using survival and percentage cover as a metric of success. Restored areas shall be considered mature when they achieve 50 percent coverage by native plant species. The mitigation plan shall apply to portions of the project alignment that support restored coastal sage scrub habitat (e.g. at the proposed subtransmission alignment). At a minimum, the mitigation plan shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The location of mitigation sites that are selected from suitable lands in the in the local project vicinity; - A description of native vegetation to be planted or seeded and an estimation of the density and coverage of the final planted areas; - Site preparation measures that will be employed to encourage vegetation establishment, including the need for supplemental irrigation, erosion control, or other measures as appropriate; - Measures that would be employed to discourage site invasion by non-native species, for example, mowing, weeding, and/or herbicide application; - The source of plantings or seeds that are used in support of site restoration, with a preference for local plant stock wherever possible; - A schedule for maintaining and monitoring restored areas to include the number of scheduled site visits, actions that will be taken on each site visit, contingency measures to respond to site degradation, need for replanting, invasion by weeds, or erosion; - The restoration effort shall be considered successful when plant cover reaches 50 percent, or is at least comparable to vegetation cover in disturbed areas, and plants are self-sustaining without supplemental water for a period of at least two years. <p>Annual monitoring reports shall be prepared to document site progress and measures that were implemented during the prior year. Reports shall be submitted to CDFG and USFWS for review and approval.</p>			
Impact 4.4-3: Construction activities may impact common or protected nesting migratory birds. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: SCE and/or its contractors shall implement the following measures to avoid impacts on nesting raptors and other protected birds for construction activities that are scheduled during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31):</p> <p>No more than two weeks before construction within each new construction area, a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys of all potential nesting habitat within 500 feet of construction sites. If active nests are not identified, no further action is necessary. If active nests are identified, a no-disturbance buffer shall be created around active raptor nests and nests of other special-status birds during the breeding season, or until it is determined that all young have fledged. Typical buffers are 300 to 500 feet for raptors and 150 to 250 feet for other nesting birds (e.g., waterfowl and songbirds), depending upon species. The size of these buffer zones and types of construction activities that are allowed in these areas could be further modified during construction in coordination with CDFG and shall be based on existing and anticipated levels of noise and disturbance.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Within two weeks of construction activity near all potential nesting habitat.
Impact 4.4-4: Operation of new transmission lines could impact raptors as a result of electrocution or collision. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-4: SCE shall follow APLIC guidelines for avian protection on powerlines. SCE and/or its contractors shall use current guidelines to reduce bird mortality from interactions with powerlines. The APLIC (2005) and USFWS recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide 60-inch minimum horizontal separation between energized conductors or energized conductors and grounded hardware; • Insulate hardware or conductors against simultaneous contact if adequate spacing is not possible, and; • Use pole designs that minimize impacts to birds. 	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During installation of conductors, poles, and power lines.
Impact 4.4-5: Construction of the proposed subtransmission alignment could impact designated critical habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.4-5: Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a and 4.4-2b.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to ground disturbance and other construction activities.

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.4-6: Construction activities could impact jurisdictional waters of the United States and waters of the State, including drainages and seasonal wetlands. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.4-6a: SCE and/or its contractors shall through project design, avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and waters of the State to the maximum extent possible. This includes minimizing the footprint during construction of poles for the proposed subtransmission line and spanning drainages that occur within the alignment.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.
	Mitigation Measure 4.4-6b: Where jurisdictional wetlands and other waters cannot be avoided, to offset temporary and permanent impacts that occur as a result of the project, restoration, enhancement or compensatory mitigation shall be provided through the following mechanisms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To compensate for wetland impacts from the Proposed Presidential Substation, wetland enhancement and/or restoration shall be performed at a suitable off-site drainage or stream that is suitable to CDFG, RWQCB, and the Corps. Wetland mitigation and/or enhancement shall be provided at a minimum 2:1 replacement ratio in one of several nearby unnamed intermittent drainages to offset wetland losses. • If temporary impacts are anticipated to wetlands, a Wetland Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall be developed by a qualified biologist or wetland scientist in coordination with CDFG, RWQCB and the Corps that details mitigation and monitoring obligations for temporary impacts to wetlands and other waters as a result of construction activities. The Plan shall quantify the total acreage lost, monitoring and reporting requirements, and site specific plans to compensate for wetland losses resulting from the project at the ratios described above. The Plan shall be submitted to the appropriate regulatory agencies for approval. The Plan and documentation of such agency approval shall be submitted to the CPUC prior to construction. 	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.
Impact 4.4-8: Construction activities associated with Alternative 1 could result in adverse impacts to special-status plants species in portion of the alignment located north of the proposed Presidential Substation site. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II). ⁵	Mitigation Measure 4.4-8a: In portions of Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1 that have not been surveyed for special-status plants, SCE and/or its contractors shall complete focused plant surveys following CDFG and USFWS special-status plant survey guidelines. Surveys shall document the location, extent, and size of rare plant populations in the study area for each project component, and shall be used to inform the planned avoidance of special-status plant populations whenever possible. Based on focused plant survey findings, to the extent feasible, the final project design shall minimize impacts on known special-status plant populations within and adjacent to the construction footprints, with complete avoidance of any federal or State-listed plant species. SCE and/or its contractors shall design facilities to avoid sensitive plant populations whenever possible. Exclusion fencing shall be installed and maintained during construction around sensitive plant populations with as large a buffer as possible to minimize the potential for direct and indirect impacts.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.
	Mitigation Measure 4.4-8b: Where avoidance of non-listed plant species is not feasible, SCE and/or its contractors shall compensate for the loss through plant salvage and replanting, as follows: A qualified ecologist shall develop a Restoration and Mitigation Plan according to CDFG guidelines and in coordination with CDFG. At minimum, the plan shall include collection of complete plants or reproductive structures (as appropriate) from affected plants, a full description of microhabitat conditions necessary for each affected species, seed germination requirements, proposed restoration techniques for temporarily disturbed occurrences, an assessment of potential transplant and enhancement sites, a description of performance criteria, and a monitoring program to follow the progress of transplanted individuals.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.
Impact 4.4-9: Construction activities associated with Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2 could result in less than significant impacts to least Bell's vireo, a federal and State listed Endangered species. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II) ⁶	Mitigation Measure 4.4-9: SCE and/or its contractors shall design Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 2 to avoid impacts to riparian habitat, with poles located outside of riparian corridors whenever feasible. If impacts to riparian habitat occur, compensatory shall be required as described in Mitigation Measure 4.4-6b. Additionally, in the absence of a focused assessment to document the presence or absence of least Bell's vireo, this species shall be presumed present and construction activities near the identified drainage shall occur outside the February 1 through August 31 breeding season described in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3. If SCE plans to locate facilities within 250 feet of riparian habitat at this location during the least Bell's vireo breeding season, a habitat assessment for least Bell's vireo shall be performed at this location and findings coordinated with the USFWS to determine the need for the full eight survey protocol. If least Bell's vireo are identified during surveys, construction activities at this location would occur outside the breeding season to avoid	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.

⁵ Impact 4.4-8 and Mitigation Measures 4.4-8 a and b were included in the Draft EIR but accidentally omitted in the Draft EIR MMRCP Section – the addition in the Final EIR is a typographical correction and does not represent a new impact or mitigation.

⁶ Impact 4.4-9 and Mitigation Measure 4.4-9 were included in the Draft EIR but accidentally omitted in the Draft EIR MMRCP Section – the addition in the Final EIR is a typographical correction and does not represent a new impact or mitigation.

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
	impacts to this species.			

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Cultural Resources				
<p>Impact 4.5-1: Project construction could cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource [inclusive of archaeological resources] which is either listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or a local register of historic resources. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1: A qualified archaeologist shall be retained to serve as lead archaeologist and shall prepare and implement a Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan shall address the implementation of protective measures (as detailed in APMs CUL-2 through CUL-5), archaeological monitoring, and procedures for discovery of cultural resources. The Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan shall provide detailed plans for data recovery for those components of eligible resource CA-VEN-744 that cannot be avoided during project implementation, and for the capping of those portions of site CA-VEN-744 that may be indirectly impacted. The plan shall also address the creation of Environmentally Sensitive Areas within sites CA-VEN-744 and CA-VEN-1571. The Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan shall also state that if significant portions of either site are encountered during project implementation outside of protected areas, Proposed Project redesign should be considered in order to avoid impacts to significant areas. If avoidance is infeasible, then data recovery shall be implemented.</p> <p>The Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan shall detail the duration and locations of archaeological and Native American monitoring during project implementation and shall provide for discretionary modifications to monitoring procedures by the lead archaeologist based on observations made by the monitor as construction progresses. The Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan shall also create measures for the accidental discovery of archaeological resources during project implementation. Avoidance shall be the preferred means of avoiding impacts to cultural resources. The Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan shall set forth detailed procedures for data recovery in the event that resources cannot be avoided.</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to issuing a grading permit.</p>
<p>Impact 4.5-2: Project construction could adversely impact a unique archaeological resource. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-2a: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, an archaeological monitor shall be retained by SCE and/or its contractors to monitor all ground-disturbing activities, including grading, excavation, vegetation clearance and grubbing, and implementation of cultural resources protective measures (i.e. site capping, pad construction). The procedures for monitoring shall be outlined in the Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan as described in Mitigation Measure 4.5-1, and shall include provisions for discretionary modifications to monitoring procedures by the lead archaeologist based on observations made by the monitor as construction progresses.</p> <p>The monitor shall be a qualified archaeologist and shall work under the supervision of an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualification standards for archaeology. In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, the archaeological monitor shall be empowered to halt or redirect ground-disturbing activities away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated.</p> <p>Due to the sensitivity of the project area for Native American resources, at least one Native American monitor shall also monitor ground-disturbing activities in the project area, including the implementation of protective measures and data recovery. Selection of monitors shall be made from the Native American Heritage Commission list provided for the Project.</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to issuing a grading permit and during construction activities.</p>
	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-2b: If archaeological resources are encountered at any point during Proposed Project implementation, SCE and/or its contractors shall cease all activity within 50 feet of the find until the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If the archaeologist determines that the resources may be significant, and if avoidance is determined to be infeasible, the archaeologist shall notify the lead agency and shall follow procedures outlined in the Cultural Resources Treatment and Discovery Plan (Mitigation Measure 4.5-1), in consultation with the lead agency and with appropriate Native American representatives (if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature).</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.</p>
<p>Impact 4.5-3: The project could adversely affect unidentified paleontological resources. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-3: Applicant Proposed Measures PAL-01 and PAL-02 shall be implemented for all paleontologically sensitive portions of the project area. The Paleontological Mitigation Plan, as described in Applicant Proposed Measure PAL-01, shall be based on prior paleontological evaluations, shall identify paleontologically sensitive formations within the project area, and shall address the locations of and procedures for paleontological resources monitoring, including the identification of specific paleontological monitoring locations; microscopic examination of samples where applicable; the evaluation, recovery, identification, and curation of fossils; and the preparation of a final mitigation report.</p> <p>All earth moving activities within those formations identified as sensitive within the Paleontological Mitigation Plan shall be monitored on a full-time basis, unless the project paleontologist determines that sediments are previously disturbed or there is no reason to continue monitoring in a particular area due to other depositional factors, which would make fossil preservation unlikely or deemed scientifically insignificant. In the event fossils are exposed during earth moving, construction activities shall be redirected to other work areas until the procedures outlined in the Paleontological Mitigation Plan have been implemented or the paleontologist determines work can resume in the vicinity of the find.</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>During construction activities.</p>

**TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Cultural Resources (cont.)				
Impact 4.5-4: Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.5-4: If human remains are uncovered during construction, SCE and/or its contractors shall immediately halt all work in the vicinity of the find, contact the Ventura County Coroner to evaluate the remains, and follow the procedures and protocols set forth in §15064.5 (e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. If the County coroner determines that the remains are Native American, SCE shall contact the NAHC, in accordance with Health and Safety Code §7050.5, subdivision (c), and PRC5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641).	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction activities.
Impact 4.5-5: Construction of Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1 could adversely impact a unique archaeological resource. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.5-5: The portion of <u>any alternative subtransmission or distribution alignment Alternative Subtransmission Alignment 1</u> that has not been subject to archaeological survey shall be surveyed prior to any ground-disturbing activities. If significant cultural resources are identified, the procedures described in Mitigation Measure 4.5-2b shall be implemented.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction activities.
Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources				
No Impacts	No Mitigations	N/A	N/A	N/A
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
Impact 4.7-2: The Proposed Project could conflict with CARB's Climate Change Scoping Plan. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.7-2: SCE shall ensure that the circuit breakers installed at the proposed Presidential Substation (Proposed Project), or Royal and Potrero substations (System Alternative A), have a guaranteed SF6 annual leak rate of no more than 0.5 percent by volume. SCE shall provide CPUC with documentation of compliance, such as specification sheets, prior to installation of the circuit breakers. In addition, SCE shall annually monitor the SF6-containing circuit breakers at the proposed Presidential Substation <u>applicable substations</u> for the detection and repair of leaks.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to installation of circuit breakers and annual monitoring of the SF6-containing circuit breakers.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Impact 4.8-1: Construction, operations, and maintenance activities would require the use of certain materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other chemical products that could pose a potential hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport and use or accidental release. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.8-1a: SCE and/or its contractors shall implement BMPs including but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow manufacturer's recommendations on use, storage, and disposal of chemical products used in construction; • Avoid overtopping construction and maintenance equipment fuel gas tanks; • Use tarps and adsorbent pads under vehicles when refueling to contain and capture any spilled fuel; • During routine maintenance of construction and operations equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils; and • Properly dispose of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals. 	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.
	Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b: SCE and/or its contractors shall prepare a Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan and implement it during construction, operations, and maintenance to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws and guidelines regarding the handling of hazardous materials. The plan shall prescribe hazardous material handling procedures to reduce the potential for a spill during construction, or exposure of the workers or public to hazardous materials. The plan shall also include a discussion of appropriate response actions in the event that hazardous materials are released or encountered during excavation activities. The plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Handling:</i> A project operations-specific hazardous materials management and hazardous waste management program shall be developed prior to construction of proposed Presidential Substation project. The program shall outline proper hazardous materials use, storage, and disposal requirements, as well as hazardous waste management procedures. The program shall identify types of hazardous materials to be used at the proposed Presidential Substation project and the types of wastes that would be generated. All project personnel shall be provided with project-specific training. This program shall be developed to ensure that all hazardous materials and wastes are handled in a safe and environmentally sound manner. Employees handling wastes would receive hazardous materials training and shall be trained in hazardous waste procedures, spill contingencies, waste minimization procedures and Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facility training in accordance with OSHA Hazard Communication Standard. • <i>Transport of Hazardous Materials:</i> Containers used to store hazardous materials shall be properly labeled and kept in good condition. Written procedures for the transport of hazardous materials used shall be established in accordance with U.S. Department of Transportation and Caltrans regulations. A qualified transporter shall be selected to comply with U.S. Department of Transportation and Caltrans regulations. 	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)				
Impact 4.8-1 (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Emergency Release Response Procedures:</i> An Operations Emergency Response Plan detailing responses to releases of hazardous materials would be developed prior to Substation construction activities. It would prescribe hazardous materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a spill and would include an emergency response program to ensure quick and safe cleanup of accidental spills. All hazardous materials spills or threatened release, including petroleum products such as gasoline, diesel, and hydraulic fluid, regardless of the quantity spilled, would be immediately reported to the applicable agencies if the spill enters a storm drain, if the spill migrates from the site, or if the spill causes injury to a person or threatens injury to public health. The plan shall identify and make all personnel aware of the local, State, and federal emergency response reporting guidelines. 			
	Mitigation Measure 4.8-1c: SCE and/or its contractors shall prepare and implement a Health and Safety Plan to ensure the health and safety of construction workers and the public during construction, operations, and maintenance. The plan shall include information on the appropriate personal protective equipment to be used during construction, operations, and maintenance. The plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction activities.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.
	Mitigation Measure 4.8-1d: SCE and/or its contractors shall ensure that oil-absorbent material, tarps, and storage drums shall be used to contain and control any minor releases. Emergency spill supplies and equipment shall be kept at the project staging areas and adjacent to all areas of work, 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 Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan (see Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b), which shall be implemented during construction operations, and maintenance.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.
	Mitigation Measure 4.8-1e: SCE shall prepare and submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan for the proposed Presidential Substation project. The required documentation shall be submitted to the Ventura County Department of Environmental Health and the CPUC. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan would include hazardous materials and hazardous waste management procedures and emergency response procedures, including emergency spill cleanup supplies and equipment.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.
Impact 4.8-2: Project activities could release previously unidentified hazardous materials into the environment. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.8-2: SCE's Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan (as required under Mitigation Measure 4.8-1b) shall include provisions that would be implemented if any subsurface hazardous materials are encountered during construction. Provisions outlined in the plan shall include immediately stopping work in the contaminated area and contacting appropriate resource agencies, including the CPUC designated monitor, upon discovery of subsurface hazardous materials. The plan shall include the phone numbers local and State agencies and primary, secondary, and final cleanup procedures. The Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Construction Plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction activities.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction of the Proposed Project
Impact 4.8-3: Project activities could release hazardous materials within the vicinity of an existing day care facility. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.8-3: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.8-1a through 4.8-1e, and 4.8-2.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.
Impact 4.8-4: The Proposed Project could result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area because a nearby private airstrip. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.8-4: SCE shall provide written notification to the Ventura County Sheriff Department and the land owner of the Tierra Rejada Valley landing strip stating when the new subtransmission line and poles would be erected. SCE shall also provide the Sheriff Department and the landing strip owner with recent aerial photos or topographic maps clearly showing the location of the new lines and poles. The photos or maps shall also indicate the heights of the poles and conductors. SCE shall provide documentation of compliance to the CPUC.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction and installation of new subtransmission lines and poles.
Impact 4.8-5: Construction of the Proposed Project could interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.8-5: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.15-1b.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction of the Proposed Project.
Impact 4.8-6: Construction and maintenance-related activities could ignite dry vegetation and start a fire. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.8-6: SCE and/or its contractors shall have water tanks and/or water trucks sited/available at active project sites for fire protection. All construction and maintenance vehicles shall have fire suppression equipment. Construction personnel shall be required to park vehicles away from dry vegetation. Prior to construction, SCE and its contractors shall contact and coordinate with the California Department of Forestry (CalFire) and applicable local fire departments (i.e., Ventura County) to determine the appropriate amounts of fire equipment to be carried on the vehicles and appropriate locations for the water tanks if water trucks are not used. SCE shall submit verification of its consultation with CalFire and the local fire departments to the CPUC.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to construction and maintenance activities.

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Hydrology and Water Quality				
<p>Impact 4.9-1: Construction and maintenance activities associated with the Proposed Project could result in increased erosion and sedimentation and/or pollutant (e.g., fuels and lubricants) loading to surface waters, which could increase turbidity, suspended solids, settleable solids, or otherwise degrade water quality. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-1: For all segments of new or improved access roads that would be within 300 feet of an existing surface water channel (i.e., one that has a distinct bed and banks, including irrigation ditches where no berm/levee is currently in place) and traverse a ground slope greater than two percent, the following protective measures shall be adhered to and/or installed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All access roads shall be out-sloped; In-board ditches may be used to control/convey water seepage from cut slopes. If used, in-board ditches shall be lined with rock rip-rap and (the slope shall not exceed 6 percent); Cross-drains (road surface drainage, e.g., waterbars, rolling dips, or channel drains) shall be installed at intervals based upon the finished road slope: road slope 5 percent or less, cross-drain spacing shall be 150 feet; road slope 6 to 15 percent, cross-drain spacing shall be 100 feet; 16 to 20 percent, cross-drain spacing shall be 75 feet; and 21 to 25 percent, cross-drain spacing shall be 50 feet; Energy dissipation features (e.g., rock rip-rap, or a rock-filled container) shall be installed at all cross-drain outlets; and No new or improved road segments with finished slopes greater than 25 percent. 	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to construction and maintenance activities.</p>
<p>Impact 4.9-2: Dewatering during Project construction activities could release previously contaminated groundwater to surface water bodies and/or increase sediment loading to local surface water channels through overland discharge and subsequent erosion, both processes could degrade water quality in receiving surface waters. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-2: Regarding dewatering activities and discharges (if necessary), the following measures shall be implemented as part of Proposed Project construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If degraded soil or groundwater is encountered during excavation (e.g., there is an obvious sheen, odor, or unnatural color to the soil or groundwater), SCE and/or its contractor shall excavate, segregate, test, and dispose of degraded soil or groundwater in accordance with State hazardous waste disposal requirements. All dewatering activities shall, where feasible, ultimately discharge to the land surface in the vicinity of the particular installation or construction site. The discharges shall be contained, such that the water is allowed to infiltrate back into the soil (and eventually to the groundwater table) and the potential for inducing erosion and subsequent sediment delivery to nearby surface waterways is eliminated. Further, the holding tank or structure shall be protected from the introduction of pollutants (e.g., oil or fuel contamination from nearby equipment). Concerning such activities, SCE shall apply and comply with the provisions of SWRCB Order 2003-0003-DWQ, including develop and submit to the LARWQCB a discharge monitoring plan. If discharging to a community sewer system is necessary, SCE shall discharge to a community sewer system that flows to a wastewater treatment plant. Prior to discharging, SCE shall inform the responsible organization or municipality and present them with a description of and plan for the anticipated discharge. SCE shall comply with any specific requirements that the responsible organization or municipality may have. If discharging to surface waters (including to storm drains) would be necessary, SCE shall obtain and comply with the provisions of the LARWQCB Dewatering General Permit. SCE shall perform a reasonable potential analysis using a representative sample(s) of the groundwater to be discharged; this shall include analyzing the sample(s) for the constituents listed in the LARWQCB Dewatering General Permit, including TDS and nitrate. Further, the sample(s) shall be compared to the screening criteria listed in the LARWQCB Dewatering General Permit and the Basin Plan, and it shall be demonstrated that the discharge would not exceed any of the applicable water quality criteria or objectives. If necessary, SCE shall develop and submit to the LARWQCB a treatment plan and design. SCE shall provide to the CPUC proof of compliance with LARWQCB plans and permits prior to the commencement of construction activities. 	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>During construction activities.</p>
<p>Impact 4.9-3: Installation of the proposed Presidential Substation would alter the local drainage pattern, potentially resulting in substantial on- or off-site erosion or sedimentation, and/or substantially increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-3: The following storm water quality control measures and BMPs shall be implemented at the proposed Presidential Substation site (see Appendix D for the related worksheet and calculations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCE shall implement a Retention BMP(s) (as defined in the Ventura County TGM [2010]) with a design volume of approximately 0.006 acre-feet. The drainage area to this feature shall comprise at least 0.10 acres of the proposed impervious surface area. This BMP shall be selected, designed, and implemented according to the guidance and requirements summarized in the Ventura County MS4 Permit and the Ventura County TGM (2010). Alternatively, SCE shall demonstrate that the proposed storm water infiltration swale, or modifications thereto, would meet these mitigation requirements. SCE shall implement a Treatment Control BMP(s) (as defined in the Ventura County TGM [2010]) with a design volume of approximately 0.056 acre-feet. The drainage area to this feature shall comprise at least the remaining 5.3 acres of the proposed Presidential substation site (i.e., the residual drainage area not captured by the Retention BMP(s)). This BMP shall be selected, designed, and implemented according to the guidance and requirements summarized in the Ventura County MS4 Permit and the Ventura County TGM (2010). Alternatively, SCE shall demonstrate that the proposed storm water infiltration swale, or modifications thereto, would meet these mitigation requirements. 	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>During construction and operation of the Proposed Project.</p>

**TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Land Use and Planning				
No Impacts	No Mitigations	N/A	N/A	N/A
Noise				
Impact 4.11-1: Construction activities would generate noise levels in unincorporated Ventura County that would exceed Ventura County construction noise threshold criteria. <i>Significant unavoidable</i> (Class I)	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-1a: SCE and/or its contractors shall develop a Construction Noise Reduction Plan. The Plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction activities. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures for daytime construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish and distribute to the potentially affected community within 300 feet, a “Hot Line” telephone number or pager number, which shall be attended during active construction working hours, for use by the public to register complaints. All complaints shall be logged noting date, time, complainants’ name, nature of complaint, and any corrective action taken. • All construction equipment shall have intake and exhaust mufflers recommended by the manufacturers thereof, to meet relevant noise limitations. • Maximize physical separation, as far as practicable, between noise sources (construction equipment) and noise receptors. Separation may be achieved by providing enclosures for stationary items of equipment and noise barriers around particularly noisy areas at the project sites and by locating stationary equipment to minimize noise impacts on the community. • Utilize construction noise barriers such as paneled noise shields, barriers, or enclosures adjacent to or around noisy equipment associated with access road construction, pole installation and removal, and underground trenching for distribution line and fiber optic cable in the immediate vicinity (i.e., within 200 feet) of sensitive receptors. Noise control shields shall be made featuring a solid panel and a weather-protected, sound-absorptive material on the construction-activity side of the noise shield. Shields used during linear construction activities shall be readily removable and moveable so that they may be repositioned, as necessary, to provide noise abatement for construction activities located near residential receptors. 	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction activities.
Impact 4.11-1 (cont.)	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11-1b: The Construction Noise Reduction Plan required by Mitigation Measure 4.11-1a shall include a nighttime noise and nuisance reduction strategy in the event that nighttime construction activity is determined to be necessary within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors. The strategy shall include a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures that apply state of the art noise reduction technology to ensure that nighttime construction noise levels and associated nuisances are reduced to the extent feasible.</p> <p>The attenuation measures may include, but not be limited to, the control strategies and methods for implementation that are listed below. If any of the following strategies are determined by SCE to not be feasible, an explanation as to why the specific strategy is not feasible shall be included in the Construction Noise Reduction Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan construction activities to minimize the amount of nighttime construction. • Offer temporary relocation of residents within 200 feet of nighttime construction activities. • Temporary noise barriers, such as shields and blankets, shall be installed immediately adjacent to all nighttime stationary noise sources (e.g., auger rigs, bore rigs, generators, pumps, etc.). • Install temporary noise barriers that block the line of sight between nighttime activities and the closest residences within 1,000 feet. <p>The notification requirements identified in Mitigation Measure 4.11-1a shall be extended to include residences within 1,000 feet of pending nighttime construction activities.</p>	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction activities.
Impact 4.11-4: Construction activities could increase ambient noise levels in Thousand Oaks and Simi Valley. <i>Less than Significant with Mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.11-4: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.11-1a and 4.11-1b.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	During construction activities.
Population and Housing				
No Impacts	No Mitigations	N/A	N/A	N/A
Public Services				
No Impacts	No Mitigations	N/A	N/A	N/A
Recreation				
No Impacts	No Mitigations	N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Transportation and Traffic				
<p>Impact 4.15-1: Project construction would temporarily increase traffic volumes on roadways in the study area, and would potentially conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-1a: SCE shall obtain and comply with local road encroachment permits for public roads that are crossed by the proposed or alternative subtransmission and distribution alignments. SCE shall also notify the owner of any private road east of Hwy 23 that would be crossed by the proposed subtransmission alignment (Proposed Project), or the owner of any private road that would be crossed by alternative distribution alignments (System Alternative A), regarding short-term construction activities at road crossings. Copies of all encroachment permits for those specific construction activities that would involve the crossing of a public road, and evidence of private property owner notification for those construction activities that would involve the crossing of a private road east of Hwy 23 shall be provided to the CPUC prior to the commencement of those specific construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-1b: SCE shall prepare and implement a Traffic Management Plan subject to approval of the appropriate state agency and/or local government(s). The approved Traffic Management Plan and documentation of agency approvals shall be submitted to the CPUC prior to the commencement of construction activities. The plan shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a discussion of work hours, haul routes, work area delineation, traffic control and flagging; • Identify all access and parking restriction and signage requirements; • Require workers to park personal vehicles at the approved staging area and take only necessary Project vehicles to the work sites; • Lay out plans for notifications and a process for communication with affected residents and landowners prior to the start of construction. Advance public notification shall include posting of notices and appropriate signage of construction activities. The written notification shall include the construction schedule, the exact location and duration of activities within each street (i.e., which road/lanes and access point/driveways would be blocked on which days and for how long), and a toll-free telephone number for receiving questions or complaints; and • Include plans to coordinate all construction activities with emergency service providers in the area prior to construction to ensure that construction activities and associated lane closures would not significantly affect emergency response vehicles. Emergency service providers shall be notified of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities. All roads shall remain passable to emergency service vehicles at all times. SCE shall submit verification of its consultation with emergency service providers to the CPUC. • Identify all roadway locations where special construction techniques (e.g., night construction) would be used to minimize impacts to traffic flow. • Limit construction-related truck traffic on State highways to off-peak traffic hours to the extent feasible. 	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of construction activities.</p>
		<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of construction activities.</p>
	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-1c: The County and SCE shall insure that appropriate warning signs are posted alerting bicyclists to bike lane closures and instructing motorists to share the road with bicyclists. In addition, in order to remove potential roadway hazards to bicyclist in the construction areas the SEC shall ensure that all contract haul trucks are covered to prevent spillage of materials onto haul routes, and that the area adjacent to the Substation site shall be kept free of debris and dirt that may accumulate from entering and exiting trucks by conducting regular sweeping of the project area.</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of construction activities.</p>
	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-1d: SCE shall coordinate with the appropriate local government departments in Thousand Oaks, Simi Valley, with county agencies such as the Ventura County Public Works Agency, with state agencies such as Caltrans, and with other utility districts and agencies as appropriate, regarding the timing of construction projects that would occur near the Proposed Project. The Ventura County Public Works Agency reviews environmental documents to ensure that all individual and cumulative adverse impacts to the Regional Road Network and County-maintained local roads have been adequately evaluated and mitigated to insignificant levels. SCE shall submit verification of its coordination to the CPUC. This multi-agency coordination, and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.15-1a and 4.15-1b, would ensure that the cumulative effect of simultaneous construction activities in overlapping areas would be minimized.</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of construction activities.</p>
<p>Impact 4.15-3: Project construction would increase potential traffic safety hazards for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians on public roadways. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-3: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.15-1a, Mitigation Measure 4.15-1b and Mitigation Measure 4.15-1c.</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of construction activities.</p>
<p>Impact 4.15-4: The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.15-4: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.15-1b.</p>	<p>SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.</p>	<p>CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.</p>	<p>Prior to commencement of construction activities.</p>

**TABLE C-1 (CONTINUED)
MITIGATION MONITORING, REPORTING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUBSTATION PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures Proposed in this EIR	Implementing Actions	Monitoring/Reporting Requirements	Timing
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)				
Impact 4.15-5: The Proposed Project would temporarily conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and would temporarily decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. <i>Less than significant with mitigation</i> (Class II)	Mitigation Measure 4.15-5: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.15-1c.	SCE and its contractors to implement measure as defined.	CPUC mitigation monitor to inspect compliance.	Prior to commencement of construction activities.
Utilities and Service Systems				
No Impacts	No Mitigations	N/A	N/A	N/A

(END OF ATTACHMENT A)