

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



January 24, 2013

Mr. Mark Cassady
TRC, Inc.
Senior Biologist
405 Clyde Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94043

Subject: Atascadero - San Luis Obispo 70kV Power Line Reconductoring Project Variance Request #12 for relocation of a temporary Pull and Tension Site (PTS) from Pole 61/3 to Pole 61/13

Dear Mr. Cassady:

I have reviewed Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) submission of Variance Request #12, which was submitted on January 14, 2013 for the Atascadero - San Luis Obispo 70kV Power Line Reconductoring Project (project).

The CPUC has determined relocating the proposed PTS from Pole 61/3 to Pole 61/13 and the associated work would not create greater environmental impacts or new significant impacts than those analyzed in the approved Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the project, pursuant to the description, analysis, and conditions presented in this letter.

Proposed Actions

PG&E proposes to relocate a temporary PTS from Pole 61/3 to Pole 61/13. The previously approved PTS location at Pole 61/3 was transcribed incorrectly due to typographical error, and a PTS is not needed at Pole 61/3.

PG&E proposes to conduct the approved pull and tensioning activities at Pole 61/13, as analyzed in the IS/MND and Atascadero Mitigation Compliance Determination in response to PG&E's 2011 Work Plan, which was approved on May 27, 2011.

The PTS would be located directly adjacent to Pole 61/13 and would include an approximately 150 feet long and 40 feet wide work area on either side of the pole. No new or additional equipment would be used. Pull and tensioning would be conducted with standard line trucks parked along the access road or under the project power line and would not require any new grading. Temporary ground disturbance at the site would be equal to that of the previously approved location. Minor brush clearing and trimming may be required as necessary, and would be conducted in the same manner as previously approved for temporary work sites.

CPUC Analysis of Environmental Impacts

Biological Resources. The proposed PTS relocation would not have any greater or new impacts to sensitive biological resources than those analyzed in the IS/MND. The proposed site has the potential for occurrence of the same types of plant and animal species as the previously approved location, due to their close proximity and similar vegetation types. No special status habitat or

species were identified at either site. All applicable biological APMs and MMs must be implemented.

Nesting Raptors and Birds. Nesting raptors and birds have the potential to be located within, or in proximity, to the proposed work area. Impacts to raptors and birds would not be any different from or greater than those analyzed in the IS/MND with the implementation of applicable applicant proposed measures (APMs) and mitigation measures (MMs). All nests identified during pre-work avian surveys must be monitored in accordance with requirements listed in MMs BO-1 and BO-3.

Cultural Resources. Applied Earthworks (Æ) conducted archaeological and historical resources surveys in November and December of 2008.

Pull and tensioning activities would have similar or fewer impacts than pole replacement activities on the cultural resource because the work would not involve ground disturbance, such as hole auguring. The temporary PTS work area would be greater than the pole replacement work area; however, the majority of the work area would be located on an existing dirt driveway that was previously approved as a project access road.

PG&E provided a letter from Æ with Variance Request #12 (dated July 3, 2012) that states the proposed pull and tensioning activities would have no effect on cultural resources. *The complete letter is marked confidential and is not included with this final approval .*

Paleontological Resources. Both the proposed and previously approved PTS location is within an area of high paleontological sensitivity, as identified in the IS/MND. Relocation of the PTS would not change the potential impacts to paleontological resources, which are not significant with implementation of MM CR-5 and MM CR-6.

Air Quality. Dust may be generated by the proposed work activities. Air impacts would be the same as those assessed in the IS/MND since the request involves relocating a PTS and would not increase the net project work activities or workspace. The proposed relocation would not result in new or greater impacts with implementation of applicable APMs and MMs.

Noise. Noise levels and the proximity to residences at the proposed site would be similar to the previously approved location. No greater or new noise impacts would be created with implementation of all applicable noise measures (APMs NS-1 through NS-8).

Traffic. Traffic impacts would be similar or less than those previously approved in the IS/MND and compliance determination for the 2011 Work Plan. The previously approved site was located on either side of San Gabriel Road and would no longer be used. The proposed site is located off of Atascadero Avenue which would reduce the potential need for traffic control. No additional or new vehicles would be used as a result of the proposed PTS relocation. All applicable traffic measures must be implemented (APMs TT-1 through TT-4).

Hydrology. Hydrology impacts would be the same as those assessed in the IS/MND. Relocation of the PTS would not create greater or new impacts to hydrologic resources. The work area would be temporary and would replace a previously approved work area. There are no streams or waterways in closer proximity to the new site than the original site and BMPs to minimize erosion would be implemented as described in the IS/MND.

Mr. Cassady
January 17, 2013
Page 3

Hazards. Hazards associated with the PTS relocation and associated activities would be similar to those assessed in the IS/MND and would not create greater or new hazards. The work activities would be conducted in the same manner as previously approved, and hazards would remain the same with implementation of all relevant plans and safety measures.

Approval

The proposed PTS relocation from Pole 61/3 to 61/13 would not create significantly greater or new significant impacts beyond those identified in the IS/MND. Variance Request #12 is approved. PG&E is required to implement all applicable project measures (APMs and MMs) as identified in the IS/MND.

Sincerely,

MJOrsaba.

Lisa Orsaba

CPUC Project Manager

Cc: Aaron Lui, Panorama Environmental, Inc.
Tania Treis, Panorama Environmental, Inc.
Judi Mosley, PG&E attorney

Attachment A: Variance Request #12