

SCE GKR Project Application Deficiencies

PEA Section or Page #	Comment Code		Quick (July 29)	Long-Term (> 60 days after May 29)	Response/Modified Text
Section 5: Environmental Analysis					
5.5 Cultural Resources					
Historic Built Environment Report					
General	DD-HBER1	Define the direct and indirect (visual) APE/API to be consistent with other TLRR projects. Include the distance and methods used to determine the APE/API for direct and indirect impacts.		X	Definitions will be defined/revised in the revised Historic Built Environment Report.
General	DD-HBER2	Discuss your methods for identifying and evaluating historic built environment resources within indirect and direct APE/API (for example only previously recorded HBER were included in the indirect APE/API)		X	Methodology will be provided in the revised Historic Built Environment Report. Desk survey of all improvements occurred, with age-dating completed to inform field survey of all resources at least 45 years old in the Direct APE. The project work plan called for photography of the first 75' of the Indirect / Visual APE / API to assess visual impacts. For the TLRR IC Project, agency reviewers established that all previously recorded recommended eligible and listed built environment resources shall be identified in the Indirect / Visual and assessed for effects / impacts accordingly based on eligibility under specific NRHP / CRHR criterion.
General	DD-HBER3	Remove discussions of the Historic/Cultural Landscape		X	Discussions will be removed in the revised Historic Built Environment Report.
p. 5	DD-HBER4	Per the PEA, there are only 5 segments, not 7. Segment descriptions need to be adjusted to match the PEA.		X	Segment descriptions will be revised in revised Historic Built Environment Report.
p. 12	DD-HBER5	Please provide the HEIMP protocol.		X	HEIMP protocol will be provided in the revised Historic Built Environment Report.
Resource Identifier: 0386, p. 161	DD-HBER6	Given the size of the facility and the fact that the project will have no effect to the facility, was there adequate time and resources expended on investigating its potential significance? Are there any facilities within the prison complex that retain integrity and date to the property's period of significance?		X	Historic Built Environment Report to be revised per comment.
Direct APE/API, p. 179, para. 1	DD-HBER7	Provide a table of the 5 properties discussed in this section.		X	Table will be provided in the revised Historic Built Environment Report.
Direct APE/API, p. 179, para. 2	DD-HBER8	Provide a table of the 6 properties discussed in this section.		X	Table will be provided in the revised Historic Built Environment Report.
Direct APE/API, p. 179, para 3	DD-HBER9	Provide a table of the 12 properties discussed in this section.		X	Table will be provided in the revised Historic Built Environment Report.
Direct APE/API, p. 179, para 4-5	DD-HBER10	Confirm that the proposed project actions near Fort Tejon State Historic Park are accurate and up to date.	X		All proposed project actions have been confirmed as accurate.
Maps	DD-HBER11	Update the maps in terms of indirect and direct APE and make sure that all data on maps is consistent with the text of the report. Remove Cultural Landscape maps.		X	Maps will be provided in the revised Historic Built Environment Report.