

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
Federal Agencies		
October 17, 2006	Cleveland National Forest Tina Terrell Forest Supervisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests additional time to comment; will complete comments by end of October.
October 20, 2006	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and California Dept. of Fish & Game Therese O'Rourke Assistant Field Supervisor U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Michael Milligan Deputy Regional Manager CA Dept. of Fish & Game	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate independence of Stirling Energy Systems planned solar facility in Imperial Valley, and other power generation projects. • Evaluate ability of existing and reasonably foreseeable future renewable resources to supply not only the Project but also the Green Path Project. Include in evaluation whether one or both transmission lines will result in excess capacity that will facilitate development of non-renewable energy. • Need for another transmission line should be independently evaluated in the context of regional transmission network and location of current and feasible sources of renewable energy. Investigate why Green Path, Southwest Powerlink and Devers–Palo Verde are not sufficient enough for power generation. Evaluate whether all of these projects are essential to network and whether improvements along any or all of the existing corridors would provide benefits equivalent to the proposed Project. An alternative that would remedy bottlenecks should be considered. • Need reasonable range of alternatives (no suggestions provided). Project objectives narrowly defined, this will limit range of feasible alternatives. Objectives clearly favor adding to existing transmission capacity. Project purpose provides more accurate description. Consider using purpose to more broadly define project objectives and include feasible non-transmission alternatives in Draft EIR/EIS. • Reconsider alternative that parallels the SWPL and address potential for new line to be more resistant to fire. • Wildlife agencies have requested in writing and in meetings that survey results should be included in the draft EIR/EIS so that alternatives and impacts can be adequately evaluated and to allow for public review. Absent this information, we request revisions to and recirculation of Draft document once survey data becomes available and can be included in alternatives and impact analyses. • Concerned with project-related direct and indirect impacts to migratory and resident bird species, project located along a major migration corridor and will traverse areas that support sensitive avian species. Applicant suggested mitigation measures must be evaluated based on implementation on other projects. • Project will disturb areas that are currently undeveloped, often results in introduction of nonnative plant and animal species. Project will traverse area covered by proposed East County Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan. EIR/EIS should address this plan and provide appropriate mitigation measures. • General Comments. Wildlife agencies request that the EIR/EIS contain at a minimum the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Purpose and need for project — Complete list of flora and fauna within and adjacent to project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough assessment of Rare Natural Communities • Current inventory of biological resources associated with each habitat on site and area of impact

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory of rare, threatened and endangered species • Seasonal variations in use by sensitive species — Thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific acreage and descriptions of wetlands and other sensitive habitats • Discuss regional setting • Qualitative and quantitative analyses of listed and sensitive species and their habitats • Indirect Project impacts on biological resources • Cumulative effects • Project impact on regional and subregional conservation programs — Thorough discussion of mitigation measures; emphasize avoidance and if not possible then reduce impacts. For unavoidable impacts, off-site mitigation through acquisition and preservation of affected habitats should be addressed. Measures to address indirect Project impacts should be included. — Consider and evaluate range of alternatives — Wildlife agencies strongly discourage development in or conversion of wetlands. All wetlands and watercourses should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks. Project may require a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement. — Attachments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guidelines for Assessing Effects of Proposed Project on Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plant and Natural Communities. 2. Sensitivity of Top Priority Rare Natural Communities in Southern California
November 1, 2006	Cleveland National Forest Tina Terrell Forest Supervisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to Parts 1 and 3 of the Forest Plan as a guide for environmental review of the project. Part 3 provides design criteria. • Part 2 of the Plan is specific to Cleveland National Forest (CNF) and includes land use zones and identified land uses that are suitable within each zone. • Major utility corridor would require placement in a designated area. CNF has limited designated utility corridors. Additional corridors would require a Plan Amendment. • Plan emphasizes a Place-based program that provides for land and resource management and desired future conditions. • Note Standard CNF S5 regarding preferred consolidation and co-location of major utility corridors. • Extensive road less designation areas between Capitan Grande Reservation and Cuyamaca Rancho State Park. • This letter also provides comments regarding potential impacts associated with project alternatives. The resources identified include potential impacts to Sunrise Scenic Byway (County Road S1), Interstate 8 (I-8), Guatay Mountain area, Sheeps Head near Glen Cliff, and raptor-sensitive areas in Valle de San Jose Grant, Santa Ysabel Valley, Witch Creek area, and San Vicente Valley. • Threat of wildfire and fire management is a concern to the Forest.

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
State Agencies		
October 16, 2006	State Water Resources Control Board Elizabeth Haven Assistant Deputy Director Division of Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Water Resources Control Board is taking the lead regulatory role for Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification. • Requests consultation for mitigation measures regarding impacts to State waters. Early consultation encouraged. • Identify all waters of the State affected by Project. • Include direct and indirect impacts to water quality from discharges to waters of the State. • Include alternatives analysis required by CWA §404 (b)(1). If have discharges then need CWA 401 from State Water Board and CWA 404 permit from Army Corps of Engineers. • Riparian corridors and other waters play important role in maintaining habitat connectivity. Analyze regional importance of movement corridors in and along water bodies. • Attachment: Impacts Identification; Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity Related to Wetland, Riparian, and Aquatic Resources.
October 17, 2006	California Department of Transportation Al Cox Chief, Development Review Branch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caltrans requests that all areas where impacts will occur on State ROW be clearly delineated in the report and in maps. • NPDES/Stormwater. Concerned about impaired water bodies along proposed alignments. Determine impacts to impaired water bodies and identify construction and operation impacts and mitigation. • Stewardship. Project crosses State Route (SR) 56, I-15, SR-78 and SR-52 in San Diego County. In Imperial County the project crosses SR-78 and SR-79. • Community Impact Assessment. Wants to ensure that social and economic impacts to communities along route are fully analyzed. • Landscape and Cultural Resources. Concerned about visual impacts to scenic highways and impacts to cultural resources within Caltrans right-of-way. Identify scenic highway design and eligibility; develop visual simulations from State highways. • Hazardous Waste. Perform hazardous waste investigation within Caltrans ROW. Mitigation: management and health and safety plans, environmental screening, and use of appropriately trained staff. • Biology. Concerned about critical habitats to listed species and the impact to them from construction and presence of power lines. Delineate location of all towers in Caltrans ROW on maps. For areas where ROW will be expanded, clarify if all work will occur within ROW. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Imperial Valley Link: This link crosses Caltrans ROW at I-8 and runs adjacent to SR-78 for about 10 miles. San Felipe Creek is within Caltrans ROW, which is habitat for federally endangered pupfish (<i>Cyprinodon macularius</i>). Special species of concern, flat-tailed horned lizard (<i>Phrynosoma mcalli</i>), also occurs. — Anza-Borrego Link: Identify method of underground installation and map locations in EIR/EIS. At SR-78, San Felipe Creek provides habitat for least Bell vireo (<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>). Adjacent ROW supports many federal and State-listed plants and animals including the federally endangered peninsular bighorn sheep (<i>Ovis canadensis</i>). — Central Link: Santa Ysabel Creek provides habitat for federally endangered arroyo toad (<i>Bufo californicus</i>). Adjacent ROW supports many federal and state-listed plants and animals including federally endangered Kangaroo rat (<i>Dipodomys stephensi</i>) and federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher (<i>Poliopitia californica californica</i>).

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Inland Valley Link: Identify method of underground installation and map locations in EIR/EIS. At SR-67, habitat within and adjacent to ROW includes chaparral and coastal sage scrub suitable of supporting California gnatcatcher. — Coastal Link: If undergrounding within Caltrans ROW, identify method of underground installation and map locations in EIR/EIS. At SR-56, habitat within and adjacent to ROW supports Orcutt's spineflower (<i>Chorizanthe orcuttiana</i>), California gnatcatcher, and other federal and State species. Vernal pools may be identified that support federally endangered San Diego fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta sandiegoensis</i>) and federally endangered San Diego Mesa Mint (<i>Pogogyne abrams</i>). • Impacts to wetland and riparian habitat may require permits from the California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. • Work performed in Caltrans ROW will require an Encroachment Permit.
October 20, 2006	California Department of Parks and Recreation Michael Wells, PhD, Supt., Colorado Desert District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Parks is a responsible agency under CEQA. • State Parks has concluded that SDG&Es preferred alternative through the ABDSP would have significant and substantial adverse impacts, contrary to many of the conclusions in the PEA. • State Parks submitted extensive comments to CPUC regarding the Project's potential impacts to ABDSP (Coleman and Wells, 9/15/06). • Alternatives. PEA has not adequately explored route alternatives that avoid State Parks lands. Believe there are feasible alternatives that preserve ABDSP resources. • Need for legislative action to complete a route other than preferred route should not render that route infeasible. SDG&E rejects certain alternatives because of the need to amend land use plans. Alternatives should not be rejected because of potential need to amend land use plans. • Project objectives 7 and 8 are primarily economic. To extent routing alternative is determined infeasible based on a failure to meet these objectives then substantial evidence (financial data) must be presented in EIR/EIS. • Interpretation of objectives is too narrow. CEQA does not permit objectives to be too narrowly drawn in order to preordain an outcome. • EIR/EIS must present substantial evidence to support determination of the infeasibility of an alternative. • EIR/EIS should conduct a detailed transmission line routing analysis for one or more route alternatives that traverse south of ABDSP in the vicinity of the I-8corridor. SDG&E's analysis was flawed and incomplete; therefore a more in-depth and site-specific analysis should be conducted. • Portions of Alternative route D could be moved slightly east to reduce take of residential property without impacting Federal Wilderness. • Land Use Impacts. EIR/EIS should include a thorough analysis of impacts to existing and planned future land uses. The Proposed Project is not consistent with the ABDSP General Plan. Project severely compromises major use of the Park – uncompromised desert vistas. • PEA indicates that encroachment into Cleveland National Forest is more significant than encroachment into ABDSP. If this statement is carried forward in the EIR/EIS then an explanation must be provided.

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Wilderness. ABDSP supports over 400,000 acres of State Wilderness. Represents 60% of ABDSP acreage and 80% of all State Wilderness in California. A 500 kV line is not consistent with State Wilderness designation. • Changing designation to create consistency and permit use would require action by the State Park and Recreation Commission, making Commission a responsible CEQA agency. • Visual Resources. EIR/EIS needs to complete a thorough analysis of visual impacts from the Proposed Project. Colorado Desert District has prepared a preliminary visual impact analysis and determined that 104,000 acres would be visually affected, with about 90,000 within designated State Wilderness lands. Visual impacts to State Scenic Highway SR-78 would be significant. Concurs with PEA assessment that visual impacts cannot be mitigated to level of insignificance. Avoidance is only mitigation. • Recreation. Effect of visual impacts on park users must be evaluated. State Parks has serious concerns that use of Tamarisk Grove and Yaqui Wells primitive camps would be significantly affected by Project. Review should consider both construction and operational impacts. EIR/EIS must also analyze cumulative impact of preferred alternative to regional recreational opportunities. • Biological Resources. Thorough biological resource inventories need to be carried out and field survey work needs to be completed at appropriate time of year to detect species of concern. Analysis should include review and consideration of regional conservation plans for the City and County of San Diego. Analysis needs to address impacts to peninsular bighorn sheep, golden eagles, and Swainson's hawk. In addition, San Felipe Valley may be an important flyway. This issue should be evaluated further in the EIR/EIS. • Public Safety. Wildfire potential in Anza-Borrego needs to be assessed. • Cultural Resources. There are a number of known cultural sites along Project alignment. Completion of cultural resource surveys is critical to completion of the EIR/EIS. • Most critical element is evaluation of all alternative routes including those that do not cross ABDSP.
November 8, 2006	California Department of Parks and Recreation Bradly S. Torgan, AICP General Counsel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up letter to one submitted by Michael Wells (see above). • General Plan (GP) does not establish the preferred Project route as consistent with or a permitted use under the Plan. Reviewed Administrative Record for the adoption of GP in February 2005 and would like to provide additional documentation supporting Department's conclusion that the preferred Project route through ABDSP is inconsistent with GP. • Draft GP did not recognize existing utility easement. SDG&E complained recognizing that Backcountry Zone and Wilderness Zone were incompatible with transmission lines, and asked that Department reclassify proposed management zones to Focused Use Zone (FUZII). • In response to SDG&E's request, the Existing Conditions section of the GP was revised to include recognition of the SDG&E and Imperial Irrigation District utility easements and existing transmission system. The GP also revised to exclude existing SDG&E transmission lines from proposed wilderness designations and allow existing transmission lines in backcountry zone that pre-dated approval of the GP. • However, Department declined request to create buffer of FUZII adjacent to the easement.

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During adoption of the GP, a number of changes to the Draft were approved. These changes included recognizing utility easements in the Existing Conditions section; management designations on either side of the existing easement did not change. Additions were made to clarify that proposed wilderness designations would not impact existing easements or transmission lines owned and operated by SDG&E. Representative of SDG&E at the adoption meeting gave no indication that changes allowed for expansion of transmission facilities. • Supporting Exhibits: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. August 27, 2004 letter from SDG&E to CDPR regarding the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR – SDG&E request to reclassify proposed management zones and request a buffer of Focused Use Zone II. 2. DPR response to this August 27 letter – stated exclusion of SDG&E easement from Wilderness designation. 3. Anza Borrego Desert State Park, Preliminary General Plan & Final EIR, Staff Recommended Changes 4. California State Park and Recreation Commission, Minutes of Meeting, Friday February 11, 2005. Adoption hearing for GP. 5. January 26, 2005 letter from SDG&E to CDPR regarding the response to comments on the GP/Final EIR 6. Final GP on CD
County Agencies		
September 5, 2006	Imperial County Air Pollution Control Board Victor Carrillo, Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperial County Air Pollution Control Board of Director's (ICAPCD Board) is opposed to the construction of transmission lines between Imperial County Substation and San Diego. • If modifications are made to the substation and transmission capacity is increased, the project will serve as a platform for building additional fossil-fuel burning facilities in the Mexicali Valley where air quality standards are not as stringent as those in California. This could further degrade air quality in Imperial Valley and exacerbate negative impact on the health of residents. The County does not meet several State and federal air quality standards. • The ICAPCD Board will continue to oppose electrical energy generation projects or portion of a project that does not implement Best Available Control Technology (BACT) and does not offset their emissions or pay in-lieu fee to be used to offset emissions. Any facility that uses existing facilities and runs through Imperial County (and may impact County), should install and maintain BACT on all sources. • ICAPCD Board supports renewable, green energy projects provided they meet all applicable standards. • ICAPCD Board urges the CPUC to carefully consider all submitted comments and make it a priority to take into account the health and well being of Imperial Valley residents and the border region.

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
October 18, 2006	San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Shawna D. Anderson, AICP Environmental Planner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Central Link of the SRPL would travel through the Parks Focused Planning Area (FPA). The power line would also cross the planned Coast to Crest Trail alignment for which approximately 26 miles has been completed and an additional 3 miles are to be completed in the next two years. The Coast to Crest Trail is recognized in State, regional, and county plans. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Joint Powers Authority recognizes need for public facilities within the FPA, but must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Concept Plan. Request that the EIR/EIS address the following; — Consistency of the Project with Park Concept Plan and Coast to Crest Trail. — Concerned with impacts to pastoral settings and visual quality. EIR/EIS should address compatibility, visual quality and safety of scenic drive and use by future trail users. — Requests the EIR/EIS quantify the exact placement of the lines and roads. — Evaluate how lines will impact wildlife corridors, avian flight patterns, animal behavior. — Opposes the alternative alignment through the Central link; a route along the western edge of the Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve and along recently purchased land with public funds. • Suggested mitigation measures include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Mitigation land should be purchased by SDG&E to mitigate for lost habitat and to preserve additional land in the FPA for damage to scenic nature. — All mitigation land should be within San Dieguito River Park east of Lake Sutherland in FPA. — Underground poles west of Highway 79 (SR-79). — Site poles west of SR-79 along toe of slope so they are less visible against hill backdrop. — Consolidate power lines within a new route and remove old poles to improve visual quality. — Include legal ROW or easement for the future alignment of the Coast to Crest Trail within SDG&E's ROW.
October 20, 2006	County of San Diego Chandra Wallar Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Land Use and Environment Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has potential to degrade quality of environment and result in cumulatively considerable and significant indirect impacts. Project may be growth inducing because it removes barriers to growth. Unincorporated areas have undeveloped land that feels effects of growth. EIR/EIS must evaluate impacts from all components of the Project as well as issue area impacts. • Project Description. Include Lakeside Planning Area as a community Project will traverse • General Comments. Request maps include County parks, locally and regionally significant preserve land, and existing lattice towers. Provide upfront, tabular format, the following: total acres impacted by project including roads and construction areas; anticipated impacts by vegetation types; and quantifiable impacts to County Parks and Open Space Preserves. Need close examination of proposed technology. Evaluate range of power-generating alternatives including Million Solar Roofs plan and ground breaking solutions for providing clean energy. • Alternative Routes. County has concerns with the preferred route and with several of the alternatives. Suggests alternatives be considered to the far north outside of San Diego County or far southern portion of the County. If No Project is infeasible then County suggests the following:

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Co-location of the Project with I-8 in strategically selected locations to avoid visual impacts to key areas such as Buckman Springs Valley and Cameron Station. — Near the SWPL along the U.S.-Mexico border. — Alignment alternative that follows existing ROW through Mt. Gower Preserve. In the Preserve the line and associated equipment would be placed underground for the entirety of the segment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics/Visual Impacts. Project likely to create significant visual impacts to community character and view sheds, and may conflict with County Dark Skies Policy. Central East Substation would be the most intense development in the central portion of the County. • Agriculture. County values agriculture's contribution to local economy and has adopted Board Policy I-133 to support and encourage farming. Project may directly and indirectly impact agriculture by altering community character of rural and agricultural areas, and may reduce long-term viability of farming. • Biology. EIR/EIS should adequately address any potential impacts to large number of species and cultural resources in project footprint and surrounding areas. County disagrees with PEA determination of less than significant with pre-construction surveys. Mitigation cannot occur with minor modification of structure sites. County has adopted Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). EIR/EIS should evaluate areas identified as high value habitats or Pre-Approved Mitigation Areas in the existing and proposed plans (northwest and east plans). • Cultural Resources. County would like to review all cultural resource documents that pertain to land owned or managed by the County. Include table in analysis that shows type of archeology sites that will be affected and include information on Indian history. • Land Use and Community Character. Land use and community character are likely to be significantly impacted by the Project. Unincorporated lands are mostly rural and agricultural. General Plan policies that should be considered include Scenic Highways, Recreation, Agriculture, and Public Facilities Element (fire); and community plans for applicable areas. Impacts from Central East substation are likely to be unprecedented for this region. • Growth Inducement. Perform general analysis of energy needs of the region and County's vision of land uses as stated in General Plan. • Parks & Recreation. Many County parks and open space preserves would be impacted by the Project (about eight). County would like to work with applicant, CPUC and BLM to determine alternatives that would avoid these lands and would like to be involved in the selection of mitigation measures. Impacts to these resources would be considered significant. Review and reference applicable Area Specific Management Directives. • Undergrounding in Preserve areas should include restoration plan. Suggested outline for this plan was provided. • Letter provides some corrections and specific information on trails, visual impacts to Preserves, and a request to identify the preserve on EIR/EIS maps. • Public Health and Safety. Project may present significant potential fire hazard due to location in fire-prone area. Potential fire hazards should be thoroughly examined. • Public Facilities/Transportation & Traffic. County Department of Public Works should be consulted if improvements are proposed in County ROWs or County-owned property. • Socioeconomics. Consider economic and legal issues associated with taking of lands purchased with public monies and the public cost of wildfires from faulty or damaged power lines.

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
October 20, 2006	Imperial County Planning & Development Services Jurg Heuberger, AICP, CEP Planning Development Services Department Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable resources identified in the PEA's Project Description include reference to solar power, wind energy, and geothermal power. These renewable energy sources are not available for the SRPL, currently or in the near future. While in some cases there has been information presented to the County Board of Supervisor regarding these renewable sources, there has been no application submitted or approval pending for any of these potential energy sources. • Concerned that SDG&E's plan to export renewable energy is actually a ploy to import (up to 1,500 Mws) natural gas from Mexico, as the resources that are supposed to meet the renewable needs will not be available in the near future. • SRPL project needs to be reviewed by County Airport Land Use Commission and U.S. Navy to address future potential impacts to low-level military training routes in the project area. • Numerous public objections received at the scoping meeting related to the preferred eastern route. Concerned about impacts to health and milk production of Bullfrog Farm Dairy and other potential future dairies in the area if this route is implemented. Farm Bureau opposes the eastern route because it is detrimental to development of dairy and farming industry in the County. • Concerned about impacts to county roads by the large footprint of the lattice towers. EIR/EIS should address how impacts to private land owners and County roads will be mitigated, offset, or avoided by Project. • Concerned about major earthquake event that will disrupt power transmission. Need to explain in detail what future federal and Imperial County emergency response procedures/actions will be taken in the event of major earthquake. In addition, must consider role of Mexican government in emergency situations. • Concerned that route will cross the "flat-tailed horned lizard management study" area, possible critical habitat for the desert tortoise, and private agricultural lands impacting the burrowing owl. Need to comprehensively review all potential impacts on these species and their habitats, and propose appropriate mitigation for impacts. • Potential for increase in power plants in Mexico. Identify federal or state air quality mitigation and offsets for future long-term health risks. Must identify "worst case" scenario for total number of power plants and future heavy development projects that could be constructed in Mexico and address potential long-term air quality deterioration. • Feels that the maps used at the scoping meetings were out-of-date and thus exact routing of the line was difficult to determine. • Aesthetic impacts from the Project should be addressed as well as other issues raised at the scoping meeting. Other issues include paleontological studies, noise studies, ozone layer, global warming, undergrounding, use of existing corridors, and compensation for conservation efforts. • County's foremost concern is that the SRPL would facilitate the export of electricity from northern Baja California, which would promote proliferation of new power-generating facilities. These new facilities would exacerbate air pollution throughout the entire Imperial-Mexicali Valley basin.

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
City Agencies		
October 17, 2006	City of San Diego Robert Manis Assistant Deputy Director Land Development Review Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility lines are considered a conditionally compatible use within San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multi-habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Letter presents guidelines from the MHPA that should be followed to minimize construction impacts. • Facilities should be routed through developed areas, such as roads, easements, or rights-of-way, rather than through Multi-habitat Planning Areas. • Project activities must avoid disturbing habitat of MSCP species and wetlands. • Construction areas and roads must occur on agricultural lands or other disturbed areas instead of in habitat and construction and maintenance must avoid significant disruption of wildlife corridors. • Environmental documents and mitigation monitoring and reporting programs must specify how disruption of wildlife corridors will be avoided. • Construction plans must contain pertinent information to avoiding wild-life disruption and must be readily available to construction crews. • Construction crews and field workers must be trained to ensure avoidance of wildlife disruption. • The project proponent is not being granted Third Party Beneficiary status through the MSCP. All "takes" of endangered species must be permitted through SDG&E's HCP. • Project passes through the Miramar Community Planning Area (CPA), Rancho Encantada CPA, and the Scripps Miramar Ranch CPA. Refer to these plans for information recreational resources. Letter identifies seven parks that have the potential to be impacted by the Project. • City does not support the Coastal Link alternative or other alternatives that impact vernal pools. • Proposed route passes through parts of Scripps Ranch Open Space, Sabre Springs Open Space, and Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve, which are part of the city's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) • Consider methods to minimize impacts to open space. Applicable community groups should be given the opportunity to comment, provide input, and kept up to date on the Project (see letter for specific group names) • Trails disturbed during project should be returned to previous state, including a 2-5% out slope to prevent erosion. • Consider making arrangements to provide a sample of paleontological artifacts discovered on open space lands to the Park and Recreation Department Open Space Division. • Consider revegetating areas where existing poles are removed with native vegetation; implement a 120-day establishment period and 25-month maintenance period for these species. • Strong possibility Project will impact cultural resources. If cultural artifacts and/or paleontological resources are discovered on City of San Diego open space lands, City would like to be provided a representative sample for educational purposes. • EIR/EIS should discuss measures to protect sensitive bird species from construction noise. • EIR/EIS should include methods used to reduce impacts to recreational resources and appropriate measures to assure public safety and continued use of trails. • EIR/EIS should discuss methods to minimize impacts to waterways. • Request design drawings showing all utility lines in streets and open space. Meeting with SDG&E may be needed to discuss City requirements.

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
November 3, 2006	City of Poway Mickey Cafagna, Mayor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sunrise project would be located in the City's Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan area. Report should assess impacts to biological resources. • Encourages greater emphasis on the analysis of potential wildfires associated with the project. • Discuss potential land use conflicts between power lines and single family homes. • EMF is a significant concern expressed by most homeowners; discuss alternatives to minimize impacts from EMF. • Existing power lines are in some cases less than 80 feet from homes. New towers are inappropriately offset to the north side of the utility easement adjacent to homes. • Additional lines proposed between Scripps Ranch and Poway's Rolling Hills Estates would create significant visual, noise, and EMF cumulative impacts and create a blemished natural setting as well as negative impact on property values. • Strongly urge placement of lines underground within existing roadway, utility easement and ROWs to route lines away from homes. • Believe more important to underground in the Poway area because with the proposed additional lines the voltage would increase to 667 kV (in combination with existing transmission lines in the area).
Special Districts		
October 19, 2006	Imperial Irrigation District Water Department Vicky Doyle Resources, Planning and Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base of aerial maps are out dated (1994) and do not show key development such as dairies, prison, agriculture businesses and new residential structures. Need to fix for EIR/EIS. • Agriculture is a significant economy in Imperial County. Agriculture served by Imperial Irrigation District (IID) supports local livestock and dairy industries. Potential economic losses due to the Project must be evaluated in the EIR/EIS. • Proposed route goes through Bullfrog Dairies and can impact the health and production rate of the cows. Given that new dairies are in the permit process, transmission lines should be away from agriculture and economically important industries within the IID water service area. Existing and proposed dairy farms, in addition to entire agricultural market, will be impacted. • An estimated 400 bird species will be impacted. Agricultural lands with IID and Salton Sea serve as critical link within 5,000 mile International Pacific flyway for bird migration. Damage to Imperial County biodiversity should be fully assessed. • Consult with Water Department staff regarding location of IID facilities, canals, and drains. Maps make it difficult to determine specific facilities that may be affected.
Tribal Governments (Government to Government Consultation)		
July 14, 2006	Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians Harlan Pinto, Sr. Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe accepts BLM's invitation to initiate government-to-government consultation. • Requests contact with Executive Director to propose meeting dates and times.
July 14, 2006	Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office Harlan Pinto, Sr. Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tribe's initial concern regarding Sunrise Project is that it has a preference for the proposed route. [See also letter of October 27, 2006]

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
July 17, 2006	Pala Band of Mission Indians Shasta C. Gaughen, Assistant Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tribe accepts BLM's invitation to initiate government-to-government consultation. • The project might uncover areas of cultural and historic significance, especially in area near Warner Springs, traditional ancestral territory of Cupeno people of Pala. • Request copies of cultural resources survey reports. • Request to be consulted about specific areas under development to ensure that negative impacts to areas of cultural, historical, archaeological, or sacred significance are avoided.
October 27, 2006	Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians Harlan Pinto, Sr. Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports alternate route near I-8. • Planning a wind energy project on Ewiiapaayp Indian Reservation that would produce 37.5 MW and 50 MW of electricity beginning in 2010, which would require connection to SRPL. • Other tribes are considering similar wind energy projects for interconnection to SRPL.
October 27, 2006	Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians Will Micklin, Executive Director & COO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Sunrise Project. Strong interest in the route being located near the Tribe's Ewiiapaayp Indian Reservation near Mt. Laguna, 12 miles north of I-8 and existing SWPL. • Planning a wind energy project on Ewiiapaayp Indian Reservation that would produce 37.5 MW and 50 MW of electricity, which would require connection to SRPL. • Other tribes are considering similar wind energy projects and would produce similar amounts of electricity. • Interconnection to SRPL essential to these projects. • Please consider request when deciding on Project.