

Responses to Comment Set D4 – Phyllis Enet

D4-1 The potential effects of earthquakes and associated mitigation are discussed in Section D.6, Geology and Soils. Impact GEO-6 (Project structures would be damaged by surface fault rupture at crossings of active and potentially active faults) discusses the location of active faults near and within the Proposed Project and potential damage to project facilities due to fault rupture. However, Mitigation Measure GEO-6 has been proposed to minimize damage to project structures in the event of an earthquake, and states:

Minimize Project Structures within Active Fault Zones. Perform a geologic study to confirm location of active and potentially mapped traces of the Beaumont Plain, San Andreas, and Crafton Hills faults where crossed by the Project alignment. Tower locations shall be adjusted as necessary to avoid placing tower footings on or across mapped fault traces. Towers on either side of a fault shall be designed to provide a significant amount of slack to allow for potential fault movement

The effects of the Proposed Project relating to wildfires are discussed in Section D.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Impact HAZ-8 (The project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires) discusses the potential for construction and operation of the Proposed Project to contribute to wildfires. Mitigation, including the implementation of a Fire Management Plan, County Fire Department review of construction methods, safe welding procedures, and fire preventive construction equipment would minimize the risk of wildfire posed by the Proposed Project.

D4-2 A description of the construction of the Proposed Project and alternatives is located in Section B (Project Description) and Section C (Alternatives), respectively. Impacts associated with construction and operation of the Proposed Project and alternatives can be found in Section D, Environmental Analysis.

D4-3 Please note that placement of the subtransmission line underground is not a recommendation by the EIR authors or CPUC Project Staff. The final decision on the alternative that will be approved is up to the vote of the five-member California Public Utilities Commission subsequent to the certification of the Final EIR.

The Environmentally Superior Alternative has been re-evaluated and is identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR, Section E (July 2008) as the Proposed Project. Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion regarding the change in determination of the Environmentally Superior Alternative.