

## D.16 Policy Consistency – Contents

D.16.1	Introduction .....	D.16-1
D.16.2	CEQA/NEPA Requirements.....	D.16-1
D.16.3	Proposed Project and Alternatives Consistency Review.....	D.16-2
D.16.4	Consistency Determinations.....	D.16-8

# D.16 Policy Consistency

## D.16.1 Introduction

This section addresses the consistency of the Proposed Project and alternatives with applicable policies and plans of the jurisdictions through which the alignment would pass or in which substations would be located. Nearly 40 plans and similar documents were identified for review. Potentially relevant policies contained in these plans were those that relate to development of a transmission line and substations. These policies were screened to determine which policies required further review to determine the consistency of the Proposed Project and alternatives with the policy. Appendix 2, Policy Screening Report (PSR), presents the results of the preliminary screening.

Various laws and regulations apply to the Proposed Project and alternatives as well. Requirements imposed by specific laws and regulations, such as those applying to the protection of wildlife and vegetation, are discussed within the appropriate resource section of the EIR/EIS. They are not discussed anew in this section.

The policies reviewed for consistency are organized by level of government (federal, State, local). Because of the volume of policies that were identified for the Proposed Project and alternatives, some policies have been summarized or abbreviated to make this report easier to read.

## D.16.2 CEQA/NEPA Requirements

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR §§15000 et seq.) do not specifically require that a policy analysis be completed for a proposed project or alternatives. The only mention of policy analysis in the CEQA Guidelines is in the CEQA Checklist Form, Appendix G, often used for an initial study of a proposed project. The Checklist includes under the topic of land use the following question:

*Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) do address policy analysis. These regulations state that an EIS shall include discussion of:

*Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian Tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned. 40 CFR 1502.16(c)*

The NEPA Regulations further state:

*To better integrate environmental impact statements into state or local planning processes, statements shall discuss any inconsistency of a proposed action with any approved State or local plan and laws (whether or not federally sanctioned). Where an inconsistency exists, the statement should describe the extent to which the agency would reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law. 40 CFR 1506.2(d)*

However, the decisionmaker retains the authority to go forward with a project despite a potential conflict between the project and a policy.<sup>1</sup> The Record of Decision must explain how the decision was made and what mitigation measures are being imposed to reduce impacts.

### D.16.3 Proposed Project and Alternatives Consistency Review

The following plans are reviewed with regard to the consistency of the Proposed Project and alternatives with the policies found in them.

#### *Federal*

- BLM – California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980, as Amended
- BLM – Flat-tailed Horned Lizard Rangeland Management Strategy, 2003 Revision
- BLM – Yuha Basin Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan, June 1981
- BLM – San Sebastian Marsh Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan and San Felipe Creek Wildlife Habitat Management Plan, October, 1986
- BLM – Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan, 1981
- BLM – South Coast Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, 1994
- NPS – Comprehensive Management and Use Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, April 1996
- USFS – Cleveland National Forest Plan
  - Part 1: Southern California National Forests Vision, 2005
  - Part 2: Cleveland National Forest Strategy, 2005
  - Part 3: Design Criteria for Southern California National Forests, 2005
- Marine Corps Air Station Miramar – Miramar Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Update, December 2004 (Revised March 2005)

#### *State*

- California State Parks – Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR

#### *Local*

- County of Imperial County – County General Plan
- County of San Diego – County General Plan
  - Lakeside Community Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - Ramona Community Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - Fallbrook Community Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - North Mountain Subregional Community Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - Central Mountain Community Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - Mountain Empire Subregional Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - Desert Subregional Plan, San Diego County General Plan
  - Alpine Community Plan, San Diego County General Plan
- Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve Draft Resource Management Plan, San Diego County

---

<sup>1</sup> Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) Memorandum: Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning NEPA Regulations 46 Fed. Reg. 18026 (March 23, 1981).

- San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority – San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan
- San Diego County – Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan MCAS Miramar
- SANDAG – Regional Comprehensive Plan
- City of San Diego – General Plan and Updates
- City of San Diego – Multiple Species Conservation Plan Subarea Plan
- Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan, City of San Diego
- City of Chula Vista General Plan
- City of Chula Vista – Municipal Code (Local Coastal Program)
- Riverside County General Plan
  - Elsinore Area Plan, Riverside County General Plan
- Orange County General Plan

There are instances of inconsistency between the Proposed Project and alternatives and portions of some applicable local, State, and Federal plans and policies applicable to lands through which the Proposed Project or alternatives would pass. Inconsistencies can arise with the designation of ROW and the construction of or presence of towers, substations, conductors, and access roads. Inconsistencies would manifest themselves as physical changes affecting environmental resources and communities. The changes or impacts resulting from project implementation are addressed in the individual resource analyses in the EIR/EIS (see Sections D.2 through D.15).

An inconsistency between a proposed project and an applicable plan is a legal determination, not a physical impact on the environment. Often there is no agreed to objective standard by which to judge the significance of a project's inconsistency with the various policies and objectives enumerated in adopted plans. Inconsistency with a plan does not alone mandate a finding of a significant impact under CEQA or NEPA. Where APMs and mitigation measures avoid or reduce impacts they likewise reduce the degree of inconsistency.

Where there is an inconsistency between the Proposed Project or alternatives and a local plan, such inconsistencies have been identified but would not require plan amendments as the CPUC has land use authority over transmission lines and substations in local jurisdictions. The situation is different with federal and State plans. Where there is an inconsistency between the Proposed Project and alternatives and plans applicable to BLM, U.S. Forest Service, and State Park lands, such plans ~~must undergo~~ may require amendments to overcome these inconsistencies and allow project approval. With adoption of amended federal or State plans, the project would be deemed consistent with the relevant plan.

Tables D.16-1a provides a matrix listing both the planning documents reviewed and the Proposed Project and wire-based alternatives to which they apply. Table D.16-1b provides a similar matrix for non-wire system alternatives. A dot indicates whether a planning document applies to the Proposed Project or an alternative. Using the tables as a reference or index, it is possible to identify which plans apply to which alternatives.

Table D.16-1a. Plans Applicable to the Proposed Project and Wire-Based Alternatives

Link		Imperial	Imperial	Imperial	Anza-Bgo	Anza-Bgo	Central	Central	Central	Central	Inland	Inland	Inland	Inland	Coast	Coast	Coast	Coast	Central	SWPL	SWPL	SWPL	Central	
Applicable Plan/Alt	Proposed Project	FTHL Eastern	SDG&E West of Dunaway	SDG&E West Main Canal – Huff Road Mod.	Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2	Overhead 500 kV ABDSP within Existing 100-FT ROW	Santa Ysabel Existing ROW	Santa Ysabel partial Underground	Santa Ysabel SR79 All Underground	SDG&E Mesa Grande	CNF Existing 69 kV Route	Oak Hollow Road Underground	Vicente Road Transition	Chuck Wagon Road	Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North	Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road	Black Mountain to Park Village Road Underground	Coastal Link System Upgrade	Top of the World Substation	Interstate 8	BCD	Route D	Modified Route D	
<b>FEDERAL</b>																								
California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan	•	•	•	•	•	•														•				
Flat-tailed Horned Lizard Rangewide Management Strategy	•	•	•																	•				
Yuha Basin Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan	•																			•				
San Sebastian Marsh Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan and San Felipe Creek Wildlife Habitat Management Plan,	•																							
Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan	•																			•				
South Coast Resource Management Plan																				•		•		
Comprehensive Management and Use Plan and Final EIS, Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail	•																			•				
Cleveland National Forest Plan Parts 1, 2 & 3										•										•	•	•	•	

Table D.16-1a. Plans Applicable to the Proposed Project and Wire-Based Alternatives

Link		Imperial	Imperial	Imperial	Anza-Bgo	Anza-Bgo	Central	Central	Central	Central	Inland	Inland	Inland	Inland	Coast	Coast	Coast	Coast	Central	SWPL	SWPL	SWPL	Central	
Applicable Plan/Alt	Proposed Project	FTHL Eastern	SDG&E West of Dunaway	SDG&E West Main Canal – Huff Road Mod.	Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2	Overhead 500 kV ABDSP within Existing 100-FT ROW	Santa Ysabel Existing ROW	Santa Ysabel partial Underground	Santa Ysabel SR79 All Underground	SDG&E Mesa Grande	CNF Existing 69 kV Route	Oak Hollow Road Underground	Vicente Road Transition	Chuck Wagon Road	Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North	Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road	Black Mountain to Park Village Road Underground	Coastal Link System Upgrade	Top of the World Substation	Interstate 8	BCD	Route D	Modified Route D	
Miramar Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Update	•														•									
STATE																								
Anza-Borrego Desert State Park Final General Plan and EIR	•				•	•																		
LOCAL																								
Imperial County General Plan	•	•	•	•																	•			
San Diego County General Plan	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•						•	•	•	•	•
Lakeside Community Plan	•																				•			
Ramona Community Plan	•										•	•	•	•										
North Mountain Subregional Community Plan	•						•	•	•	•										•				
Central Mountain Community Plan																						•		
Mountain Empire Subregional Plan																				•	•		•	

Table D.16-1a. Plans Applicable to the Proposed Project and Wire-Based Alternatives

Link		Imperial	Imperial	Imperial	Anza-Bgo	Anza-Bgo	Central	Central	Central	Central	Inland	Inland	Inland	Inland	Coast	Coast	Coast	Coast	Central	SWPL	SWPL	SWPL	Central	
Applicable Plan/Alt	Proposed Project	FTHL Eastern	SDG&E West of Dunaway	SDG&E West Main Canal – Huff Road Mod.	Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2	Overhead 500 kV ABDSP within Existing 100-FT ROW	Santa Ysabel Existing ROW	Santa Ysabel partial Underground	Santa Ysabel SR79 All Underground	SDG&E Mesa Grande	CNF Existing 69 kV Route	Oak Hollow Road Underground	Vicente Road Transition	Chuck Wagon Road	Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North	Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road	Black Mountain to Park Village Road Underground	Coastal Link System Upgrade	Top of the World Substation	Interstate 8	BCD	Route D	Modified Route D	
Desert Subregional Plan	•																							
Alpine Community Plan																				•		•	•	
Santa Ysabel OSP Draft Resource Mgmt Plan							•	•	•															
San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan	•						•	•	•															
San Diego County Airport Land Use Compatibility	•																							
SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan	•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	
City of San Diego General Plan	•														•	•	•							
City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan	•														•	•	•							
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve	•																							
City of Chula Vista General Plan	•																							
City of Chula Vista – Municipal Code (Local Coastal Program)	•																							

Table D.16-1b. Plans Applicable to Non-Wires and System Alternatives

Alternative Type	In-Area Renewable Generation				In-Area All-Source Generation						System	
	Solar Thermal	Solar Photovoltaic	Biomass & Biogas	Wind	South Bay Replacement Project	San Diego CCP	Peaking – Miramar	Peaking – Pala	Peaking – Margarita	Peaking – Borrego Springs	LEAPS Transmission Only	LEAPS Generation and Transmission
<b>FEDERAL</b>												
California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan	•											
Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan				•								
Cleveland National Forest Plan Parts 1, 2 & 3											•	•
Miramar Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Update						•						
<b>STATE</b>												
Anza-Borrego Desert State Park Final General Plan and EIR	•											
<b>LOCAL</b>												
Imperial County General Plan												
San Diego County General Plan	•		•					•		•	•	•
Fallbrook Community Plan			•									
Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan											•	•
Desert Subregional Plan	•											
SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•
City of San Diego General Plan						•	•					
City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan						•						
City of Chula Vista General Plan					•							
City of Chula Vista – Municipal Code (Local Coastal Program)					•							
Riverside County General Plan											•	•
Elsinore Area Plan											•	•
Orange County General Plan									•			

## D.16.4 Consistency Determinations

A determination was made as to whether the Proposed Project or alternative was consistent with each applicable policy. This information is provided in this section.

Some federal and State agencies (e.g., BLM, USFS, and State Parks) are required by law and regulations to maintain consistency between their land use and management plans and any project they intend to approve. When a project is approved, the relevant plan is amended as well, thereby making the project and plan consistent.

Local jurisdictions (counties and incorporated cities and towns) are required have consistency between their General Plans and discretionary development actions to be approved by the locality. In instances where a project is proposed that is not consistent with the General Plan, the jurisdiction must amend its plan in order to approve the project. However, transmission and substation facilities are under the land use authority of the CPUC and not local jurisdictions. Because this jurisdictional authority preempts local land use decisions, there is no requirement that the General Plan and the proposed project be consistent. The General Plan does not need to be amended to accommodate the project. Although matters related to the siting of a public utility’s electrical facilities are within the exclusive permitting authority of the CPUC, Commission rules require the utility to consult with local entities on land use matters.

### D.16.4.1 Federal and Department of Defense Plans and Documents

#### BLM – California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980, as Amended

The Proposed Project and all alternatives in Imperial County, Borrego Springs, and Anza-Borrego Desert State Park are included within the CDCA Plan area. The 25-million-acre CDCA contains over 12 million acres of public lands within the area known as the California Desert, which includes the Mojave Desert, the Sonoran Desert, and a small portion of the Great Basin. Many of the CDCA Plan Policies and goals are couched as directives to officials.

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980, as Amended		
Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Wildlife Element, Pages 28-30</b>		
Policy 2: Discovery of previously unknown but significant wildlife values may serve as the basis for initiating the amendment of a multiple-use class designation. Designation of “Critical Habitat” for a federally listed species may necessitate a change in multiple-use class designation.	Based on preliminary biology studies, the Proposed Project and alternatives are not anticipated to result in previously unknown but significant wildlife values. The project includes APMs and mitigation measures that would address impacts to biological resources.	YES
Policy 3: Protective provisions, stipulations, or objectives for wildlife will be considered in all permits, licenses, activity plans, etc., to avoid or minimize habitat deterioration.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species (See BIO-APM-2, 7, 9 10, 11, 13, and 29.)	YES

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980, as Amended

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Vegetation Element, Pages 37-38</b>		
<p>Goal 2: Manage those plant species on the federal and State lists of threatened and endangered species and their habitats so that the continued existence of each is not jeopardized. Stabilize and, where possible, improve populations through management and recovery plans developed and implemented cooperatively with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would be subject to APMs and/or mitigation measures that address impacts to sensitive plant species and their habitats. These APMs and mitigation measures are intended to minimize or avoid impacts and to provide appropriate mitigation where avoidance of impacts is not possible. Project avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures are being developed in consultation with the USFWS and CDFG. (See APMs BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, and -5a).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal 3: Manage those plant species officially designated as sensitive by the BLM for California and their habitats so that the potential for federal or State listing is minimized. Include consideration of sensitive species habitats in all decisions such that impacts are avoided, mitigated, or compensated.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would be subject to APMs and/or mitigation measures that address impacts to sensitive plant species and their habitats. (See APMs BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, and -5a).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal 4: Manage unusual plant assemblages (UPAs) so that their continued existence is maintained. In all actions, include consideration of UPAs so that impacts are avoided, mitigated or compensated.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would be subject to APMs and mitigation measures that address impacts to sensitive plant species and their habitats. (See APMs BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, and -5a.)</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal 5: Manage wetland and riparian areas in the CDCA, with the following specific objectives; (a) To avoid the long-term and short-term impacts associated with the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetland and riparian areas; (b) To preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetland and riparian areas which may include constraining or excluding those uses that cause significant long-term ecological damage; (c) To include practical measures to minimize harm in all actions causing adverse impacts on wetlands and riparian areas; and (d) To retain all wetlands and riparian habitats presently under BLM administration wherever high resource values exist and adverse impacts cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize or avoid impacts to jurisdictional areas whenever possible, and to provide appropriate mitigation where avoidance of impacts is not possible. (See APMs BIO-APM-1, 2, 4, 5, 16, and 18, and Mitigation Measure B-2a.)</p>	<p>YES</p>

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980, as Amended

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

VISUAL RESOURCES

7.0 Transmission Facilities, Interim VRM Classifications, Table 1: Multiple Use Class Guidelines, Page 15

<p>In the absence of established Visual Resource Management Classes (VRM Classes), Interim VRM Classes have been prepared for the BLM covering those BLM lands crossed by the project. VRM Classifications have been determined from VRM inventories to be Class II or Class III in the project study area.</p> <p>The VRM Class II Management Objective requires that a project or action retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the landscape should be low. Activities may be seen but should not attract attention of the casual observer. Changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.</p> <p>The VRM Class III Management Objective requires that a project or action partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the landscape should be moderate. Activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would cross BLM lands east and north of the Superstition Hills including the West Mesa area with an interim VRM Class III designation. The moderate to high levels of visual change that would be caused by the project in these areas would not meet the VRM Class III objective of not exceeding a moderate degree of visual change. The new line with its complex structural forms and vertical to diagonal lines would not repeat the basic elements of the existing natural features in the landscape (simple, flat horizontal landform). Also, the proposed structures would be prominent to dominant features in the landscape, accentuated by the skylining that would occur. This would be particularly noticeable where the line would be parallel and adjacent to existing highways. See Figures D.3-4A/B and D.3-5A/B for views of portions of this area.</p>	<p>NO</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

WILDERNESS AND RECREATION

14. Motorized-Vehicle Access/Transportation, Table 1: Multiple-Use Class Guidelines, Pages 19-20

<p>Class C – Motorized-vehicle use is generally not allowed unless provided for in individual wilderness legislation and management plans or if necessary to serve valid existing rights, and for emergency use for public safety, or protection of wilderness values.</p> <p>Class L – New roads and ways may be developed under right-of-way grants or pursuant to regulations or approved plans of operation. Motorized vehicle use will be allowed on existing routes of travel until designation of routes is accomplished. [#3, 1982]</p> <p>Class M – Motorized-vehicle use will be allowed on “existing” routes of travel unless closed or limited by the authorized officer. New routes may be allowed upon approval of the authorized officer [#3, 1982].</p> <p>Class I – Same as Class M. In addition, the vehicle open areas are available for unrestricted vehicle access except where private land, ACECs, and active mining areas are included [#3, 1982].</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would minimize motor vehicle impacts to surrounding biological resources. Further, APMs BIO-APM-3, -17, and -18 specifically address the issue of motor vehicle access for the Proposed Project, encouraging the use of existing ROW and access roads wherever possible, and the use of sensitive practices for avoidance of resources when existing access roads cannot be used.</p>	<p><del>NO</del> YES</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------

Motorized-Vehicle Access Element, Goals, Page 75

<p>When designating or amending areas or routes for motorized vehicle access, to the degree possible, avoid adverse impacts to desert resources.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would minimize motor vehicle impacts to surrounding biological resources. Further, APMs BIO-APM-3, -17, and -18 specifically address the issue of motor vehicle access, encouraging the use of existing ROW and access roads wherever possible, and the use of sensitive practices for avoidance of resources when existing access roads cannot be used.</p>	<p>YES</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

**California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan, 1980, as Amended**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Use maps, signs and published information to communicate the motorized vehicle access situation to desert users. Be sure all information materials are understandable and easy to follow.	Implementation of recreation APMs and mitigation measures (WR-1a, WR-1c) would ensure that information regarding potential road closures and available detours is clearly posted and widely available to desert motorists.	YES

**Appendix B: Interim Management Guidelines (For Lands Under Wilderness Review), Recreation, Page 144**

No new permanent recreational roads, structures, or installations will be permitted, except structures for human health and safety or the minimum necessary for public enjoyment of wilderness values.	No ROW for towers would be required within the San Felipe Hills Wilderness Study Area. However, the propose or alternative alignment of a new line within Grapevine Canyon would be highly visible from higher elevations within the WSA and the Pacific Crest Trail. The complex, industrial appearing structures and curvilinear conductor lines would not be perceived as enhancements to the landscape or wilderness values and would result in significant (Class I) visual impacts when viewed from locations within the WSA.	NO
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

**CULTURAL & PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Cultural & Paleontological Resources Pages 15 & 23**

Vehicle route approval in Classes L and M and closures in Class M are other tools for cultural and paleontological resource protection. Cultural and paleontological resource data will be used during the route approval progress to help minimize or eliminate adverse impacts on these resources from access and vehicle use.	The Proposed Project would use existing access roads, improve others, and create some new roads. Adverse effects to cultural and paleontological resources will be avoided or reduced to a level that is less than significant (Class II) through implementation of mitigation measures such as C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans), PAL-1a (Inventory and evaluate paleontological resources), PAL-1b (Develop paleontological monitoring and mitigation plan), and PAL-1c (Monitoring construction for paleontology).	YES
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Note: No applicable policies were identified for agriculture; noise; public health and safety; air quality; hydrology and water resources; and socioeconomics.

**BLM – Flat-tailed Horned Lizard Rangewide Management Strategy, 2003 Revision**

The Flat-tailed horned lizard (FTHL) management strategy would apply to the Proposed Project and the I-8 Alternative south of I-8, the FTHL Eastern Alternative, and the SDG&E West of Dunaway Alternative, in Imperial County. This is an interagency management strategy that uses conservation agreements for the management of flat-tailed horned lizard habitat. The purpose is to maintain several self-sustaining populations of the FTHL throughout the species range in the U.S. Five Management Areas (MAs) were established that encompass large blocks of habitat. The five designated MAs include the Yuma Desert, East Mesa, West Mesa, Yuha Desert and Borrego Badlands.

U.S. BLM Flat-Tailed Horned Lizard Rangewide Management Strategy 2003 Revision

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>MANAGEMENT PROGRAM Pages 25 to 43</b>		
<p><b>Planning Action 2.1:</b> Mitigate and compensate for project impacts on FTHLs and their habitat both within and outside of MAs and the RA. Require compensation for residual impacts remaining after application of other on-site measures.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would be subject to Mitigation Measure B-7b, which provides for specific protections of and compensation for impacts to FTHLs. This mitigation would ensure that impacts to FTHLs would not be significant.</p>	YES
<p><b>Planning Action 2.2:</b> 2.2.1. Limit the land use authorizations that would cause surface disturbance within MAs. New ROWs may be permitted only along the boundaries of MAs and only if impacts can be mitigated to avoid long-term effects on FTHLs. Where discretionary, other new authorizations may be permitted if the habitat disturbance does not pose a significant barrier to lizard movements. Disturbance shall be limited to 10 acres or less per authorization, if possible. If individual disturbances of over 10 acres are necessary, the ICC and the MOG shall be contacted to provide suggestions for minimizing potential impacts to FTHL. 2.2.2. All federally owned lands in the MAs shall be retained in federal ownership.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would be subject to Mitigation Measure B-7b, which provides specific mitigation for impacts to FTHLs. The ICC (Interagency Coordinating Committee) would be responsible for ensuring that the Proposed Project complies with this measure. As such, the ICC would be aware of project impacts to FTHLs and their habitat, and it could offer other suggestions for minimizing impacts to FTHLs pursuant to Planning Action 2.2.</p>	YES
<p><b>Planning Action 2.4:</b> Limit vehicle access and limit route proliferation within MAs 2.4.1 Reduce new road construction to a minimum by coordinating access needs and avoiding conflicts and replications in road use development, and management...Any new surface disturbance associated with road maintenance shall require mitigation. 2.4.2 Vehicles shall be restricted to designated open and limited routes. Routes in MAs shall be given high priority for signing. Routes shall be considered "closed" unless signed as "opened" or "limited." 2.4.3 Reduce open and limited route density in MAs, particularly in portions of MAs where route density is high.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would minimize motor vehicle impacts to surrounding biological resources. Further, APMs BIO-APM-3, -17, and -18 specifically address the issue of motor vehicle access for the Proposed Project, encouraging the use of existing ROW and access roads wherever possible, and the use of sensitive practices for avoidance of resources when existing access roads cannot be used.</p>	YES
<p><b>Planning Action 3:</b> Within the MAs, rehabilitate damaged and degraded habitat, including closed routes and other small areas of intense past activity. Methods used may include, but are not limited to, (a) ripping or scarifying compacted soils, (b) re-contouring the surface, (c) pitting or imprinting the surface, (d) seeding with native plants, (e) planting seedlings, (f) irrigating, and (g) barricading.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would incorporate APMs and mitigation measures that address issues of habitat rehabilitation and recovery and impacts to FTHLs. Specifically, BIO-APM-1, -19, -22, and -23, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, and -7b would address concerns for rehabilitation of damaged and degraded habitat.</p>	YES

BLM – Yuha Basin Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan, June 1981

The Yuha Basin ACEC would apply to the Proposed Project and the I-8 Alternative south of I-8 in Imperial County. The Yuha Basin Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan has been prepared to in order to give additional protection to unique cultural resource and wildlife values within portions of the Yuha Basin. This ACEC contains high density and diversity of cultural resource values, including intaglios, temporary camps, lithic scatters, cremation loci, pottery loci, trails, and shrines. The ACEC also includes 11 sections containing high relative densities of the flat-tailed horned lizard (FTHL).

**Yuha Basin Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan, June 1981**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**Summary of Major Recommendations, Pages 5 & 6**

N. Manage the Yuha Basin according to Class II Visual Resource Management (VRM) guidelines, and the surrounding terraces according to Class III VRM guidelines.	The development of Interim VRM Classes within the Yuha Basin has resulted in refined VRM Class boundaries within the ACEC. The Interim VRM Class II boundary is limited to a central basin area between Vista De Anza in the southwest to the Oyster Shell Beds in the northeast. The remaining area of the ACEC is now VRM Class III. The Proposed Project within the ACEC would be limited to a geographic area in close proximity to the existing SWPL transmission line, which is located within the VRM Class III area. While the new line would not repeat the basic elements of the existing natural features in the landscape, it would repeat the characteristics of the existing line. Although the project would be visible, it would not dominate the view of the casual observer. The moderate level of change that would result from the new line (structures and conductors) would meet the VRM Class III objective of moderate (or lower) visual change.	YES
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

**Planned Actions, Pages 17 through 38**

F) <i>Goal:</i> Provide for maximum protection for the highly sensitive cultural resources. <i>Action:</i> Nominate several areas within the ACEC for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places...Fence selected resources.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not impact any resources within the Yuha Basin ACEC that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, adverse effects to other cultural resources will be avoided through implementation of mitigation measures such as C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).	YES
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

**BLM – San Sebastian Marsh Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Management Plan and San Felipe Creek Wildlife Habitat Management Plan, October, 1986**

The Proposed Project would cross this area south of SR78. The San Sebastian Marsh/San Felipe Creek provides a corridor of unique and highly valuable habitat. The portion of the stream between Tarantula Wash and Harper’s Well Wash is spring fed and perennial. The area supports numerous endangered plant and animal species.

**San Sebastian Marsh Area of Critical Environmental Concern Management Plan, and San Felipe Creek Wildlife Habitat Management Plan, October 1986**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Coordination with BLM Programs, Page 41</b>		
<b>Cultural Resources</b> Coordination will be necessary to ensure that habitat enhancement projects do not adversely affect cultural resource values. No surface disturbing activity will occur without the review and concurrence of the Resource Area Archeologist.	The Proposed Project will disturb lands and resource agencies may require enhancement of habitat in compensation. Adverse effects to cultural resources will be avoided through implementation of mitigation measures such as C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).	YES
<b>Botany</b> Coordination will be necessary to ensure that habitat enhancement projects do not adversely affect rare plants. No surface disturbing activity will occur without the review and concurrence of the Resource Area Botanist.	The Proposed Project would be subject to mitigation measures that address impacts to sensitive plant species and their habitats. See APMs BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, and -5a.	YES
<b>Environmental Assessment, Appendix A-1</b>		
Surveys prior to disturbing activities would ensure that no wildlife, fish, or botanical species of special management concern would be impacted. If it is anticipated that any listed species could be affected by a proposed disturbance, BLM will informally confer with USFWS and CDFG to determine if formal consultation is necessary.	The Proposed Project would incorporate APMs and mitigation measures that would ensure that surveys would be conducted prior to disturbance activities. Specifically, see APMs BIO-APM-1 and -4, and Mitigation Measures B-5b, -7d through -7l, -8a, and -9a, which provide both general surveying protocol as well as survey requirements for specific species.	YES

**BLM – Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan, 1981**

The Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan (MFP) would apply to the I-8 alternative where it passes south of the Table Mountain Area of Critical Environmental Concern just west of Imperial County. The alternative is south of I-8, the ACEC is to the north of the highway. The Proposed Project would pass near BLM lands within the Framework Plan in the San Felipe Hills, but would not enter these lands. The Eastern San Diego County Planning Unit spans a portion of the eastern escarpment of Southern California’s Peninsula Ranges, where Mt. Laguna drops dramatically into the Colorado Desert. A broad range of rainfall, temperature, and topographic conditions has produced a landscape that supports a wide variety of plants and animals, including sensitive big horned sheep and raptor species, and sensitive plant species. The San Felipe Wilderness Study Area, located west of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, falls under the jurisdiction of the Management Framework Plan.

**U.S. BLM Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan, 1981**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>OTHER LANDS ACTIONS, Page 17</b>		
<b>Decision 11:</b> Until Congress acts on BLM’s recommendation of areas suitable for wilderness (Class C), manage lands actions in accordance with Class L guidelines. Allow new power lines for roads only when necessary for access to or occupancy of private in holdings. Such developments should follow existing disturbed areas as much as possible. Allow no new apiary sites, and phase out existing sites unless located along existing roads (those meeting the wilderness definition of a road).	The San Felipe Hills Wilderness Study Area has not been designated as wilderness; its status remains as a wilderness study area (WSA). However, the Proposed Project would not enter the San Felipe Hills WSA. Therefore, it would be consistent.	YES

**U.S. BLM Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan, 1981**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Recreation, Pages 27-31</b>		
Decision 35: In the San Felipe Hills and Julian areas, support the U.S. Forest Service in preserving the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail by reserving a perpetual exclusive easement for the trail to the U.S. Forest Service. In the San Felipe Hills area, delineate a special Scenic Management Zone along the trail to protect scenic values and open space...The special San Felipe Hills Scenic Management Zone will help guide future management decisions regarding the administration of discretionary land actions such as disposals, granting rights-of-ways, and issuing leases and permits.	The new line within Grapevine Canyon would be highly visible from higher elevations within the San Felipe WSA and along the Pacific Crest Trail. The complex, industrial appearing structures and curvilinear conductor lines would not be perceived as enhancements to the landscape or wilderness values and would result in significant (Class I) visual impacts when viewed from locations within the WSA and along the Pacific Crest Trail. See Figures D.3-13A/B for views of a portion of the Grapevine Canyon area.	NO
Decision 39: b. Manage the San Felipe Hills as a Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II during interim WSA management. If Congress concurs with the recommendation of this plan and finds the area non-suitable as wilderness, the PCT Scenic Management Zone will remain in Class II and the remainder of the area will be reassigned to Class IV.	New ROW for towers would be required within portions of the San Felipe Hills Wilderness Study Area and the new line within Grapevine Canyon would be highly visible from higher elevations within the WSA along the Pacific Crest Trail. The complex, industrial appearing structures and curvilinear conductor lines would not be perceived as enhancements to the landscape or wilderness values and would result in significant (Class I) visual impacts when viewed from locations within the WSA and along the Pacific Crest Trail. See Figures D.3-13A/B for views of a portion of the Grapevine Canyon area.	NO
<b>Wildlife and Vegetative Resources, Pages 43-49</b>		
Decision 55: Protect riparian habitat throughout the planning unit	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to vegetation communities, including riparian habitat. APM BIO-5 includes measures to avoid impacts to riparian habitat as part of the design phase, and Mitigation Measure B-2a addresses impacts and mitigation for wetlands. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species introduction (i.e., pets).	YES

**U.S. BLM Eastern San Diego County Management Framework Plan, 1981**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Decision 56: In accordance with BLM policy, protect the habitat of sensitive wildlife species throughout the planning unit, with emphasis in the following areas: Golden eagle and other raptors, Magic Gecko and other sensitive reptiles and amphibians, as well as the peninsular bighorn sheep.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat, including that for sensitive wildlife species. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species introduction (i.e., pets). As well, mitigation measures have been included that would address specific species concerns, including mitigation for golden eagles and other raptors, arroyo toads, desert tortoise, Peninsular bighorn sheep, and others.	YES
Decision 60: In accordance with BLM policy protect the habitat of sensitive plants throughout the planning unit, with emphasis on the following species: Fairchild's Lily, Cuyamaca Meadow-foam, Douglas Locoweed, Tecate Tarweed, Payson's Caulanthus, Leguna Alumroot, California Hulsea, Interior Bush Lupine, and the Jumping Cholla.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would be subject to mitigation measures that address impacts to sensitive plant species and their habitats. See APMs BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, and -5a.	YES

**BLM South Coast Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, June 1994**

The San Diego County Resource Management Area includes 65,000 acres of BLM public land, and an additional 74,000 acres of BLM split estate lands in the western portion of the County. Most of these BLM public lands are the mountainous terrain lying between Interstate 8 and the U.S.-Mexico border. This Plan applies to the Modified Alternative D and Interstate 8 Alternatives.

**BLM South Coast Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, June 1994**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Chapter 2 – Land Use Decisions</b>		
<b>Policy and Management Guidance, page 13</b>		
13. BLM will continue to avoid jeopardizing the existence of any federally listed or State listed or proposed species, and will actively promote species recovery and work to continue to improve the status of candidate and sensitive species.	This policy is directive of BLM staff. The APMs and mitigation measures for the alternative, in addition to any requirements imposed by BLM, will ensure that the alternatives are consistent with this policy.	YES
17. Management actions will be conducted in a manner which conforms to the objectives and strategies of the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District for attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), State air quality standards and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) goals.	The Air Quality APMs and mitigation measures for the alternative will ensure that the alternatives are consistent with this policy.	YES

**BLM South Coast Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, June 1994**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
18. Management actions will be conducted in a manner which conforms to Regional and State Water Quality Control Board objectives which have been developed as required by the 1987 Water Quality Act Amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Best management practices (BMPs) will be developed as needed under the guidance of the California BLM 208 Water Quality Management Plan, the State's Non-point Source Program, and in coordination with the responsible Regional Water Quality Control Board.	This policy is directive of BLM staff. The APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives include BMPs. In addition, BLM may impose additional requirements. Together, these will ensure that the alternatives are consistent with this policy.	YES
19. Measures for minimizing accelerated soil erosion will continue to be made on a site-specific basis through evaluation of management actions.	The Geology/Soils and the Water Resources APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives will ensure site-specific compliance with this policy. In addition, BLM may impose additional requirements. As a result, the alternative is consistent with this policy.	YES

**Appendix H – Visual Resource Management, Page 133**

The visual resource inventory process provides BLM managers with a means for determining visual values. The inventory consists of a scenic quality evaluation, sensitivity level analysis, and a delineation of distance zones. Based on these three factors, BLM public lands are placed into one of four visual resource inventory classes. The inventory classes represent the relative value of the visual resources, with Class I and II being the most valued, Class III representing a moderate value, and Class IV being of least value. The inventory classes provide the basis for considering visual values in the resource management planning (RMP) process for all BLM public lands (see also manual 1625.3). Visual management objectives are established for each class, and are defined below:	See below	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	--

**VRM Management Class Objectives**

<b>Class 1 Objective</b> The objective of this class is to preserve the existing character of the landscape. This class provides for natural ecological changes; however, it does not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention.	Within the BLM South Coast Resource Management Area (SCRMA) in San Diego County, VRM Class I management objectives apply to Wilderness Areas. The alternatives do not cross wilderness areas in the South Coast plan area.	YES
<b>Class II Objective</b> The objective of this class is to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.	Within the BLM SCRMA in San Diego County, VRM Class II management objectives apply to Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs). The alternatives do not cross ACECs in San Diego County.	YES

**BLM South Coast Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, June 1994**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Class III Objective</b> The objective of this class is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract the attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.</p>	<p>Within the BLM SCRMA in San Diego County, VRM Class III management objectives apply to all areas not designated Class I (Wilderness Areas) or Class II (ACECs). The I-8 Alternative would cross VRM Class III lands within the SCRMA southwest of El Cajon Mountain. The Modified Route D Alternative would cross VRM Class III lands within the SCRMA south of Cameron Valley, North of Hauser Mountain WSA, and South of Hauser Wilderness. In all instances where VRM Class III lands are crossed, the resulting levels of visual change would not be consistent with the Class III management objectives.</p>	NO
<p><b>Class IV Objective</b> The objective of this class is to provide for management activities which require major modification of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements.</p>	<p>There are no VRM Class IV management areas within the SCRMA in San Diego County.</p>	YES

**NPS – Comprehensive Management and Use Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, April 1996**

The Proposed Project would cross the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail near MP 49, south of Highway 78, and the I-8 Alternative would cross the trail in the existing SWPL ROW south of I-8. The National Park Service provides overall administration for the trail. Along its length the trail traverses both public and private land.

**Comprehensive Management and Use Plan Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (NPS 1996)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Management Objectives</b> The goals of NPS trail administration are to protect a trail right-of-way, to protect cultural and scenic resources along the trail, to foster public appreciation and understanding of the trail, to encourage facilities for resource protection and public information and use, and to promote cooperative management of trail resources and programs.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project may directly impact the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail. It has not yet been assessed or determined if these effects would be adverse but it is likely that impacts to the trail can be reduced to a level that is less than significant (Class II) through implementation of Mitigation Measures such as C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan).</p> <p>The Proposed Project would be located adjacent to the Juan Bautista de Anza trail in the West Mesa area south of SR 78. The transmission line would introduce structurally prominent, industrial appearing features into the otherwise natural-appearing landscape. The resulting visual impact would be significant (Class I) and would not be consistent with the goal of protecting scenic resources along the trail.</p>	NO

Comprehensive Management and Use Plan Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail (NPS 1996)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Resource Protection Objectives		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect certified trail segments and historic sites from overuse, inappropriate use, and vandalism.</li> <li>• Identify and protect ethnographic resources (those cultural and natural resources of ongoing significance to contemporary peoples, especially American Indians and Hispanics).</li> <li>• Encourage uses of adjacent lands that complement the protection and interpretation of trail resources.</li> <li>• Comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Historic Preservation Act, and other environmental, cultural, and historic preservation laws.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project would be located adjacent to the Juan Bautista de Anza trail in the West Mesa area south of SR 78. The transmission line would introduce structurally prominent, industrial appearing features into the otherwise natural-appearing landscape. The resulting visual impact would be significant (Class I) and would not be perceived as complementing the protection of trail resources.</p> <p>The Proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable environmental laws and regulations. The project requires a formal consultation between the BLM and USFWS concerning project effects on endangered species per the Endangered Species Act. BIO-APM-6 would ensure that the Proposed Project would comply with all applicable environmental laws and regulations, including those specific to protection of wildlife and its habitat.</p> <p>With regard to cultural resources, it has not yet been determined if the Proposed Project will have an adverse effect on the Trail, but the preferred Mitigation Measure C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources) would be implemented, if feasible. If effects are determined to be adverse, it is likely that impacts to the trail can be reduced to a level that is less than significant (Class II) through implementation of mitigation measures such as C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan). Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE) and C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources) further help the objectives of this plan.</p>	NO

USFS – Cleveland National Forest

The CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative, four SWPL alternatives — Interstate 8, BCD, Route D, and Modified Route D — and the two LEAPS alternatives all would cross portions of Cleveland National Forest (CNF). CNF is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service, and is located in Orange, Riverside, and San Diego Counties. In instances where there would be an inconsistency between a proposed alternative and the CNF Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) as currently written, the Forest Plan would need to be amended in order to make the plan and alternative consistent.

Three interrelated documents provide direction and policies for the management of CNF and its resources. Together these constitute the Forest Plan for CNF. The documents making up plan include: Part 1 Southern California National Forests Vision; Part 2 Cleveland National Forest Strategy; and Part 3 Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests. Parts 1 and 3 apply to CNF as well as the Angeles, Los Padres, and San Bernardino National Forests. Part 2 only applies to CNF. The Forest Plan incorporates all overarching direction in Part 3, which means an alternative would need to be consistent

with all overarching direction including all relevant statutes, regulations, Executive Orders and memorandums, agreements, and other management direction applicable to the Forest Service or the local unit.

Part 1 provides the vision for Southern California National Forests, including CNF. Part 2 establishes the strategy to be followed in CNF. Part 3 is the design criteria or ‘the rules’ that managers will operate with as we work toward the realization of the desired conditions described in Part 1 (Vision). Part 3 provides forest plan standards and guidelines. The criteria are expected to enable sustainable resource use and conservation. The design criteria are used in combination with the description of desired conditions (Part 1), the objectives, program emphasis and strategies (Part 2), and the land management zoning map to define the strategic direction and guide the management of the southern California national forests.

These policies apply to alternatives crossing the Cleveland National Forest: Interstate 8, BCD, Route D, Modified Route D, and LEAPS.

The location of the project alternatives relative to CNF Land Use Zones is presented in Section D.17 Plan Amendments (see Figure D.17-2).

**USFS – Land Management Plan: Part 1 – Southern California National Forests Vision, September 2005**

Land Management Plan: Part 1 – Southern California National Forests Vision (2005)		
Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Strategic Goals – National Strategic Plan, Pages 16-17 and Appendix A, Pages 52-57</b>		
Goal 1: Reduce the risk from catastrophic wildland fire		
Objective 2: consistent with resource objectives, wildland fires are suppressed at a minimum cost, considering firefighter and public safety, benefits, and values to be protected.	The presence of transmission lines limits the use of fire fighting and observation aircraft. While energized, transmission lines preclude firefighting under and near the transmission lines because of risks to personnel.	NO
Objective 1: Improve the effectiveness of treating selected invasive species.	Maintenance of the ROW under a power line would alter the plant species make up of the ROW. This may result in colonization of the area by invasive species. A strategy would be required to prevent or reduce this outcome. The USFS would need to approve any strategy to prevent or reduce invasive species.	MAYBE
Goal 3: Provide outdoor recreation opportunities		
Objective 1: Improve public access to National Forest System land and water and provide opportunities for outdoor health-enhancing activities.	The Plan has specific policies regarding modes of access to various areas of CNF. An access road on a transmission line ROW may present an opportunity for unauthorized vehicular access. However, this specific objective is neutral with regard to creation of a transmission line access. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with the objective.	YES
Goal 4: Help meet energy resource needs		
Objective 1: Work with other agencies to identify and designate corridors for energy facilities, improve permit application processing efficiency, and establish appropriate land tenure (including transferability clauses) in easements and other authorizations to provide for long-term viability.	The Alternatives would require new ROW. The USFS will determine the ROW and land tenure conditions for any transmission line in CNF. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with the objective	YES

**Land Management Plan: Part 1 – Southern California National Forests Vision (2005)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Goal 5: Improve watershed condition		
Objective 1: Assess and restore high-priority watersheds and maintain riparian habitat within these watersheds.	An alternative may require crossing riparian habitat. APMs and mitigation measures applicable to Water Resources, Soils, and Biological Resources will minimize riparian habitat impacts. In addition, CNF may impose additional requirements. However, the actual location of structures relative to riparian areas cannot be determined until final design. Therefore, the status of the project with regard to this standard is unclear.	MAYBE
Objective 2: Monitor water quality impacts of activities on National Forest System lands.	The project proponent would be required to monitor water quality impacts as a condition of project approval. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this objective.	YES
Objective 3: Restore and maintain native and desired nonnative plant and animal species diversity within terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and reduce the rate of species endangerment by contributing to species recovery.	Maintenance of the ROW under a power line would alter the plant species make up of the ROW. This may result in colonization of the area by invasive species. A strategy would be required to prevent or reduce this outcome. The USFS would need to approve any strategy to prevent or reduce invasive species.	MAYBE
Goal 6: Mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals		
Objective 3: Maintain the environmental, social, and economic benefits of forests and grasslands by reducing their conversion to other uses.	The alternatives would require new ROW in the forest, thereby converting the ROW land to other uses. Therefore, the project would be inconsistent with this objective to the extent that land is converted from its current condition.	NO

**Forest Goals and Desired Conditions**

**Community Protection Element, Page 20**

Goal 1.1: Improve the ability of Southern California communities to limit loss of life and property and recover from the high intensity wildland fires that are a natural part of the state's ecosystem.  The desired condition is to have vegetation treated to enhance community protection and reduce the risk of loss of human life, structures, improvements, and natural resources from wildland fire and subsequent floods. Firefighters have improved opportunities for tactical operations and safety near structures, improvements, and high resource values. By providing for defensible space, public and firefighter safety is enhanced. Local jurisdictional authorities, citizen groups and the Forest Service act together to mitigate hazardous fuel conditions in areas surrounding urban interface, urban intermix, and/or outlying improvements.	The presence of transmission lines can impede fire fighting efforts in the vicinity of the lines while they are energized. A delay in getting lines de-energized may result in a fire increasing in size and escaping initial attack. In addition, transmission lines and towers prevent the use of aerial firefighting equipment in the vicinity, reducing the resources that can be applied to fires under or near a transmission line. The presence of a transmission line would not improve the ability to reduce the risk of losses to fire. Therefore, the alternatives would not be consistent with this goal.	NO
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

Land Management Plan: Part 1 – Southern California National Forests Vision (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Restoration of Forest Health, Pages 21-31</b>		
<p>Goal 1.2: Restore forest health where alteration of natural fire regimes have put human and natural resource values at risk. The long-term goal of vegetation management is to perpetuate plant communities by maintaining of re-introducing fire regimes appropriate to each type while at the same time protecting human communities from destructive wildland fires. To accomplish this goal, the Forest Service has developed desired conditions within the framework of five major fire regimes that have been described for the United States (Schmidt et al. 2002). In this classification, fire regimes are defined primarily by the frequency (average interval between fires) and fire severity (related to intensity). Generally, other elements of fire regimes such as season of burning, landscape pattern and size are not so heavily weighted in the classification. The regimes are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fire Regime I (0-35 years – low severity)</li> <li>• Fire Regime II (0-35 years – stand replacement)</li> <li>• Fire Regime III (35-100+ years – mixed severity fires)</li> <li>• Fire Regime IV (35-100+ years – stand replacement)</li> <li>• Fire Regime V (200+ years – stand replacement)</li> </ul>	<p>The alternatives would alter the plant communities under transmission lines in areas where the vegetation must be maintained for safety. Maintaining ROW would not serve to restore forest health. It may also adversely alter the frequency of natural fires. The presence of the transmission lines reduces the ability of firefighters to attack a fire under or near the lines. The alternatives would not be consistent with this goal.</p>	NO
<p>Goal 1.2.1: Reduce the potential for widespread losses of montane conifer forests caused by severe, extensive, stand replacing fires.</p>	<p>Where a montane conifer forest is near the ROW, the presence of the transmission line could exacerbate fire risks to the forest by hampering firefighting. Therefore, the alternatives would not be consistent with this goal.</p>	NO
<p>Goal 1.2.2: Reduce the number of acres at risk from excessively frequent fires while improving defensible space around communities.</p>	<p>The alternatives would increase the acreage wherein firefighting would be hampered. Therefore, the alternatives would not be consistent with this goal.</p>	NO
<p>Goal 1.2.3: Maintain long fire-free intervals in habitats which are slow to recover.</p>	<p>If an alignment passes through or near a slow-to-recover habitat, the presence of the transmission line would hamper firefighting ability, thereby increasing the likelihood that long fire-free intervals would not be realized.</p>	NO
<b>Invasive Species Element, Pages 32-33</b>		
<p>Goal 2.1: Reverse the trend of increasing loss of natural resource values due to invasive species.</p> <p>Desired Condition: The structure, function, and composition of plant communities and wildlife habitats are not impaired by the presence of invasive nonnative plants and animals.</p>	<p>Maintenance of the ROW under a power line would alter the plant species make up of the ROW. This may result in colonization of the area by invasive species. This would not reverse the loss of natural resource values due to invasive species.</p>	NO

Land Management Plan: Part 1 – Southern California National Forests Vision (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**Wilderness Element, Page 37**

<p>Goal 3.2 Retain a Natural Evolving Character within Wilderness. Desired conditions for wilderness include:</p> <p><i>Ecological Processes</i> – Ecological processes occur untrammelled. Human influences do not impeded the free play of natural forces in the ecosystem. Management activities prescribed for enhancement and recovery of threatened and endangered species and for the re-introduction of extirpated species are supported.</p> <p><i>Vegetation Management/Fire</i> – Vegetation management maintains or mimics natural processes for the purpose of achieving wilderness fire management objectives. Reduce to an acceptable level, the risks and consequences of wildland fire within wilderness or escaping from wilderness.</p> <p><i>Solitude</i> – Outstanding opportunities for solitude and inspiration are characteristic and stable, or increasing. Challenge – Primitive and unconfined recreation opportunities that offer physical and mental challenges are stable or increasing.</p> <p><i>Air Resources</i> – Remediate and prevent human caused impairments to air quality values (AQRV) including visibility, ozone injury, and acid and nitrogen deposition. Suppression of wildland fires and ignition of prescribed fires in wilderness will consider impacts to human health and air quality (AQRVs)</p>	<p>The alternatives do not pass through a designated wilderness. However, for the Interstate 8 alternative, transmission lines and towers would be near the north end of the Pine Creek Wilderness. This could affect the visual experience from within the wilderness. Therefore, the I-8 alternative may be inconsistent with the solitude aspect of this goal.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

**Watershed Function Element, Pages 40-41**

<p>Goal 5.1: Improve watershed conditions through cooperative management.</p> <p>The desired condition is that national forest watersheds are healthy, dynamic and resilient, and are capable of responding to the natural and human caused disturbances while maintaining the integrity of their biological and physical processes.</p> <p>Additional desired conditions are that geologic resources are managed to protect, preserve and interpret unique resources and values, and to improve management of activities that affect watershed condition and ecosystem health. Geologic hazards are identified, analyzed and managed to reduce risks and impacts where there is a threat to human life, natural resources, or financial investment.</p>	<p>The alternatives would require grading and access road construction, potentially contributing to erosion and sedimentation that could affect water quality and watershed conditions. However, APMs and mitigation measures applicable to Water Resources, Soils, and Biological Resources will minimize riparian habitat impacts. In addition, CNF may impose additional requirements. However, the actual location of structures relative to riparian areas cannot be determined until final design. Therefore, the status of the project with regard to this standard is unclear.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

Land Management Plan: Part 1 – Southern California National Forests Vision (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**Riparian Condition Element, Page 42**

<p>Goal 5.2: Improve riparian conditions.</p> <p>Riparian Conservation Areas (RCAs) are areas along streams and around water/riparian features that are identified to protect riparian and aquatic ecosystems and the dependent natural resources associated with them during site-specific project planning and implementation. Standard S47 (in Appendix E and Part 3) explain the concept and the process for delineating RCAs.</p> <p>Montane meadow is a rare wetland type that provides habitat for a large number of rare plant and animal species. It is present on all four southern California national forests; however the highest acreages occur on the Cleveland and San Bernardino National Forests. These wetlands function like a sponge to collect water and then slowly release it into adjacent drainages. They also filter runoff by trapping sediments, nutrients, and pollutants, and lower the risk of erosion by moderating the energy of water flow. Montane meadow habitats are affected by activities that alter hydrology, remove vegetation, or cause compaction or soil erosion.</p> <p>The desired condition is that watercourses are functioning properly and support healthy populations of native and desired non-native riparian dependent species. Riparian vegetation consists mainly of native species, with minimal or no presence of invasive nonnative plants. Nuisance nonnative aquatic animals are absent or rare in streams and lakes. Riparian and aquatic ecosystems (including vegetation, channel stability, water quality and habitat for aquatic and riparian dependent species) are resilient and able to recover after natural events, such as floods and wildland fires.</p>	<p>APMs and mitigation measures in the alternatives generally accomplish the intent of Appendix E. However, the actual location of structures relative to riparian areas cannot be determined until final design. Therefore, the status of the project with regard to this standard is unclear.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

**Biological Resources Condition Element, Pages 45-46**

<p>Goal 6.2: Provide ecological conditions to sustain viable populations of native and desired nonnative species.</p> <p>The desired condition is that habitats for federally listed species are conserved, and listed species are recovered or are moving toward recovery. Habitats for sensitive species and other species of concern are managed to prevent downward trends in populations or habitat capability, and to prevent federal listing. Flow regimes in streams that provide habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and/or sensitive aquatic and riparian-dependent species are sufficient to allow the species to persist and complete all phases of their life cycles.</p> <p>Habitat conditions sustain healthy populations of native and desired nonnative fish and game species. Wildlife habitat functions are maintained or improved, including primary feeding areas, winter ranges, breeding areas, birthing areas, rearing areas, migration corridors, and landscape linkages. Fish habitat functions are maintained or improved, including spawning areas, rearing areas, and upstream and downstream migration, where possible.</p> <p>Vegetation condition is managed toward the desired conditions identified for each habitat grouping listed under Forest Goal 1.2 – Restoration of Forest Health.</p> <p>Riparian and aquatic habitat conditions are managed toward the desired conditions identified under Goal 5.2 – Riparian Condition and Goal 5.1 – Watershed Function.</p>	<p>This goal is descriptive of the outcome of successful implementation of programs in support of the goal. APMs and mitigation measures in the alternatives accomplish the general intent of this goal. However, habitat disturbance is an outcome of constructing and maintaining the transmission line. The extent to which habitat of listed species may be affected is unknown, pending field surveys. Likewise, the actual location of structures relative to riparian areas cannot be determined until final design. Therefore, the status of the project with regard to this standard is unclear.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

Land Management Plan: Part 1 – Southern California National Forests Vision (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**Natural Areas in an Urban Context Element, Pages 4749**

<p>Goal 7.1: Retain natural areas as a core for a regional network while focusing the built environment into the minimum land area needed to support growing public needs.</p>	<p>The alternatives would impose on the landscape an industrial type structure in the form of transmission towers. Within the ROW vegetation would be altered to accommodate transmission line safety requirements. Access roads would permanently alter the area of vegetation disturbed by the road.</p>	<p>NO</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

The desired condition is that the natural and cultural features of landscapes that provide their 'sense of place' are intact. Landscapes possess a vegetation pattern and species mix that is natural in appearance and function. Built elements and landscape alterations complement landscape characteristics. Areas zoned as Back Country retain an undeveloped character with a low level of loss of acres in this condition.

Structures are well integrated into the landscape and advance environmentally sensitive technology, such as water and energy efficiency and retention of habitat linkages.

Facilities supporting urban infrastructure needs are clustered on existing sites or designated corridors, minimizing the number of acres encumbered by special-use authorizations. Special-uses serve public needs, provide public benefits, and conform to resource management and protection objectives. All uses are in full compliance with the terms and conditions of the authorization. There is a low level of increase in the developed portion of the landscape as measured by road densities; in fact, over time, the built environment is shifted away from or designed to better protect resource values.

Land adjustment administration contributes to the reduction of the complexity of land ownership and consolidates the National Forest System land base; reduces administrative problems and costs; enhances public access and use; supports resource management objectives, including the protection and improvement of habitat condition and linkage. Strategic easements for access and species conservation are acquired. Clear title to National Forest System land is retained. Occupancy trespass is eliminated and national forest boundaries are clearly posted.

**Forest-Specific Design Criteria, Page 68**

<p>CNF S12 Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail – Protect scenic values in accordance with adopted scenic integrity objectives. Protect foreground views from the footpath as well as designated viewpoints. Where practicable avoid establishing unconflicting land uses within the viewshed of the trail (Morena, Laguna, Aguanga Places).</p>	<p>The PCT would be crossed by the Proposed Project and the Interstate 8, BCD, and Modified Route D alternatives. It would be visible to trail users. However, as a practical matter, to traverse from Imperial County to San Diego, the transmission line would have to cross the PCT at some point. Nevertheless, the project would be inconsistent with this design criterion.</p>	<p>NO</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

Land Management Plan: Part 2 – Cleveland National Forest Strategy (Appendix B – Program Strategies and Tactics), September 2005

Land Management Plan: Part 2 – Cleveland National Forest Strategy (Appendix B) (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Tribal 1: Traditional and Contemporary Uses, Page 84</b>		
<p>Allow traditional use, access to traditionally used areas, as well as contemporary use and needs by tribal and other Native American interests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect, conserve, and restore traditionally or contemporarily used resources. Opportunities for traditional use of the national forest and national forest resources are provided and provisions are made to offer access to sites with cultural significance. Use opportunities during project planning and implementation to identify, enhance, and protect traditionally or contemporarily used resources.</li> <li>• Maintain opportunities for spiritual solitude for tribal groups and individuals. Retain the character of traditional sites in conditions consistent with traditional cultural use.</li> <li>• Work collaboratively with tribes to determine appropriate locations and levels for gathering traditional plant material.</li> </ul>	<p>This policy is directive to CNF managers. However, the policy to retain the character of traditional use sites in conditions consistent with traditional cultural use may be affected by the transmission line. Until such sites are identified and the relationship between the sites and the transmission line confirmed, it is not possible to determine if the project is consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
<b>WL 2: Management of Species of Concern Element, page 90</b>		
<p>Maintain and improve habitat for fish, wildlife, and plants, including those with the following designations: game species, harvest species, management indicator species, and watch list species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage State of California designated Wild Trout Streams to maintain high quality habitat for wild trout populations.</li> <li>• Develop and maintain wildlife water sources and other habitat improvement structures.</li> <li>• Protect habitat during fire suppression activities where feasible.</li> <li>• Cooperate with other agencies, partners, and other national forest programs to maintain and improve landscape level habitat conditions and ecological processes over the long-term for landscape linkages, wildlife movement corridors, key deer and bighorn sheep fawning, lambing, and winter ranges, and raptor nesting sites.</li> </ul>	<p>To the extent that this policy would apply to the alternatives, it would be a requirement imposed by the CNF. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Land Management Plan: Part 2 – Cleveland National Forest Strategy (Appendix B) (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**IS 1: Invasive Species Prevention and Control, Page 91**

<p>Prevent the introduction of new invaders, conduct early treatment of new infestations, and contain and control established infestations:</p>	<p>Maintenance of the ROW under a power line would alter the plant species make up of the ROW. This may result in colonization of the area by invasive species. A strategy would be required to prevent or reduce this outcome. The USFS would need to approve any strategy to prevent or reduce invasive species.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

- Implement the *Noxious Weed Management Strategy* for the four southern California national forests.
- Limit ground disturbance to the minimum area necessary during project activities. Promote conditions to enhance the recovery of vegetation recovery in project planning, design, and implementation. Use native plant materials as needed to restore disturbed sites to prevent the introduction or re-introduction of invasive nonnative species. Conduct follow-up inspections of ground disturbing activities to monitor the effectiveness of restoration efforts in reducing or preventing the introduction or re-introduction of invasive non-native plants.
- When setting priorities for treating invasive species consider the rate of spread, the likeliness of environmental harm resulting from the establishment and spread of the invasive non-native species, the geographical location within the watershed, and the sensitivity of the location, especially invasions occurring within occupied or potential habitat for threatened, endangered or proposed species or within special management areas such as research natural areas, special interest areas, and wilderness; and the probability that the treatment(s) will be successful.
- Prevent the introduction of invasive species and coordinate the treatment of invasive species across jurisdictional boundaries. Coordinate internally, as well as with local, state and federal agencies and permittees, and the public to prevent future introductions of invasive species through stocking, recreation use, special-use authorizations and all other national forest management and emergency activities or decisions that could promote additional invasions. Emphasize using weed management areas to consolidate and coordinate weed prevention and treatment efforts across jurisdictional boundaries.
- Treatments may include herbicide application if approved through environmental analysis.

**Air 1: Minimize Smoke and Dust, Page 94**

<p>Control and reduce smoke and fugitive dust to protect human health, improve safety and/or reduce or eliminate environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Construction of dirt roads to gain access to tower sites would be required. This construction would create dust. Mitigation Measure AQ-1a requires use of watering or soil stabilizers to suppress dust on roads and exposed surfaces. Dust from construction would be limited in duration. Together, these reduce environmental impacts. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this goal.</p>	<p>YES</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

- Incorporate visibility requirements into project plans.

Land Management Plan: Part 2 – Cleveland National Forest Strategy (Appendix B) (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**WAT 1: Watershed Function, Page 95**

<p>Protect, maintain and restore the natural watershed functions including slope processes, surface water and groundwater flow and retention, and riparian area sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restore, maintain and improve watershed conditions. Assure that approved and funded rehabilitation and emergency watershed treatments are implemented in an effective and timely manner.</li> <li>• Maintain or restore soil properties and productivity to ensure ecosystem health (soil, microbiota and vegetation growth), soil hydrologic function, and biological buffering capacity.</li> <li>• Manage Riparian Conservation Areas (RCA) to maintain or improve conditions for riparian dependent resources. Riparian Conservation Areas include aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems and lands adjacent to perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams, as well as around meadows, lakes, reservoirs, ponds, wetlands, vernal pools, seeps, springs and other waterbodies. Riparian dependent resources are those natural resources that owe their existence to the area, such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, fairy shrimp, aquatic invertebrates, plants, birds, mammals, soils and water quality.</li> <li>• Maintain natural stream channel conductivity, connectivity and function.</li> <li>• Maintain watershed integrity by replacing or disposing of displaced soil and rock debris in approved placement sites.</li> </ul>	<p>The APMs and mitigation measures for the alternative include BMPs. In addition, CNF may impose additional requirements. Together, these will ensure that the alternative is consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

**WAT 2: Water Management, Page 96**

<p>Manage groundwater and surface water to maintain or improve water quantity and quality in ways that minimize adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote water conservation at all national forest administrative and authorized facilities. Protect and improve water quality through implementing best management practices and other project specific water quality protection measures for all national forest and authorized activities. Include appropriate conservation and water quality mitigation measures in the review response when reviewing non-forest water-related projects that may affect forest resources.</li> <li>• Conserve and protect high quality water sources in quantities adequate to meet national forest needs.</li> </ul>	<p>The APMs and mitigation measures for the alternative include BMPs. In addition, CNF may impose additional requirements. The alternatives would create no water needs. Borings for tower footings would be filled with concrete, precluding impacts to groundwater by way of the boring. Together, these will ensure that the alternative is consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

Land Management Plan: Part 2 – Cleveland National Forest Strategy (Appendix B) (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>WAT 3: Hazardous Materials, page 97</b>		
<p>Manage known hazardous materials risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a <i>Hazardous Materials Response Plan</i> that addresses risk and standard cleanup procedures.</li> <li>• Coordinate with federal, tribal, state, city and county agencies, and local landowners to develop emergency response guidelines for hazardous spills on National Forest System land or on adjacent non-National Forest System land with the potential to affect threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive fish and amphibian habitat. In the event of hazardous material spills in known habitat on National Forest System land, the Forest Service will contact the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries (as appropriate) within 24 hours. Quickly contact resource personnel and use them as consultants to minimize impacts to habitat and to initiate emergency consultation with the USFWS if necessary. Provide habitat maps to response personnel for hazardous spills.</li> </ul>	<p>SDG&amp;E would be required to prepare a Hazardous Materials Response Plan, subject to USFS approval. With implementation of this plan, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>	YES
<b>SD 1: Wilderness, Page 99</b>		
<p>Protect and manage wilderness to improve the capability to sustain a desired range of benefits and values and so that changes in ecosystems are primarily a consequence of natural processes. Protect and manage the areas recommended for wilderness designation to maintain their wilderness values.</p>	<p>The alternatives do not enter wilderness areas or areas recommended for wilderness designation. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	YES
<b>SD 2: Wild and Scenic Rivers, Page 99</b>		
<p>Manage designated wild and scenic river segments to perpetuate their free-flowing condition and designated classifications, and to protect and enhance their outstandingly remarkable values and water quality. Manage eligible wild and scenic river segments to perpetuate their free-flowing condition and proposed classifications, and to protect and enhance their outstandingly remarkable values and water quality through the suitability study period until designated or released from consideration.</p>	<p>The alternatives would not obstruct free-flowing rivers. The only river designated as eligible for Wild and Scenic status that would be crossed would be Cottonwood Creek, which would be crossed by the Interstate 8 Alternative. It is classified as 'recreational'.</p> <p>This is defined as those rivers or sections of rivers that are readily accessible by road or railroad, that may have some development along their shorelines, and that may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past. Based on this, the alternative would not reduce the qualities of the creek and is, therefore, consistent with this standard.</p>	YES
<b>SD 3: Research Natural Areas, Page 100</b>		
<p>Protect and manage research natural areas to maintain unmodified conditions and natural processes. Identify a sufficient range of opportunities to meet research needs. Compatible uses and management activities are allowed.</p>	<p>The San Diego River is a proposed Research Natural Area. The Route D Alternative would cross the river in the vicinity of Mt. Gower. King Creek is a designated RNA. The alternative would cross the creek east of the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation. Depending on the final location of tower and the need to clear along the ROW, this may result in modified conditions. If so, this alternative would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	MAYBE
<b>SD 4: Special Interest Areas, Page 100</b>		
<p>Protect and manage special interest areas (SIAs) for the values and features for which they are established. Allow uses and management activities, including access, that complement or are subordinate to the values and features.</p>	<p>The Interstate 8 Alternative would cross south of the Guatay Mountain SIA. Therefore, this alternative would be consistent with this policy.</p>	YES

**Land Management Plan: Part 2 – Cleveland National Forest Strategy (Appendix B) (2005)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**LM 1: Landscape Aesthetics, Page 105**

<p>Manage landscapes and built elements in order to achieve scenic integrity objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the best environmental design practices to harmonize changes in the landscape and to advance environmentally sustainable design solutions.</li> </ul>	<p>The following Alternatives would not be consistent with applicable “HIGH” Scenic Integrity Objective where they cross Cleveland NF lands. Approximate milepost locations are provided in parentheses for reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative (PP-111.3 to 111.8)</li> <li>• I-8 Alternative (I8-51 to 71)</li> <li>• West Buckman Springs Alternative (BSW-0 to 5.6)</li> <li>• Buckman Springs Underground Alternative (BSU-0 to 2.4)</li> <li>• South Buckman Springs Alternative</li> <li>• BCD Alternative (BCD-0 to 19.6)</li> <li>• Route D Alternative (D-0 to 17)</li> <li>• Modified Route Alternative (MD-0 to 40.6).</li> </ul>	NO
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

**LM 2: Landscape Restoration, Page 105**

<p>Restore landscapes to reduce visual effects of management activities and nonconforming features.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize landscape restoration activities in key places (Aguanga, Elsinore, Laguna, Morena, Palomar Mountain, Pine Creek, San Dieguito/Black Mountain, San Mateo, Silverado, Sweetwater, and Upper San Diego River). Integrate restoration activities with other resource restoration.</li> </ul>	<p>The alternatives identified above in LM 1 would require the construction of access and tower spur roads on forest lands. These activities can be long-lasting, particularly in arid and semi-arid environments where vegetation recruitment and growth is slow. In-line views of linear land scars or newly bladed roads are particularly problematic and introduce adverse visual change and contrast by causing unnatural vegetative lines and soil color contrast from newly exposed soils. The EIR/EIS contains Mitigation Measures V-2a through V-2c to address the impact of land scarring. Depending on the location of the scar/road, available sightlines to the scar/road, and effectiveness of the mitigation at that particular location, it is likely that in some locations, the project action will be consistent with this policy while in other locations a project action will not be consistent.</p>	MAYBE
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

**LM 3: Landscape Character, Page 105**

<p>Maintain the character of National Forest System lands in order to preserve their intact nature, valued attributes, and open space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the integrity of the expansive, unencumbered landscapes and traditional cultural features that provide the distinctive character of places.</li> <li>• Plan, design, and improve infrastructure along scenic travel routes to meet scenic integrity objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>The alternatives identified above in LM 1 would not be consistent with the applicable Scenic Integrity Objectives on Cleveland NF lands and would not be consistent with predominantly natural character of the existing landscapes.</p>	NO
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

**TRANS 1: Transportation System, Page 108**

<p>Plan, design, construct, and maintain the road and trail system to meet those objectives established to implement the forest plan, to promote sustainable resource conditions, and to safely accommodate anticipated levels and types of use:</p>	<p>The project alternatives would create additional access roads. To the extent they provide access, existing road would be used. However, any new road would not be unnecessary or redundant. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>	YES
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Land Management Plan: Part 2 – Cleveland National Forest Strategy (Appendix B) (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>TRANS 2: Unnecessary Roads, Page 108</b>		
Reduce the number of unnecessary or redundant unclassified roads and trails and restore landscapes.	The project alternatives would create additional access roads. To the extent they provide access, existing road would be used. However, any new road would not be unnecessary or redundant. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	YES

Land Management Plan: Part 3 – Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests, September 2005

Land Management Plan: Part 3 – Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Vegetation Management Standards, Pages 3-5</b>		
S5: Treat all freshly cut live or recently dead conifer stumps with a registered fungicide to prevent the establishment of annosus root disease.	This would be a requirement imposed by CNF as a condition of constructing the transmission line. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.	YES
S6: Seed to be used on National Forest System lands will be certified to be free of noxious weeds. Where available, only locally collected native seed will be used, or seeds will be used from species that are noninvasive and nonpersistent. When available, wattles, mulch and livestock feed to be used on National Forest System lands will be certified to be free of noxious weeds.	This would be a requirement imposed by CNF as a condition of constructing the transmission line. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.	YES
<b>Aesthetic Management Standards, Page 6</b>		
S9: Design management activities to meet the Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIOs) shown on the Scenic Integrity Objectives Map.	The alternatives identified above in LM 1 would not be consistent with AMS S9 requiring activities to meet the applicable Scenic Integrity Objective (SIO). Specifically, the transmission line would not repeat the form, line, color, texture, and pattern common to the landscape character so completely and at such scale that it is not evident, as required by the applicable "HIGH" SIO. Indeed, the structures would be quite prominent features in the landscape.	NO
S10: Scenic Integrity Objectives will be met with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor adjustments not to exceed a drop of one SIO level is allowable with the Forest Supervisor's approval.</li> <li>• Temporary drops of more than one SIO level may be made during and immediately following project implementation providing they do not exceed three years in duration.</li> </ul>	The transmission line impacts would cause a drop of more than one SIO level, and the drop would be permanent.	NO

Land Management Plan: Part 3 – Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Fish and Wildlife Standards, Pages 6-9</b>		
S11: When occupied or suitable habitat for a threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate or sensitive (TEPCS) species is present on an ongoing or proposed project site, consider species guidance documents (see Appendix H) to develop project-specific or activity-specific design criteria. This guidance is intended to provide a range of possible conservation measures that may be selectively applied during site-specific planning to avoid, minimize or mitigate negative long-term effects on threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, or sensitive species and habitat. Involve appropriate resource specialists in the identification of relevant design criteria. Include review of species guidance documents in fire suppression or other emergency actions when and to the extent practicable.	The alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures requiring biological surveys, monitoring, avoidance strategies, and time-of-year construction limitations. Maintenance activities would occur outside of avian breeding season. However, the actual location of structures relative to riparian areas cannot be determined until final design. Therefore, the status of the project with regard to this standard is unclear.	MAYBE
S12: When implementing new projects in areas that provide for threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species, use design criteria and conservation practices (see Appendix H) so that discretionary uses and facilities promote the conservation and recovery of these species and their habitats. Accept short-term impacts where long-term effects would provide a net benefit for the species and its habitat where needed to achieve multiple-use objectives.	The alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures requiring biological surveys, monitoring, avoidance strategies, and time-of-year construction limitations. Maintenance activities would occur outside of avian breeding season. However, the actual location of structures relative to riparian areas cannot be determined until final design. Therefore, the status of the project with regard to this standard is unclear.	MAYBE
S14: Where available and within the capability of the site retain a minimum of six downed logs per acre (minimum 12 inches diameter and 120 total linear feet) and 10 to 15 hard snags per five acres (minimum 16 inches diameter at breast height and 40 feet tall, or next largest available). Exception allowed in Wildland/Urban Interface Defense Zones, fuelbreaks, and where they pose a safety hazard.	This would be a requirement imposed by CNF to the extent that it is applicable to the alternatives and where such logs are present and do not constitute a hazard to the transmission line.	YES
S15: Within the riparian conservation areas retain snags and downed logs unless they are identified as a threat to life, property, or sustainability of the riparian conservation area.	This would be a requirement imposed by CNF to the extent that it is applicable to the alternatives and where such logs are present and do not constitute a hazard to the transmission line.	YES
S17: In areas outside of Wildland/Urban Interface Defense Zones and fuelbreaks, retain soft snags and acorn storage trees unless they are a safety hazard, fire threat, or impediment operability.	This would be a requirement imposed by CNF to the extent that it is applicable to the alternatives and where such logs are present and do not constitute a hazard to the transmission line.	YES
S18: Protect known active and inactive raptor nest areas. Extent of protection will be based on proposed management activities, human activities existing at the onset of nesting initiation, species, topography, vegetative cover, and other factors. When appropriate, a no-disturbance buffer around active nest sites will be required from nest-site selection to fledging.	APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives require pre-construction surveys and limit construction periods so as to have no impact on nesting birds. This includes no-disturbance zones around nest sites.	YES
S19: Protect all spotted owl territories identified in the Statewide California Department of Fish and Game database (numbered owl sites) and new sites that meet the state criteria by maintaining or enhancing habitat conditions over the long-term to the greatest extent practicable while protecting life and property. Use management guidelines in the species conservation strategy (or subsequent species guidance document; see Appendix H) to further evaluate protection needs for projects, uses and activities.	This standard directs CNF managers to enhance and maintain spotted owl territories. APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives require pre-construction surveys and limit construction periods so as to have no impact on nesting birds. This includes no-disturbance zones around nest sites.	YES

Land Management Plan: Part 3 – Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
S20: Maintain a limited operating period (LOP) prohibiting activities within approximately 0.25 miles of a California spotted owl nest site, or activity center where nest site is unknown, during the breeding season (February 1 through August 15), unless surveys confirm that the owls are not nesting. Follow the USDA Forest Service (1993, 1994 or subsequent) protocol to determine whether owls are nesting. The LOP does not apply to existing road and trail use and maintenance, use of existing developed recreation sites, or existing special-uses, such as recreation residence tracts. When evaluating the need to implement a limited operating period, site- and project-specific factors need to be considered (use species management strategy or subsequent guidance; see Appendix H).	This standard directs CNF managers to enhance and maintain spotted owl territories. APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives require pre-construction surveys and limit construction periods so as to have no impact on nesting birds. This includes no-disturbance zones around nest sites.	YES
S21: California spotted owl habitat that is lost to development for a compelling reason should be mitigated up to a two-to-one basis considering quality of habitat lost, number of territories affected, reproductive history of pair(s) displaced, location, and related factors. Development includes ski area creation or expansion, new roads or trails, special-use sites and corridors, new recreation or administrative facilities, land exchanges, etc. Mitigation land should be sought first within the mountain range where the impacts occur; if this is not possible, mitigation land should be acquired within the San Gabriel or San Bernardino Mountains.	If it is determined that California spotted owl habitat is lost as a result of constructing the Proposed Project or alternatives, CNF will determine the habitat mitigation required. As a result of compliance with any such requirements, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S22: Except where it may adversely affect threatened and endangered species, linear structures such as fences, major highways, utility corridors, bridge upgrades or replacements, and canals will be designed and built to allow for fish and wildlife movement.	Transmission towers have a small footprint within the ROW. They provide no impediment to fish and wildlife movement. Therefore the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S24: Mitigate impacts of on-going uses and management activities on threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species.	This is a general standard that would be addressed by agreements between CNF and SDG&E with regard to activities within the ROW and on access roads. As a result, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S25: Conduct road and trail maintenance activities during the season of year that would have the least impact on threatened, endangered, and proposed wildlife species in occupied habitats, except as provided by site-specific consultation.	APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives require maintenance to occur outside of avian breeding seasons. CNF may impose additional specific requirements. As a result, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S27: Use seasonal closures as specified by site-specific analysis to protect occupied bald eagle wintering, breeding, or nesting habitat.	APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives require construction and maintenance to occur outside of avian breeding seasons. CNF may impose additional specific requirements based on the location of nests. As a result, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S28: Avoid or minimize disturbance to breeding and roosting California condors by prohibiting or restricting management activities and human uses within 1.5 miles of active California condor nest sites and within 0.5 miles of active roosts. Refer to California condor species account (or subsequent species guidance document; see Appendix H) for additional guidance.	APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives require construction and maintenance to occur outside of avian breeding seasons. CNF or USFWS may impose additional specific requirements based on the location of nests or roosts. As a result, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES

**Land Management Plan: Part 3 – Design Criteria for the Southern California National Forests (2005)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
S30: Avoid activities that result in removal, crushing, burying, burning, or mowing of host plants within critical and occupied habitat for threatened, endangered, and proposed butterfly species; unless guided differently by a species-specific consultation.	APMs and mitigation measures for the alternatives require pre-construction surveys for special status plant species and for avoidance or salvage where possible. CNF or USFWS may impose additional specific requirements based on the location of species. As a result, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S32: When surveys for species presence/absence are done for threatened, endangered, and proposed species, use established survey protocols, where such protocols exist.	Project APMs require the use of established protocols. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S33: Manage Special Interest Areas so that activities and discretionary uses are either neutral or beneficial for the resource values for which the area was established. Accept short-term adverse impacts to these resource values if such impacts will be compensated by the accrual of long-term benefit.	This is directive to CNF managers. They would establish requirements for the Proposed Project or alternatives to satisfy this standard. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES

**When Implementing Fire Management Activities, Page 9**

S37: Design and manage fuel treatments to minimize the risk that treated areas will be used by unauthorized motorized and mechanized vehicles. Mitigate impacts where such use does occur.	This is directive to CNF managers. They would establish requirements for the Proposed Project or alternatives to satisfy this standard. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES
S39: Avoid fuel treatments in coastal sage scrub within the range of the California gnatcatcher, except in Wildland/Urban Interface Defense Zones and on fuelbreaks.	This is directive to CNF managers. They would establish requirements for the Proposed Project or alternatives to satisfy this standard. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this standard.	YES

**Soil, Water, Riparian and Heritage Standards, Page 10-13**

**Applicable Within Riparian Conservation Areas, Page 11**

S47: When designing new projects in riparian areas, apply the Five-Step Project Screening Process for Riparian Conservation Areas as described in Appendix E – Five-Step Project Screening Process for Riparian Conservation Areas.	APMs and mitigation measures in the alternatives generally accomplish the intent of Appendix E. However, the actual location of structures relative to riparian areas cannot be determined until final design. Therefore, the status of the project with regard to this standard is unclear.	MAYBE
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

**When Implementing Minerals and Energy Activities, Page 13**

S58: Evaluate geologic hazards and develop mitigations where risks to life, property or resources are identified when planning and implementing management activities.	APMs and mitigation measures for Geology require assessments of geologic hazards when planning and designing the alignment. Therefore, the project and alternatives would be consistent with this policy	YES
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

**Wild and Scenic River Standards, Page 13**

S59: Manage eligible wild and scenic river segments to perpetuate their free-flowing condition and proposed classifications, and protect and enhance their outstandingly remarkable values and water quality through the suitability study periods and until designated or released from consideration. When management activities are proposed that may compromise the outstandingly remarkable value(s), potential classification, or free-flowing character of an eligible wild and scenic river segment, a suitability study will be completed for that eligible river segment prior to initiating activities.	The alternatives would not obstruct free-flowing rivers. The only river designated as eligible for Wild and Scenic status that would be crossed would be Cottonwood Creek, which would be crossed by the Interstate 8 Alternative. It is classified as 'recreational'.  This is defined as those rivers or sections of rivers that are readily accessible by road or railroad, that may have some development along their shorelines, and that may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past. Based on this, the alternative would not reduce the qualities of the creek and is, therefore, consistent with this standard.	YES
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Update, December 2004 (Revised March 2005)

The Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Study for Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar supersedes the previously adopted Naval Air Station (NAS) Miramar land use compatibility AICUZ guidelines published in 1992. The AICUZ update also serves as the basis of the command's recommendation to the revised MCAS Miramar Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). These policies apply to the Proposed Project and the Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North Alternative.

Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar AICUZ Update, December 2004 (Revised March, 2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Chapter 5. Height Zone Obstructions</b>		
The published Airport Reference Point (ARP) is utilized for obstruction evaluations of any proposed project in proximity to Miramar flight operations. Any proposed land use which exceeds 200 feet Above Ground Level (AGL) or penetrates the 100:1 slope extending 20,000 feet from the nearest point of the closest runway must be submitted to both the FAA and MCAS Miramar for further review. Both agencies will advise the local land use authority regarding safety impacts to insure safety of flight for Miramar operations.	SDG&E would obtain permits from both the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the United States Department of Defense (DoD) to enter and construct transmission line/poles on military lands. Compliance with the permits would ensure that the height zone obstruction policy is not violated.	YES
Clear Zone Surface – The area at runways end, beginning at the same width of 2,284 feet and 3,000 feet long. The clear zone surface requires significant limitations to accommodate requirements of aircraft overrun areas and unrestricted visibility of airfield lighting. Clear zones are maintained as open, graded and free of above ground objects with exception of navigational aids.	SDG&E would obtain permits from both the FAA and DoD prior to any construction on military lands. In compliance with the permits, Clear Zones would not be affected.	YES
<p><b>5.3 Compatible Development Criteria</b> The following are parameters for determining nonconforming land uses and developments with MCAS Miramar operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects penetrating the 100:1 surface that are not noticed to the FAA, Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), or MCAS Miramar for any analysis.</li> <li>• Objects determined to be an obstruction or hazard by federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 or Department of Transportation/FAA Terminal Instrument Procedures, Chapter 12 criteria</li> <li>• Objects that would require a permanent change to MCAS Miramar flight operations, approach minimums or arrival/ departure routes.</li> <li>• Uses which release into the air any substance that would impair visibility or otherwise interfere with the operation of aircraft such as dust, smoke or steam.</li> <li>• Uses that emit or reflect light which would interfere with aircrew vision.</li> <li>• Uses which produce emissions which would interfere with aircraft communication, navigation or electrical systems.</li> <li>• Uses which would attract birds or waterfowl and the growing of certain types of vegetation.</li> </ul>	SDG&E would obtain permits from both the FAA and DoD prior to any construction on military lands. Compliance with the permits would ensure that the project is compatible with development criteria.	YES, <u>pending</u> <u>FAA</u> <u>Airspace</u> <u>Analysis</u>

Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar AICUZ Update, December 2004 (Revised March, 2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>6.7 Compatibility with Height &amp; Obstructions</b> It is beyond the scope of this study to determine the incompatibilities of future development under the appropriate height and obstruction criteria. However, discussion of the criteria is provided below. Figure 5-1 in Chapter 5 can be referenced for the height and obstruction criteria.</p> <p>Any development proposal that includes an object over two hundred feet above ground level or which penetrates the 100:1 slope surface extending 20,000 feet from the nearest runway must be submitted to the FAA for an obstruction evaluation. In addition, the CLUP requires that SANDAG and MCAS Miramar be notified of these proposals by the applicant.</p>	<p>SDG&amp;E would obtain permits from both the FAA and DoD prior to any construction on military lands. Compliance with the permits would ensure that the project is compatible with height and obstruction policies.</p>	<p>YES<sub>2</sub> <u>pending</u> <u>FAA</u> <u>Airspace</u> <u>Analysis</u></p>
<p><b>7.7. City and Local Strategies</b> <b>Zoning.</b> The City of San Diego zoning ordinance (Land Development Code) identifies what land uses are permitted within the MCAS Miramar AICUZ Study area.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternative would traverse through the communities of Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North. The Miramar Ranch North Zoning Map details permitted uses within the MCAS Miramar area, and an SDG&amp;E easement is shown on the map in the same location as the proposed route for both the Miramar Ranch North and Scripps Miramar Ranch. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the land uses identified by the City of San Diego near MCAS Miramar.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Table 3. Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Suggested Land Use Compatibility in Accident Potential Zones</b> Note 4: No Structures (except airfield lighting), buildings or above ground utility/communication lines should normally be located in Clear Zone Areas.</p>	<p>SDG&amp;E would obtain permits from both the FAA and DoD prior to any construction on military lands. Compliance with the permits would ensure that the project or alternative is compatible with Use Zones Suggested Land Use Compatibility in Accidental Potential Zones.</p>	<p>YES</p>

D.16.4.2 State Plans and Policies

California State Parks – Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

The Proposed Project and the Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2 and the Overhead 500 kV ABDSP within Existing 100-Ft ROW Alternatives would traverse ABDSP. The ABDSP Final General Plan establishes the overall long-range purpose and vision for the future of the Park. In addition to other areas in the Park, the alignment would affect Vallecito Mountains Wilderness Area, Pinyon Ridge Wilderness Area, and Grapevine Mountain Wilderness Area. The presence of the towers and conductors, temporary and permanent roads, motor vehicles and helicopters within wilderness areas would be inconsistent with Pub.Res.Code § 5093.36(b) and the ABDSP Final General Plan and EIR. The existing wilderness boundaries would need to be modified in order for the Proposed Project ROW to be located outside of a designated wilderness area.

In addition to the policies listed below, the ABDSP General Plan also includes a number of land use classifications, referred to as Management Zones. These describe the overall management purpose and intent of specific regions with the park. Each zone provides direction for the general level and type of development and use with that zone. They are ordered, in general, from the highest intensity of visitor use to the lowest. Areas within each zone may also have varying degrees of use intensity.

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies Consistency Determination Consistent

PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Geology Element, Pages 3-20 to 3-21

Goal 1: Protect and preserve the unique geological resources and features of ABDSP. Desert pavement is a unique geological/soil feature that protects underlying silty and sandy soils from erosion. Damage to the desert pavement can lead to excessive erosion. APMs GEO-APM-1, -2, -5 and -6 would induce the amount of potential erosion. In addition, Mitigation Measure G-42a (Protect Desert Pavement) would reduce impacts. ~~YES~~ NO

However, the plan's goal is to "preserve and protect" these resources. Development is inconsistent with preservation, therefore the Proposed Project and alternatives would be inconsistent with this goal.

Guideline 1c: Management plans and decisions with respect to facilities development and visitor access and recreation must recognize and accordingly mitigate negative impacts to these fragile geological features. Damage to the desert pavement can lead to excessive erosion. APMs GEO-APM-1, -2, -5 and -6 would induce the amount of potential erosion. In addition, Mitigation Measure G-42a (Protect Desert Pavement) would reduce impacts. YES

Guideline 1f: Identify and monitor significant geological features. Take protective measures where necessary. Damage to the desert pavement can lead to excessive erosion. APMs GEO-APM-1, -2, -5 and -6 would induce the amount of potential erosion. In addition, Mitigation Measure G-42a (Protect Desert Pavement) would reduce impacts. YES

Soils Element, Page 3-21

Goal 1: Protect sensitive soils and promote further understanding of the role of soils and soil biota in desert ecosystems. Damage to the desert pavement can lead to excessive erosion. APMs GEO-APM-1, -2, -5 and -6 would induce the amount of potential erosion. In addition, Mitigation Measure G-42a (Protect Desert Pavement) would reduce impacts. YES

As noted previously, the Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to sensitive species and habitat. To the extent certain soils foster sensitive resources, these measures will address that issue. BIO APM-23 requires salvage and stockpile of soils for reuse in habitat restoration of disturbed areas.

Guideline 1b: Identify and minimize visitor activities and park operations that have negative impacts on sensitive soils. Develop an understanding of the extent to which this impact further affects the water quality, plant communities, terrestrial invertebrates, birds, mammals, and other components of the region's ecosystems. Potential degradation of water quality by the Proposed Project and alternatives has been evaluated and found to be less than significant. YES

Damage to the desert pavement can lead to excessive erosion. APMs GEO-APM-1, -2, -5 and -6 would induce the amount of potential erosion. In addition, Mitigation Measure G-42a (Protect Desert Pavement) would reduce impacts. There could be impacts to surface water. APM BIO-5 includes measures to ensure sensitive project design near riparian areas. Mitigation Measure B-2a require securing wetland permits and minimization of wetland impacts, and Mitigation Measure B-5-b requires biological monitoring, which will help limit inadvertent habitat impacts and the implementation of necessary fencing and erosion control measures.

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Hydrology Element, Page 3-22</b>		
Goal 1: Protect the surface water and groundwater of ABDSP and strive to restore sustainable and ecologically functional watersheds and groundwater basins throughout the region.	The Proposed Project and alternatives do not have the potential to adversely impact groundwater resources, however, there could be impacts to surface water. APM BIO-5 includes measures to ensure sensitive project design near riparian areas. Mitigation Measure B-2a require securing wetland permits and minimization of wetland impacts, and Mitigation Measure B-5-b requires biological monitoring, which will help limit inadvertent habitat impacts and the implementation of necessary fencing and erosion control measures.	YES
Guideline 1a: Identify the sources that degrade water quality and quantity within the watersheds associated with ABDSP. Ensure that current and future park developments and visitor-use patterns do not degrade water quality and quantity. Pursue cooperative actions with watershed neighbors and users to improve water conservation ethics, reduce or eliminate the discharge of pollutants, and restore natural flow and hydrological processes. Land within critical watersheds shall be bought from willing sellers.	WQ-APM-1 through -B, -14, -15, and Mitigation Measure H-6a (Scour Protection to include bank erosion and effects to adjacent property) address activities that could degrade water quality due to erosion and sedimentation. Potential degradation of water quality by the Proposed Project and alternatives have been evaluated and found to be less than significant.	YES
<b>BIOTIC RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Paleontology Element, Pages 3-22 to 3-23</b>		
Goal 1: Protect and preserve the paleontological resources of ABDSP in perpetuity for their inherent scientific and educational values.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this goal through implementation of Mitigation Measure PAL-1a (inventory and evaluate paleontological resources), PAL-1b (develop monitoring and mitigation plan), and PAL-1d (conduct paleontological data recovery).	YES
Guideline 1a: Determine the geological, stratigraphical, and geographical distribution of fossil localities and potentially fossiliferous sedimentary deposits within the Park.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this goal through implementation of Mitigation Measure PAL-1a (inventory and evaluate paleontological resources).	YES
Guideline 1e: Adequately protect significant resources in place, or conserve them through recovery, such that their inherent scientific and interpretive values are not degraded.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this goal through implementation of Mitigation Measure PAL-1a (inventory and evaluate paleontological resources), PAL-1b (develop monitoring and mitigation plan), PAL-1c (monitor construction for paleontology) and PAL-1d (conduct paleontological data recovery).	YES
Guideline 1f: Monitor sensitive paleontological sites for natural degradation or vandalism/poaching. Take protective measures where necessary.	Data acquired from paleontological resource surveys (Mitigation Measure PAL-1a, inventory and evaluate paleontological resources) for the Proposed Project and alternatives could be used to identify sensitive paleontological sites that may require future monitoring for natural degradation or vandalism/poaching.	YES

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Significant and Sensitive Biota Element, Page 3-24 to 3-26		
Goal 1: Protect the native biota of ABDSP.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to native vegetation, wetland habitats, and sensitive rare plants. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species introduction (i.e., pets). (See APMs BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, and -5a. <u>However, there would be impacts to bighorn sheep critical habitat that could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be consistent with this goal.</u>	YES NO
Guideline 1a: Preserve sensitive species and habitats and encourage their recovery. Comply with State and Federal environmental legislation, Recovery Plans, and Critical Habitat enacted to protect this disappearing biota. Contribute to efforts that seek to "list" species that are in need of Threatened or Endangered designation, and work to extent Critical Habitat to appropriate regions within the Park.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat, including that for sensitive wildlife species. However, there would be impacts to bighorn sheep critical habitat that could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be consistent with this guideline.	NO
Guideline 1b: California State Parks will identify situations where native species are rare or rapidly declining and develop methods to protect such species and/or their habitats as stewards of the Parks resources. California State Parks will be proactive in biological conservation and not necessarily focus on species management when other levels of biological organization may be more appropriate units of conservation. California State Parks will manage for subspecies, evolutionary units, ecologically functional units, populations, metapopulations, biological landscapes, or other levels of biological organization if those appear to be the most practical units for conserving biodiversity. Proactive and protective treatment for rare and declining species will be incorporated into park stewardship and planning in accordance with CSP's Mission and regional habitat conservation planning efforts.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat, including that for sensitive wildlife species. However, there would be impacts to bighorn sheep critical habitat that could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be consistent with this guideline.	NO
Guideline 1c: Ensure that the conservation of native biota is incorporated into all future developments, management plans, and visitor-use patterns throughout ABDSP, and that the protection of sensitive species and habitats receives the highest priority.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures that, taken together, would minimize impacts to habitat, including that for sensitive wildlife species.	YES
Guideline 1d: California State Parks will actively incorporate inventory and monitoring efforts into land management actions. A major focus will be to quantify trends in species distribution and abundance, to document correlations between land management actions and biotic health, and to identify sensitive species and habitats. Management strategies will be developed to counteract declines or loss of native biota if those declines are the result of human actions and appear to indicate a compromised native species or ecological system.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would implement APMs and mitigation measures that would ensure that native biota protections would be included in project development, including surveying/monitoring efforts before and during construction, special procedures for minimizing impacts and exposure to sensitive species during project maintenance, restoration/rehabilitation of sensitive areas after construction is completed, and purchase of mitigation lands to mitigate impacts where impacts cannot be avoided.	YES

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Guideline 1e: Desert and Montane Riparian, Palm Tree Oases, Mesquite Bosques, Cienegas, Montane Vernal Pools and Meadows, Desert Ephemeral Playas, small Springs and Seeps, Sand Dunes, and significant wildflower areas are recognized as sensitive habitats and will be managed for their biological significance and protected as critical resources that support the extraordinary biological diversity of California. All sensitive habitats in ABDSP will be assessed for individual significance and site-specific threats. The sub-unit classification of Natural Preserve may be considered for those sensitive habitats of outstanding importance for regional biodiversity and sensitive species conservation.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would implement APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species introduction (i.e., pets). However, the presence of transmission facilities could preclude designation in the future of Natural Preserves.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
<p>Guideline 1g: Wetland delineation will be performed in accordance with the 1987 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Wetland Delineation Manual (TR Y-87-1) prior to the development of a wetland site.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure B-2a requires a jurisdictional delineation, securing wetland permits, and preparation of appropriate wetland mitigation plans prior to development.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Exotic Biota Element, Page 3-26 to 3-27</p>		
<p>Goal 1: Reduce the presence and further invasion of exotic species in the Park.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat. Mitigation Measure B-1a requires restoration of all temporarily disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, -20, -23, and -25 address restoration of disturbed areas with native species that address the potential for exotic species introduction.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Guideline 1a: Support projects that quantify and map the distribution and abundance of exotic species within ABDSP and the extent to which they negatively affect the Park's native biota. Identify and implement effective methods of control and eradication, using the most effective techniques while balancing the need to reduce negative effects on the native biota and ecosystems.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure B-1a requires restoration of all temporarily disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, 20, -23, and -25 address restoration of disturbed areas with native species that address the potential for exotic species introduction.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Guideline 1b: Support studies that determine the degree to which various visitor uses promote the spread of invasive exotic plant species. Promote awareness of those visitor activities that are shown to spread invasive exotics and develop plans that balance the control of exotic invasion and visitor access.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure B-1a requires restoration of all temporarily disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, 20, -23, and -25 address restoration of disturbed areas with native species that address the potential for exotic species introduction.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Biological Processes, page 3-27</p>		
<p>Goal 1: Protect the natural processes associated with the Park and allow them to function in a manner that supports the region's native biodiversity.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species introduction. <u>However, there would be impacts to bighorn sheep critical habitat that could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be consistent with this goal.</u></p>	<p><del>YES</del> NO</p>

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Guideline 1a: Among the natural processes thought to shape the biota of the region are: the interaction of surface and ground water with soil and biota; the frequency and intensity of fire and the response to fire of the land and the living organisms; soil and slope stability and the colonization or persistence of biotic communities; and plant and animal interactions including competition, predation, and herbivory. The perpetuation and enhancement of natural processes must be incorporated into future developments, management plans, and visitor-use patterns throughout ABDSP. California State Parks will support projects that identify specific natural processes, their role in supporting the regions native biodiversity, and the extent to which park operations and visitor activities negatively affect those natural processes.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include numerous APMs and mitigation measures to address the direct effects of the project. With regard to indirect effects of the project that may affect natural process, the Proposed Project and alternatives would minimize human interference with natural processes through APMs and mitigation measures, including measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species introduction (See APMs BIO APM-2, -6, -7, -9, -10, -11, -12, -13, -24, -29). <u>However, there would be impacts to bighorn sheep critical habitat that could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be consistent with this goal.</u></p>	<p><del>YES</del> <b>NO</b></p>
<p>Landscape Linkages, pages 3-29 to 3-30</p>		
<p>Goal 1: Maintain and enhance the movement and dispersal of native animals and plants through the Park and the regional ecosystems</p>	<p>By its nature, a transmission line would not maintain or enhance the moved and dispersal of native animals and plants. APMs and Mitigation Measures imposed on the project would reduce impacts, but not eliminate them. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives cannot be consistent with this goal.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>Guideline 1a: California State Parks will actively work with local, federal, transportation, and regulatory agencies in the planning of future regional transportation and infrastructure projects. California State Parks will discourage the fragmentation and isolation of habitat by such projects and ensure that adequate mitigation measures are incorporated into all road and infrastructure improvement and construction projects. California State Parks will advocate measures that consider known information on wildlife use of landscape linkages, principles of conservation biology, and other professionally accepted design criteria. An emphasis should be placed on the maintenance of habitat linkages and construction of undercrossings and bridges that allow full wildlife movement between affected areas.</p>	<p>This guideline is directive of Park managers. However, as noted above for Goal 1, by its nature, a transmission line would not maintain or enhance the moved and dispersal of native animals and plants. APMs and Mitigation Measures imposed on the project would reduce impacts, but not eliminate them. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives cannot be consistent with this goal.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>Guideline 1b: California State Parks will plan with neighboring land and business owners, communities, and city, county, state, and Federal agencies to develop and maintain a buffer system outside of California State Parks ownership, along the outer edge of park boundaries.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not conflict with California State Parks' plan to develop a buffer system along the outer edge of the ABDSP boundaries, and the Proposed Project and alternatives would not change buffer conditions.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Cultural Resources, pages 3-30 to 3-35</p>		
<p>Goal 1: Identify, document, and evaluate cultural resources within ABDSP.</p>	<p>Cultural resources studies conducted by the Applicant team and EIR/EIS team have identified and documented cultural resources within ABDSP. Mitigation Measure C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE) also supports this goal.</p>	<p>YES</p>

**Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Guideline 1a:</b> Develop a program for archaeological survey, site recordation and evaluation, GPS mapping, and preparation of records and reports for the cultural resources within the Park. Nominate those cultural resources that may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and/or the California Register of Historical Resources (either as individual sites, historic districts, or as cultural landscapes).</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would comply with ABDSP guidelines for survey, recording, and evaluation during the implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources). While nomination of resources to the NRHP and CRHR is an ABDSP function, the technical studies completed for the Proposed Project also contribute to the achievement of this goal.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Guideline 1b:</b> Facilitate classification, eligibility determination, and interpretation of the Park's historic-period resources by categorizing and/or grouping resources under one or more of the historical-period themes as outlined in the "Existing Conditions" section for Cultural Resources.</p>	<p>Historic period resources within ABDSP have been recorded and (in some cases) evaluated for the Proposed Project. Future cultural resources efforts for the Proposed Project and alternatives would be conducted in a manner consistent with this guideline through Mitigation Measures C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Guideline 1c:</b> Conduct research on known roads, trails, natural corridors, and segments of historic routes of travel to identify their builders, periods of use, and periods of historical significance. Contributing features, such as rock cairns, walls, cut slopes, work camps, stage stations, and others should be inventoried, maintained, and interpreted.</p>	<p>Where the Proposed Project or alternatives encounters these types of resources, the resources will be recorded in a manner consistent with Guideline 1c through Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Guideline 1f:</b> Improve and maintain the inventory of cultural resource records, cultural resource location and survey-coverage maps, and GPS/GIS database for cultural resources within the Park. These data should be available to cultural specialists throughout the California State Parks system.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would assist in achieving the goals of Guideline 1f through implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans). All cultural resources data collected in ABDSP during the project would be filed with the ABDSP Archaeologist. In addition, the technical studies completed for the Proposed Project are consistent with this guideline.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Guideline 1g:</b> Inventory, analyze, and provide reports for existing archaeological collections from within ABDSP. These inventories can assist park staff in evaluating the significance of various archaeological sites more completely.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives do not directly address Guideline 1g but it is consistent with the aim of this guideline. Surveys conducted for the Proposed Project can help verify and update the location and typological data of known sites within the park.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Goal 2:</b> Identify, protect, and interpret places within ABDSP holding special cultural or religious significance to Native Americans and other ethnic communities.</p>	<p>Through Native American consultation already conducted for the Proposed Project and Mitigation Measure C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans), the Proposed Project and alternatives have and will continue to contribute to the identification of resources within ABDSP that are important to Native Americans.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Guideline 2a:</b> Consult with local Native American groups and individuals, historical accounts, and ethnographic records to identify traditional cultural properties and other special areas known by direct historical memory.</p>	<p>As stated above for Goal 2, the project proponent has and continues to consult local Native American groups in accordance with Guideline 2a.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Guideline 2b: Identify areas of the Park with potential significance to other ethnic communities through use of historical accounts, oral history interviews, and other means. Document and record these areas.	The technical study for the Proposed Project has recorded resources such as a historic period ranching open space that illustrate the Proposed Project's consistency with Guideline 2b.	YES
Guideline 2c: Plan for protection and interpretation if appropriate.	Where appropriate, the Proposed Project and alternatives will comply with Guideline 2c through Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).	YES
Goal 3: Protect, stabilize, and preserve cultural resources within ABDSP.	Through avoidance, the Proposed Project and alternatives minimize and/or prevent impacts to cultural resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans) reduce project related. However, disturbance of sites bearing human remains would be a significant unmitigable impact. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this goal.	NO
Guideline 3b: Provide the locations of archaeological sites, historic landmarks, and other historic properties to the patrol rangers and augment this information with cultural resource training. This information can assist them in monitoring the conditions of historical resources throughout the Park, including the assessment of natural erosion and possible site vandalism.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not directly accomplish the goal of Guideline 3b; however, cultural resources data from the Proposed Project and alternatives would be made available to ABDSP archaeologists through Mitigation Measure C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans). ABDSP archaeologists could disseminate this data to rangers and other staff, if appropriate.	YES
Guideline 3e: Using applicable California State Parks policies and <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , maintain and restore all buildings and structures that have been determined eligible for the National Register and/or California Register of Historical Resources. Historic resource preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of all eligible or potentially eligible resources shall comply with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , the State Historic Building Code, and resource management policies of California State Parks. The recordation of architectural elements must be performed by a qualified specialist and comply with current professional standards and California State Parks protocol.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not impact any NRHP or CRHR-listed buildings or structures within ABDSP. Adverse effects to potentially NRHP or CRHR-eligible buildings and structures would be reduced to a less than level (Class II) through implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).	YES
Goal 4: Identify, document, protect, and interpret, if appropriate, archaeological and historic-period resources within culturally sensitive areas, and establish means to minimize impacts from visitor use.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include mitigation measures consistent with Goal 4 including: C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans)	YES

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Guideline 4a: Future management plans will identify highly significant and sensitive cultural resources and potential threats to those resources. Management plans will also identify known impacts to archaeological sites, establish protective guidelines and operational goals, as well as establish an interpretation program that balances site interpretation with protection and preservation.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with Guideline 4a and cultural resources data from the Proposed Project and alternatives could be useful for future management plans. Mitigation measures that support this guideline include: C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Guideline 4b: Actions in future management plans will include the redirection of current visitor activities, such as hiking, camping, etc., which are damaging known archaeological sites or other cultural properties or have the potential to impact resources within culturally sensitive locations. Camping will be excluded if damage to cultural remains is documented. Other management actions to protect these areas may include rerouting trails, or roads; road closures; relocation of parking, trailheads, or other visitor facilities; and posting signs.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives have the potential to increase impacts (both direct and indirect) to cultural resources located along existing roads and trails. Implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan), C-1d (Conduct data recovery to reduce adverse effects), and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans) will reduce project related effects to cultural resources to a level that is less than significant (Class II). <u>However, impacts in portions of the Anza-Borrego Link would be significant and unmitigable (Class I) due to the sensitivity and local importance of its Native American resources. In particular, impacts in the traditional landscape and use area would be significant and partially unmitigable (Class I). The sensitive landscape would be bisected by several miles of transmission lines and towers which cannot be relocated or screened from view.</u></p>	<p><del>YES</del> NO</p>
<p>Guideline 4c: Future management plans will identify areas of the Park with highly significant cultural remains that warrant higher levels of protection. Recommended protective actions may include Superintendent-ordered closures and designation of certain areas as Cultural Preserves.</p>	<p>Technical studies for the Proposed Project have identified cultural resources within ABDSP that may be highly significant. This information can be useful in establishing Cultural Preserves (CPs). <u>The Proposed Project would have no impact on the existing We-Nelsch Cultural Preserve, although alternatives to the Proposed Project could create indirect visual impacts to the CP. The impacts that the Proposed Project or alternatives would have on CPs identified in the future would depend on the location of the CP, types of cultural resources in the CP, and whether direct or indirect impacts would adversely affect the qualities that make those resources significant.</u> Guideline 4c will be aided by implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans). <u>Nonetheless, some impacts of the Proposed Project could be adverse, even after mitigation.</u></p>	<p><del>YES</del> MAYBE</p>

**Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Guideline 4d: Establish standards for identifying traditional cultural properties and cultural landscapes that should be governed by a higher level of protection and utilize these standards during archaeological survey and research programs.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with Guideline 4d through implementation of Mitigation Measure C-4a (Complete consultation with Native American and other traditional groups).	YES
Guideline 4e: Identify significant traditional cultural properties or sacred areas through consultation with the Kumeyaay, Cahuilla, Cupeno, or other local Native American groups.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with Guideline 4e through implementation of Mitigation Measure C-4a (Complete consultation with Native American and other traditional groups).	YES
Guideline 4f: Establish standards for the treatment of fragile cultural remains, such as aboriginal rock art.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with Guideline 4e through implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan), and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).	YES
<b>Recreation Element, pages 3-42 to 3-44</b>		
Goal 1: Maintain the Park's qualities of solitude and wildness. Management decisions will favor the desert environment, promote the health and well being of desert ecosystems, and promote those activities that are sustainable over time in providing for the health, inspiration, and education of Californians.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would result in temporary impacts to recreation from construction activities and permanent significant unmitigable impacts to the character of wilderness areas and select recreation areas within ABDSP. Specifically, the presence of the towers and conductors, temporary and permanent roads, motor vehicles and helicopters within wilderness areas would be inconsistent with Pub.Res.Code § 5093.36(b) and the ABDSP Final General Plan and EIR. The existing wilderness boundaries would need to be modified in order for the proposed ROW to be located outside of a designated wilderness area. Therefore, construction and operation of the Proposed Project would not be consistent with the qualities of solitude and wildness.	NO
Guideline 1b: Continue to work with appropriate agencies to minimize the negative effects of aerial fly-overs, traffic noise, and other impediments to visitor solitude.	The Applicant will coordinate construction activity with ABDSP with regard to disruption from noise.	YES
<b>Real Property Additions and Management, pages 3-48 to 4-49</b>		
Goal 2: Monitor and reduce impacts to park resources and visitor experience due to adjacent land uses.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would introduce structurally prominent, industrial appearing features into an otherwise predominantly natural-appearing landscape. The resulting visual impacts within the Park would be significant (Class I) and would not be consistent with the goal of reducing impacts to park resources and visitor experiences. See Figures D.3-6A/B through D.3-3A/B for views within the Park.	NO
Guideline 2a: Work to minimize or contain negative effects from lands adjacent to the Park, such as: encroaching developments, the planting and invasion of exotic species, feral or domestic animals, watershed pollution, water pumping, etc.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would introduce structurally prominent, industrial-appearing features into predominantly natural-appearing landscapes adjacent to the Park and within the Park viewshed. The resulting visual impacts would adversely affect Park resources and visitor experiences.	NO

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Infrastructure and Operations, pages 3-49 to 3-52</p> <p>Goal 3: Provide trails and roads that offer the opportunity for diverse visitor experiences while not compromising the integrity of park resources.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the extent possible, which would help to minimize impacts to surrounding biological resources.</p> <p>The construction of access roads and spur roads associated with the Proposed Project and alternatives would compromise the integrity of park resources by creating unnatural or more prominent lines of demarcation in vegetative patterns. Also, land scarring from construction activities would persist for an extended period of time due to the slow recovery and recruitment rates in arid landscapes. Mitigation Measures V-2a through V-2c would reduce land scarring and road construction impacts, but impacts to the integrity of park resources would remain.</p> <p>The Proposed Project and alternatives will improve roads within ABDSP that have the potential to reduce the integrity of cultural and paleontological resources.</p> <p><del>The degree to which the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with the goal is unclear. It depends on the interpretation of what constitutes a compromised resource.</del></p>	<p><del>Consistent</del></p> <p><b>MAYBE NO</b></p>

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Guideline 3a: Develop a comprehensive <i>Roads Management Plan</i>, and <i>Trails Management Plan</i> (to include issues such as maintenance, volunteer efforts, resource impacts, clearly defined regulations, etc.) The following criteria will be evaluated and addressed within these plans...:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain roads and trails to the degree appropriate for the intended use, and in such a manner that they are clearly delineated to the user while not detracting from the visual aesthetics of the area in which they are located.</li> <li>• Roads and trails, or portions of roads and trails, may be closed or rerouted as a result of the findings of the <i>Roads and Trails Management Plans</i>, or when resources are being damaged or compromised.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not interfere with development of a Comprehensive Roads Management Plan and Trails Management Plan. Roads and trails would still be accessible after implementation of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would help minimize impacts to surrounding biological resources. Further, APMs BIO-APM-3, -17, and -18 specifically address the issue of motor vehicle access for the Proposed Project, encouraging the use of existing ROW and access roads wherever possible, and they encourage using sensitive practices for avoidance of resources when existing access roads cannot be used.</p> <p>The construction of access roads and spur roads associated with the Proposed Project and alternatives would compromise the integrity of park resources by creating unnatural or more prominent lines of demarcation in vegetative patterns. Also, land scarring from construction activities would persist for an extended period of time due to the slow recovery and recruitment rates in arid landscapes. However, effective implementation of Mitigation Measures V-2a through V-2c would reduce land scarring and road construction impacts to less than significant levels, thereby making the project consistent with Guideline 3a.</p> <p>Data acquired from cultural resources efforts for the Proposed Project could be used to identify sensitive cultural resources for the development of these management plans. Data acquired from paleontological resource surveys for the Proposed Project and alternatives could be used to identify sensitive paleontological resources for the development of these management plans.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Guideline 3c: Roads and trails will exist in such a way that they enable the visitors to experience the diversity of the Park, while minimizing negative effects on the resources.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not interfere with development of a Comprehensive Roads Management Plan and Trails Management Plan. Roads and trails would still be accessible after implementation of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would help minimize impacts to surrounding biological resources. Further, APMs BIO-APM-3, -17, and -18 specifically address the issue of motor vehicle access for the Proposed Project, encouraging the use of existing ROW and access roads wherever possible, and they encourage using sensitive practices for avoidance of resources when existing access roads cannot be used.</p> <p>The construction of access roads and spur roads associated with the Proposed Project and alternatives would compromise the integrity of park resources by creating unnatural or more prominent lines of demarcation in vegetative patterns. Also, land scarring from construction activities would persist for an extended period of time due to the slow recovery and recruitment rates in arid landscapes. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures V-2a through V-2c would reduce land scarring and road construction impacts to less than significant levels, thereby making the project consistent with Guideline 3a.</p> <p>Data acquired from cultural resources efforts for the Proposed Project and alternatives could be used to identify sensitive cultural resources for the development of these management plans. Data acquired from paleontological resource surveys for the Proposed Project and alternatives could be used to identify sensitive paleontological resources for the development of these management plans.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal 4: The department shall work with local agencies, Caltrans, and utility companies to minimize the adverse impacts associated with developments.</p>	<p>The Park has been involved in the review of the Proposed Project and alternatives and has engaged in discussions on how to minimize impacts. Therefore, the project is consistent with this goal.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><del>Guideline 4a: Should Caltrans or utility companies propose to improve or expand existing facilities (within existing easements); the department will work in collaboration with them to minimize adverse impacts to Park resources and the visitor experience. By evaluating proposed designs, DPR will be able to foster implementation of park friendly project elements (such as: reducing intrusion of footings, built elements that can be camouflaged to blend with or match natural surroundings, spacing between facilities to be less obtrusive to vistas, etc.)</del></p>	<p><del>The Park has been involved in the review of the Proposed Project and alternatives and has engaged in discussions on how to minimize impacts. Therefore, the project is consistent with this goal.</del></p>	<p><del>YES</del></p>

Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Guideline 4b: If Caltrans or utility companies propose new facilities, in areas not presently developed for such use, the department will work with the appropriate parties to evaluate alternatives that result in a net improvement to the environment. As well, such evaluation will strive to ensure projects which are consistent with the Management Zones delineated in this General Plan.	The Park has been involved in the review of the Proposed Project and alternatives and has engaged in discussions on how to minimize impacts. <del>Therefore, the project is consistent with this goal. However, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not result in a "net improvement to the environment."</del>	YES <del>NO</del>
<b>Hazards Element, pages 3-52 to 3-53</b>		
Goal 1: Ensure that all facilities provide a safe environment for visitors.	All facilities would be constructed to industry safety standards.	YES
Guideline 1a: Recognize the potential for major flash flood events and ensure that park facilities are sited to avoid flash flood damage.	Portions of the project, specifically some towers, will be in areas subject to flash flooding. These will be anchored and protected such that flash flood damage will be less than significant. APMs WQ-APM-1 through -8, -14, and 15 address this concern.	YES
<b>Area-Specific Goals and Guidelines</b>		
Sentenac Canyon, page 3-58. The Sentenac Canyon area is located near Scissor Crossing (intersection of State Highway 78 and County Highway S2).		
Goal 1: Support efforts to protect and interpret the historical, archaeological, natural, and scenic resources of this unique area of the Park while providing for minimal public facilities and trail access.	A portion of the Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 Alternative would require overhead structures for approximately one mile when crossing a fault zone. As a consequence, the alignment would be visible from the Pacific Coast Trail and from portions of the Sentenac Canyon	NO
Guideline 1a: The purpose of the FUZ II designation in this area is meant to provide a staging area for the Pacific Crest Trail and other closely associated park opportunities. These facilities will be limited to interpretive/information kiosks, drinking water, hitching posts, portable toilets, and other facilities to support minimal activities.	A portion of the Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 Alternative would require overhead structures for approximately one mile when crossing a fault zone. As a consequence, the alignment would be visible from the Pacific Coast Trail and from portions of the Sentenac Canyon	NO
Grapevine Canyon, page 3-59. Grapevine Canyon lies in the central portion of ABDSP.		
Goal 1: Encourage efforts to protect and document the sensitive and fragile resources in Grapevine Canyon	Cultural resources work undertaken for the Proposed Project has documented additional cultural resources within Grapevine Canyon and has identified a prehistoric complex/district composed of numerous previously recorded and newly recorded sites. The Proposed Project and alternatives will directly impact the site complex; mitigation measures could possibly reduce effects to the complex to a level that is less than significant (Class II) but in some cases (i.e., human remains), effects may remain adverse (Class I) despite mitigation efforts.  The Proposed Project and alternatives would incorporate APMs and mitigation measures that would ensure that surveys would be conducted (and appropriate mitigation provided) in sensitive areas prior to disturbance activities. Specifically, APMs include BIO-APM-1 and -4, and mitigation measures include B-5b, -7d through -7l, -8a, and -9a, which provide both general surveying protocol as well as survey requirements for specific animal species.	NO

**Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP) Final General Plan and EIR (2005)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Guideline 1b: Investigate potential vehicular routes of travel within the canyon that will avoid sensitive resources while providing access for visitors and utility companies.	<p>This guideline calls for investigation of vehicular routes, which is being done as part of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would minimize motor vehicle impacts to surrounding biological resources. Further, APMs BIO-APM-3, -17, and -18 specifically address the issue of motor vehicle access for the Proposed Project, encouraging the use of existing ROW and access roads wherever possible, and they encourage using sensitive practices for avoidance of resources when existing access roads cannot be used.</p>	YES

### D.16.4.3 Local Plans and Policies

#### County of Imperial County – County General Plan, 2003

The Proposed Project as well as all alternatives in Imperial County (FTHL Eastern, SDG&E West of Dunaway, SDG&E West Main Canal–Huff Road Mod., and Interstate 8) would be within Imperial County jurisdiction. The County covers an area of 4,597 square miles. Approximately 50 percent of County lands are under federal ownership and jurisdiction. Currently one-fifth of the nearly 3 million acres of the county is irrigated for agricultural purposes, most notably the central area in the Salton Sea area known as Imperial Valley. The developed area, where the County's incorporated cities, unincorporated communities, and supporting facilities are situated comprises less than 1 percent of the land.

The Imperial County General Plan consists of nine Elements entitled Land Use, Housing, Circulation and Scenic Highways, Noise, Seismic and Public Safety, Agricultural, Conservation and Open Space, Geothermal and Transmission, and Water.

This plan is applicable to the Proposed Project and the Imperial Link alternatives.

Imperial County General Plan

Applicable Policies Consistency Determination Consistent

GEOTHERMAL AND TRANSMISSION ELEMENT

Goals and Objectives, Policies, Page 19

<p><b>Locating Transmission Line Corridors</b>                  Goal 5: When planning and designing transmission lines, the County will consider impacts to agricultural lands, wildlife, and the natural desert landscape.                  Objective 5.1 Require all major transmission lines to be located in designated federal and IID [Imperial Irrigation District] corridors.                  Objective 5.2 Design lines for minimum impacts on agriculture, wildlife, urban areas, and recreational activities.</p>	<p>Goal 5: As discussed in individual resource sections, impacts to agricultural lands, wildlife, and the natural desert landscape have been considered.                  The design and siting of the proposed route would be located in designated corridors wherever feasible. However, based on identified constraints in certain areas (e.g., biology, land use), the proposed route would fall outside existing corridors. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be consistent with Objective 5.1.                  The Proposed Project and alternatives establish APMs and design/operation measures (e.g., avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations, wherever feasible) to minimize impacts to agriculture. The proposed alignment is not in an urban area, and implementation of APMs and mitigation measures would minimize impacts to recreational resources in Imperial County.</p>	<p>NO</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

SEISMIC AND PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT

Goals and Objectives, Implementation Programs and Policies, Pages 25-30

<p>Goal 1: Include public health and safety considerations in land use planning.                  Objective 1.1 Ensure that data on geological hazards is incorporated into the land use review process, and future development process.                  Objective 1.2 Regulate development within flood-way areas in accordance with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).                  Objective 1.4 Require, where possessing the authority, that avoidable seismic risks be avoided; and that measures, commensurate with risks, be taken to reduce injury, loss of life, destruction of property, and disruption of service.                  Objective 1.6 Ensure environmental hazards are considered when siting critical facilities.                  Objective 1.7 Require developers to provide information related to geologic and seismic hazards when siting a proposed project.</p>	<p>Construction of certain structures within the flood-way is allowed by FEMA provided the structure is not for human habitation and does not result in a rise in the base flood elevation. The proposed towers are not for human habitation and offer little obstruction to flow.                  Geological and seismic studies will identify risks and guide tower design and placement.</p>	<p>YES</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

Imperial County General Plan

Applicable Policies Consistency Determination Consistent

AGRICULTURE ELEMENT

Goals and Objectives, Implementation Programs and Policies, Pages 30-41

<p><b>Preservation of Important Farmland</b>          Goal 1: All Important Farmland, including the categories of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance, as defined by Federal and State agencies, should be reserved for agricultural uses.          Objective 1.1 Maintain existing agricultural land uses outside of urbanizing areas and allow only those land uses in agricultural areas that are compatible with agricultural activities.          Objective 1.3 Conserve Important Farmland for continued farm related (non-urban) use and development while ensuring its proper management and use.          Objective 1.5 Direct development to less valuable farmland (i.e., Unique Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance rather than Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance) when conversion of agricultural land is justified.          Objective 1.8 Allow conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses only where a clear and immediate need can be demonstrated, based on population projections and lack of other available land (including land within incorporated cities) for such non-agricultural uses. Such conversion shall also be allowed only where such uses have been identified for non-agricultural use in a city general plan or the County General Plan, and are supported by a study to show a lack of alternative sites.          Objective 1.9 Preserve major areas of Class II and III soils which are currently nonirrigated but which offer significant potential when water is made available.</p>	<p>Goal 1: The Proposed Project would impact Important Farmlands and would not meet the stated goal of reserving all Important Farmland for agricultural use.           The Applicant has established specific APMs and design/operation measures (e.g., avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations, wherever feasible) that would minimize impacts to agriculture.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>Development Patterns and Locations on Agricultural Land</b>          Objective 2.1 Do not allow the placement of new non-agricultural land uses such that agricultural fields or parcels become isolated or more difficult to economically and conveniently farm.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would avoid agricultural lands wherever feasible, and has established APMs and project design measures (e.g., avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations) that would address agricultural concerns along the proposed route. However, the placement of towers and the orientation of the alignment may create conditions where parcels may become inconvenient or uneconomic to farm due to the inability to crop dust.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>Goal 3: Limit the introduction of conflicting uses into farming areas, including residential development of existing parcels which may create the potential for conflict with continued agricultural use of adjacent property.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include a number of APMs and design/operation measures (e.g., avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations, wherever feasible) to avoid or minimize agricultural impacts where feasible. Thus, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with the intent of this goal.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Imperial County General Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>C. Policies and Programs</p> <p>1. Preservation of Important Farmland</p> <p>No agricultural land designated except as provided in Exhibit C shall be removed from the Agriculture category except where needed for use by a public agency, for geothermal purposes, where a mapping error may have occurred, or where a clear long term economic benefit to the County can be demonstrated through the planning and environmental review process. The Board (or Planning Commission) shall be required to prepare and make specific findings and circulate same for 60 days (30 days for parcels considered under Exhibit C of this element) before granting final approval of any proposal which removes land from the Agriculture category.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not involve the removal of agricultural land from any agricultural designations. The Proposed Project and alternatives include a number of design/operation measures to avoid impacts to Important Farmland and agricultural uses, including, but not limited to, avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations wherever feasible.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>LAND USE ELEMENT</b>		
<b>Goals and Objectives, Implementation Programs and Policies, Pages 36-64</b>		
<p>Goal 6: Promote orderly industrial development with suitable and adequately distributed industrial land.</p> <p>Objective 6.2 Ensure that development in the areas surrounding military, public, and private airports are consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives considers all applicable policies of ALUCPs along the proposed route, and, in consideration of further analysis in this EIR/EIS, it is determined that the Proposed Project and alternatives would comply with area ALUCPs.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal 8: Coordinate local land use planning activities among all local jurisdictions and state and federal agencies.</p> <p>Objective 8.8 Ensure that the siting of future facilities for the transmission of electricity, gas, and telecommunications is compatible with the environment and County regulation.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not conflict with this goal in that it would not interfere with the coordination of local land use planning activities among local, state, and federal jurisdictions. In addition, the Applicant has been coordinating with affected agencies in order to minimize impacts of the Proposed Project.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal 9: Identify and preserve significant natural, cultural, and community character resources and the County's air and water quality.</p> <p>Objective 9.1 Preserve as open space those lands containing watersheds, aquifer recharge areas, floodplains, important natural resources, sensitive vegetation, wildlife habitats, historic and prehistoric sites, or lands which are subject to seismic hazards and establish compatible minimum lot sizes.</p> <p>Objective 9.3 Adopt noise standards which protect sensitive noise receptors from adverse impacts.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures that would ensure that surveys would be conducted in sensitive areas prior to disturbance activities. Specific APMs include BIO-APM-1 and -4, and mitigation measures include B-5b, -7d through -7l, -8a, and -9a. The Proposed Project and alternatives consider impacts to sensitive habitats and species that could occur during project construction and project maintenance after construction. APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species.</p> <p>The alignment would not create noise to sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Imperial County General Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>C. Land Use Designations and Standards</p> <p>1. Agriculture</p> <p>Where this designation is applied, agriculture shall be promoted as the principal and dominant use to which all other uses shall be subordinate. Where questions of land use compatibility arise, the burden of proof shall be on the non-agricultural use to clearly demonstrate that an existing or proposed use does not conflict with agricultural operations and will not result in the premature elimination of such agricultural operations. No use should be permitted that would have a significant adverse effect on agricultural production, including food and fiber production, horticulture, floriculture, or animal husbandry. All non-agricultural uses in any land use category shall be analyzed during the subdivision, zoning, and environmental impact review process for their potential impact on the movement of agricultural equipment and products on roads located in the Agriculture category.</p> <p>No land shall be removed from the Agriculture category except for annexation to a city, where needed for use by a public agency, for geothermal purposes, where a mapping error may have occurred, or where a clear long term economic benefit to the County can be demonstrated through the planning and environmental review process.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include a number of APMs and design/operation measures to allow continued agricultural use and maintain compatibility with agricultural operations, including, but not limited to, avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations wherever feasible. In addition, the proposed provision of electrical energy to meet projected demand would provide long-term economic benefits to the region.</p>	<p>YES</p>

CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

Goals and Objectives, Implementation Programs and Policies, Pages 47-63

<p>Preservation of Biological Resources</p> <p>Goal 2: The County will preserve the integrity, function, productivity, and long-term viability of environmentally sensitive habitats, and plant and animal species.</p> <p>Objective 2.1. Conserve wetlands, fresh water marshes, and riparian vegetation.</p> <p>Objective 2.2. Protect significant fish, wildlife, plant species, and their habitats.</p> <p>Objective 2.3. Protect unique, rare, and endangered plants and animals and their habitats.</p> <p>Objective 2.4. Use the environmental impact report process to identify, conserve and enhance unique vegetation and wildlife resources.</p> <p>Objective 2.6. Attempt to identify, reduce, and eliminate all forms of pollution which adversely impact vegetation and wildlife.</p> <p>Objective 2.7. Discourage the use of wild native animals as pets.</p> <p>Objective 2.8. Adopt noise standards which protect sensitive noise receptors from adverse impacts.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives consider impacts to sensitive habitats and species that could occur during project construction and project maintenance after construction. APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species. In addition, mitigation for restoration of sensitive areas is included as well See APMs BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25. Pollution that adversely impacts vegetation and wildlife could come from many sources and be found in many locations. For this reason, sections of this EIR/EIS have addressed pollution specific to certain issues, including air, water, hazardous materials, and the like. The incorporate APMs and mitigation measures to ensure that project-related impacts to sensitive biological resources would not be significant. APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species BIO-APM-13, which prohibits collection of native species. Mitigation Measures B-7e, B-8a, and B-13a include measures to mitigate potential noise impacts on sensitive species during the breeding season.</p>	<p>YES</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

**Imperial County General Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Preservation of Cultural Resources</b>                      Goal 3: Important prehistoric and historic resources shall be preserved to advance scientific knowledge and maintain the traditional historic element of the Imperial Valley landscape.                      Objective 3.1. Protect and preserve sites of archaeological, ecological, historical, and scientific value, and/or cultural significance.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives have the potential to encounter or affect the resources enumerated in Goal 3 and Objective 3.1. Implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans) may reduce project related effects to cultural resources to a level that is less than significant (Class II).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Preservation of Agricultural Lands</b>                      Goal 4: The County will actively conserve and maintain contiguous farmlands and prime soil areas to maintain economic vitality and the unique lifestyle of the Imperial Valley.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not substantially interfere with the identified County goal to conserve and maintain farmlands and prime soil areas.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Preservation of Visual Resources</b>                      Goal 7: The aesthetic character of the region shall be protected and enhanced to provide a pleasing environment for residential, commercial, recreational, and tourist activity.                      Objective 7.1. Encourage the preservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the desert and mountain landscape.</p>	<p>Within Imperial County, the Proposed Project and alternatives would result in significant (Class I) and adverse but less than significant (Class III) visual impacts. In both cases, the project would not be perceived as enhancing the aesthetic character of the region or the natural beauty of the desert and mountain landscape. See Figures D.3-2A/B through D.3-5A/B for views within the County.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>Protection of Air Quality</b>                      Goal 9: The County shall actively seek to improve and maintain the quality of air in the region.                      Objective 9.1. Ensure that all facilities shall comply with current federal and state requirements for attainment of air quality objectives.                      Objective 9.2. Cooperate with all federal and state agencies in the effort to attain air quality objectives.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would comply with federal and State laws for meeting clean air objectives.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Preservation of Open Space</b>                      Goal 10: Open space shall be maintained to protect the aesthetic character of the region, protect natural resources, provide recreational opportunities, and minimize hazards to human activity.                      Objective 10.9. Conserve desert lands, within the county's jurisdiction for wildlife protection, recreation, and aesthetic purposes.</p>	<p>Within Imperial County, the Proposed Project and alternatives would result in significant (Class I) and adverse but less than significant (Class III) visual impacts. In both cases, the project would not be perceived as enhancing the aesthetic character of the region or the natural beauty of the desert and mountain landscape. See Figures D.3-2A/B through D.3-5A/B for views within the County.</p> <p>The Proposed Project and alternatives consider impacts to sensitive habitats and species that could occur during project construction and project maintenance after construction. APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species.</p>	<p>NO</p>

Imperial County General Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>IV. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES</b></p> <p><b>A. Preface</b> The primary mechanism to implement the Goals and Objectives of the Conservation and Open Space Element is to incorporate environmental concerns into land use planning. This occurs primarily through the discretionary permit process of subdivision map review, rezones, conditional use permits, specific plans, and general plan amendments. Accompanying all of these applications is an environmental review process to identify significant site resources and evaluate project impacts.</p> <p><b>1. Biological Resource Conservation</b></p> <p><b>Policy</b> Provide a framework for the preservation and enhancement of natural and created open space which provides wildlife habitat values.</p> <p><b>Programs</b> Identify Resource Areas (see Figure 3) to conserve and enhance native vegetation and wildlife. These areas shall include: BLM "Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)"; areas of high value to wildlife; areas necessary for the protection and perpetuation of rare, endangered, and threatened species; and areas important for scientific study. Following identification of these areas, they shall be rezoned to limit development to low intensity uses which are compatible with resource conservation. Projects within or in the vicinity of a Resource Area, as defined in the Imperial County General Plan EIR, should be designed to minimize adverse impacts on the biological resources it was created to protect.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project considers impacts to natural elements through the environmental review procedures and policy framework followed in preparation of this EIR/EIS. The Proposed Project consider impacts to sensitive habitats and species that could occur during project construction and project maintenance after construction and includes APMs and mitigation measures to minimize such impacts.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Policy</b> Landscaping should be required in all developments to prevent erosion on graded sites and, if the area is contiguous with undisturbed wildlife habitat, the plan should include revegetation with native plant species.</p> <p><b>Programs</b> Revegetation plans shall be submitted and approved by the Imperial County Planning Department and relevant resource agencies for the mitigation of sensitive habitat lost, and for disturbed areas created by roads or installation of facilities adjacent to native habitat. Such plans shall mitigate for the loss of sensitive habitat and habitat value based on a ratio consistent with accepted policy, as recommended by the State and federal resource agencies.</p> <p>These specifications shall include, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locations of ecologically appropriate planting areas.</li> <li>• Site preparation/remedial grading.</li> <li>• Amounts, sizes, and locations of appropriate overstory tree species to be planted.</li> <li>• Hydroseed/container stock planting mixes and locations for appropriate understory shrub species and groundcovers.</li> <li>• Timing of planting (for example, most plantings should be conducted during the rainy season).</li> </ul> <p>Protective measures during and after plant installation, such as temporary chainlink fencing to keep out construction equipment/personnel; caging to avoid potential herbivory (animal browsing);</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures B-1a, requires restoration of all temporarily disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, -20, -23, and -25 address restoration of disturbed areas with native species.</p>	<p>YES</p>

**Imperial County General Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
and permanent wood-rail fencing or signage to deter human intrusions. This would also reduce potential impacts caused by future active uses, or "edge effects," from adjacent residential areas.		
The proposed habitat restoration sites shall be monitored for an appropriate period of time to ensure long-term plant survivorship. A maintenance program shall be implemented for the length of the monitoring period.  When appropriate, a bond or other security shall be provided for all required revegetation plans, which would be released by the County only after: 1) the consulting biologist has concluded that all specified success criteria have been met; and, 2) the County and other relevant permitting agencies have approved the successful completion of the plan.  Clearing of shrubs, vines, and other native vegetation for purposes of fire control shall be coordinated with the local fire district, particularly in fire-prone areas.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would be subject to mitigation measures that address revegetation of sensitive habitat areas (See Mitigation Measure B-1a and BIO-APM-19, -20, -23, and -25a The mitigation measures include requirements for ensuring long-term habitat survivorship.	YES

**NOISE ELEMENT**

**Goals and Objectives, Implementation Programs and Policies, Pages 16-30**

Goal 1: Provide an acceptable noise environment for existing and future residents in Imperial County.  Objective 1.3 Control noise levels at the source where feasible.	NOI-APM-1 (Provide notice prior to construction) and Mitigation Measures L-1a (Prepare construction notification plane) and N-1a (Implement best management practices for construction noise) would create less than significant impacts during construction. However, during operation under certain conditions, such as fog or wet weather, transmission lines can emit corona noise. This is a potentially significant impact in the vicinity of Split Mountain Road, where noise increase over existing conditions could create an infrequent but significant and unavoidable impact. In this area, the Proposed Project and alternatives may be inconsistent with County policy.	MAYBE
Goal 2: Review proposed projects for noise impacts and require design which will provide acceptable indoor and outdoor noise environments.	As noted for Goal 1 above, there can be an infrequent but significant impact from corona noise	NO
<b>3. Construction Noise Standards</b> Construction noise, from a single piece of equipment or a combination of equipment, shall not exceed 75 dB L <sub>eq</sub> , when averaged over an eight (8) hour period, and measured at the nearest sensitive receptor. This standard assumes a construction period, relative to an individual sensitive receptor of days or weeks. In cases of extended length construction times, the standard may be tightened so as not to exceed 75 dB L <sub>eq</sub> when averaged over a one (1) hour period.  Construction equipment operation shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Saturday. No commercial construction operations are permitted on Sunday or holidays.	Construction noise would be within the County noise limits with regard to sensitive noise receptors.	YES

**Imperial County General Plan**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Consistency Determination</b>	<b>Consistent</b>
<p><b>4. Significant Increase of Ambient Noise Levels</b> The increase of noise levels generally results in an adverse impact to the noise environment. The Noise/Land Use Compatibility Guidelines are not intended to allow the increase of ambient noise levels up to the maximum without consideration of feasible noise reduction measures. The following guidelines are established by the County of Imperial for the evaluation of significant noise impact.</p> <p>a. If the future noise level after the project is completed will be within the “normally acceptable” noise levels shown in the Noise/Land Use Compatibility Guidelines, but will result in an increase of 5 dB CNEL or greater, the project will have a potentially significant noise impact and mitigation measures must be considered.</p> <p>b. If the future noise level after the project is completed will be greater than the “normally acceptable” noise levels shown in the Noise/Land Use Compatibility Guidelines, a noise increase of 3 dB CNEL or greater shall be considered a potentially significant noise impact and mitigation measures must be considered.</p>	<p>During operation under certain conditions, such as fog or wet weather, transmission lines can emit corona noise. This is a potentially significant impact in the vicinity of Split Mountain Road, where noise increase over existing conditions could create an infrequent but significant and unavoidable impact. In this area, the Proposed Project and alternatives may be inconsistent with County policy.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
<p><b>D. Programs and Policies</b> <b>1. Acoustical Analysis of Proposed Projects</b> The County shall require the analysis of proposed discretionary projects which may generate excessive noise or which may be impacted by existing excessive noise levels, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An analysis shall be required for any project which would be located, all or in part, in a Noise Impact Zone as specified above.</li> <li>• An analysis shall be required for any project which has the potential to generate noise in excess of the Property Line Noise Limits stated in Table 9.</li> <li>• An analysis shall be required for any project which, although not located in a Noise Impact Zone, has the potential to result in a significant increase in noise levels to sensitive receptors in the community.</li> </ul>	<p>During operation under certain conditions, such as fog or wet weather, transmission lines can emit corona noise. This is a potentially significant impact in the vicinity of Split Mountain Road, where noise increase over existing conditions could create an infrequent but significant and unavoidable impact. In this area, the Proposed Project and alternatives may be inconsistent with County policy.</p>	<p>MAYBE</p>
<p><b>WATER ELEMENT</b></p>		
<p><b>Goal and Objectives, Implementation Programs and Policies, Pages 26-33</b></p>		
<p>As part of the effort to protect and enhance wildlife and their habitat, the County of Imperial shall actively pursue the preservation, maintenance of breeding and foraging habitat for native and migratory birds and animals, preserving these biological systems as indicators of environmental integrity, and as a source of sport and recreation.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives incorporate APMs and mitigation measures to protect biological resources, including migratory birds and their habitat. All APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, -12a, and -13a would address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and B-11a specifically addresses the issue of electrocution concerns.</p>	<p>YES</p>

County of San Diego – County General Plan, 1979 as amended

The Proposed Project and all alternatives not exclusively in Imperial County or the Cities of San Diego and Chula Vista are subject to the County of San Diego General Plan. The County General Plan was last updated in 1979, with substantial amendments made since. In 1998, the county embarked on a multi-year project to update the San Diego General Plan. This is an ongoing process that is not complete. Until a new plan is adopted, the current plan remains in force.

San Diego County General Plan		
Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>REGIONAL LAND USE ELEMENT (II)</b>		
<b>Public Facility Element (XII)</b>		
<b>Flood Control Goals</b> 1. Preservation and conservation of floodways in their natural state. Policy 1.1: Development within floodplains will be restricted to decrease the potential for property damage and loss of life from flooding and to avoid the need for channels and other flood control facilities.	Construction of towers in or near dry watercourses will not substantially alter their natural state. Alteration to floodplain and increased risk will be minimal.	YES
<b>Open Space Element (I)</b>		
<b>Conservation of Resources and Natural Processes</b> 1. Encourage the conservation of the habitats of rare or unique plants and wildlife. 2. Encourage the conservation of areas with sensitive plant life or irreplaceable, high quality plant and animal communities. 3. Encourage the preservation of significant natural features of the County, including the beaches, lagoons, shoreline, canyons, bluffs, mountain peaks, and major rock outcroppings.	The Proposed Project and alternatives incorporate APMs and mitigation measures to ensure that project impacts to biological resources would not be significant. APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species.	YES
<b>Conservation of Resources and Natural Processes</b> 2. Encourage the conservation of vegetation and trees needed to prevent erosion, siltation, flood, and drought, and to protect air and water quality.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would be subject to APMs and mitigation measures that require sensitive design intended to limit impacts to sensitive habitats (including riparian areas). APMs and mitigation measures are included that require revegetation of temporarily impacted areas with native species that would help address erosion issues.	YES
<b>Floodplains Goals and Objectives</b> <i>Health and Safety</i> <i>Conservation of Resources and Natural Processes</i> Encourage the conservation of the habitats of rare or unique plants and wildlife. Encourage the conservation of vegetation and trees needed to prevent erosion, siltation, flood, and drought, and to protect water quality.	The Proposed Project and alternatives incorporate APMs and mitigation measures to ensure that project impacts to biological resources, including plants and wildlife, would not be significant. APMs are included to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species.	YES
<b>Particularly Relevant Floodplain Policies:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support RWQCB policies and urge it to adopt standards for Storm Water runoff.</li> <li>• Support efforts to identify and protect rare and unique plant and wildlife habitats.</li> </ul>	The Proposed Project and alternatives incorporate APMs and mitigation measures to ensure that project impacts to habitat would not be significant. All APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to sensitive habitats and species. Stormwater management plans would be prepared or part of project implementation.	YES

San Diego County General Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Agricultural Preserves and Open Space Easements Goals and Objectives</b> <i>Conservation of Resources and Natural Processes</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Encourage the conservation of vegetation and trees needed to prevent erosion, siltation, flood, and drought.</li> <li>3. Encourage the conservation of the habitats of rare or unique plants and wildlife.</li> </ol>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives incorporate APMs and mitigation measures to ensure that project impacts to habitat would not be significant. APMs are included to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to sensitive habitats and species.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Foster compatibility between agricultural uses and nonagricultural uses.</li> <li>2. Facilitate, protect, and preserve agricultural use of lands in the Agricultural Land Use Designations.</li> </ol>	<p>1. The Proposed Project and alternatives would not interfere with the County's ability to foster compatibility between agricultural and non-agricultural uses and protect agricultural lands. The Proposed Project and alternatives would be generally compatible with most agricultural uses because it would include APMs and design/operation measures such as, but not limited to, avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations wherever feasible.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><i>Open Space Design of Private Lands Goals and Objectives</i> <b>Health and Safety</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Control development to assure a minimal adverse polluting effect on reservoirs, lakes, rivers, streams, and groundwater supplies.</li> <li>3. Protect life and property by regulating use of areas subject to flooding landslides, high fire hazard and high earthquake potential.</li> </ol>	<p>APMs WQ-APM-1 through 5, -9, and 13 through 15 provide for best management practices that ensure the Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Conservation of Resources and Natural Processes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Encourage the conservation of vegetation and trees needed to prevent erosion, siltation, flood, and drought, and to protect air and water quality.</li> <li>2. Encourage the conservation of the habitats of rare or unique plants and wildlife.</li> <li>3. Encourage the use of minor natural watercourses as local open spaces.</li> </ol>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives incorporate APMs and mitigation measures to ensure that project impacts to habitat would not be significant. All APMs were designed to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species. In particular, APM BIO-18 requires sensitive design near sensitive areas, including riparian habitat.</p>	<p>YES</p>

San Diego County General Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Conservation Element (X)</b>		
<b>Vegetation and Wildlife Policies</b>		
<p>Policy 1 (X-45) The County will act to conserve and enhance vegetation, wildlife, and fisheries resources.</p> <p>Policy 2 (X-46) San Diego County shall coordinate with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies to conserve areas of rare, endangered, and threatened species.</p> <p>Policy 3 (X-46) The County will use the EIR process to identify, conserve, and enhance unique vegetation and wildlife resources.</p> <p>Policy 5 (X-47) San Diego County shall encourage use of native plants in review of landscaping and erosion control plans for public and private projects.</p> <p>Policy 6 (X-47) If a project is determined to have significant adverse impacts on plants or wildlife, an acceptable mitigating measure may be voluntary donation of land or monies for acquisition of land of comparable value to wildlife.</p> <p>Policy 9 (X-52) When significant adverse habitat modification is unavoidable, San Diego County will encourage project designers to incorporate mitigation measures in their design to protect existing habitat.</p> <p>Policy 16 (X-54) The County will regulate major land-clearing projects to minimize significant soil erosion, destruction of archaeological, historic, and scientific resources, and endangered species of plants and animals (same as Policy 11 in Soils).</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives consider impacts to biological resources through the environmental review procedures and policy framework followed in preparation of this EIR/EIS. The Proposed Project and alternatives consider impacts to sensitive habitats and species that could occur during project construction and project maintenance after construction. APMs are included to address impacts to sensitive habitats and species, and Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a, -7a, and -13a would address impacts to all sensitive habitats and species.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>Soil Policies</b>		
<p>Policy 4 (X-80) The County will utilize existing and evolving geologic, geophysical, and engineering knowledge to distinguish and delineate those areas which are particularly susceptible to damage from geologic phenomena.</p> <p>Policy 5 (X-82) The County will seek to preserve natural terrain features through the adoption of guidelines and regulations.</p> <p>Policy 6 (X-82) The County recognizes the need to assess physical suitability of a project site for both the proposed use and proposed density.</p> <p>Policy 7 (X-82) The County will seek to implement a grading ordinance that protects public health and safety, property, and that conserves visual character of the land.</p> <p>Policy 9 (X-82) To prevent erosion and slippage in man-made slopes approved low maintenance trees, bushes, and grasses which establish themselves quickly should be planted.</p> <p>Policy 10 (X-83) The County will regulate major land-clearing projects to minimize significant soil erosion, destruction of archaeological, historic, and scientific resources, and endangered species of plants and animals (same as Policy 16 in Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat).</p>	<p>APMs GEO-APM-1, -2, -5, and -6 would reduce the amount of erosion that would result from construction limiting grading of existing roads in areas with sensitive soils. In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would limit erosion from the construction site would be required in accordance with the Clean Water Act. This would result in a less than significant impact</p>	<p>YES</p>

San Diego County General Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Cultural Sites Policies</b></p> <p>Policy 1 (X-92) The County shall take those actions which will seek to conserve and protect significant cultural resources.</p> <p>Policy 3 (X-93) San Diego County shall coordinate with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies to conserve cultural resources.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would minimize and/or prevent impacts to cultural resources through avoidance, when possible. For cultural resources that cannot be avoided, implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans) may reduce project-related effects to a level that is less than significant (Class II).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>Public Safety Element (VII)</b>		
<p><b>Goals of this Element</b></p> <p>2. Maximize public safety factors in the physical planning process.</p> <p><i>Fire Hazards</i></p> <p>Identification, reduction, or elimination of both structural and brush fire hazards.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would maximize safety by implementing APMs GEO-APM3 through 8 and Mitigation Measures G2a (Conduct geotechnical studies for soils to assess characteristics and aid in appropriate foundation design), G-3a (Reduce effects of groundshaking), G-3b (Conduct geotechnical investigations for liquefaction), G4a (Minimize project structures within active fault zones, and G-5a (Conduct geotechnical surveys for landslides and protect against slope instability).</p> <p>CPUC regulations and SDG&amp;E practices minimize fire risks along transmission routes.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>Seismic Safety Element (V)</b>		
<p><b>Goals</b></p> <p>The basic goals of the County of San Diego in adopting the safety element of the general plan are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimize injury and loss of life;</li> <li>2. Minimize damage to public and private property;</li> <li>3. Minimize social and economic dislocations resulting from injuries, loss of life, and property damage.</li> </ol> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. To minimize the risk to human life from structures located in hazardous areas.</li> <li>4. To ensure that facilities whose continuing functioning is essential to society, and facilities needed in the event of emergency, are so located and designed that they will continue to function in the event of a disaster.</li> </ol>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would maximize safety by implementing APMs GEO-APM3 through 8 and Mitigation Measures G2a (Conduct geotechnical studies for soils to assess characteristics and aid in appropriate foundation design), G-3a (Reduce effects of groundshaking), G-3b (Conduct geotechnical investigations for liquefaction), G4a (Minimize project structures within active fault zones, and G-5a (Conduct geotechnical surveys for landslides and protect against slope instability).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Policies on Fault Rupture</b></p> <p>It is the Policy of the County of San Diego to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prohibit construction of essential facilities and high occupancy structures in special studies zones as defined under the Alquist-Priolo Act (Sec. 5404, Zoning Ordinance) or in special studies zones defined by the County of San Diego.</li> <li>2. Require a geologic report for other development proposed in special studies zones as defined under the Alquist-Priolo Act (Sec. 5406, Zoning Ordinance) or in special studies zones defined by the County of San Diego.</li> </ol>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would maximize safety by implementing APMs GEO-APM3 through 8 and Mitigation Measures G2a (Conduct geotechnical studies for soils to assess characteristics and aid in appropriate foundation design), G-3a (Reduce effects of groundshaking), G-3b (Conduct geotechnical investigations for liquefaction), G4a (Minimize project structures within active fault zones, and G-5a (Conduct geotechnical surveys for landslides and protect against slope instability).</p>	<p>YES</p>

**San Diego County General Plan**

<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Consistency Determination</b>	<b>Consistent</b>
<i>Policies on New Development</i>		
<p>6. Require major utility lines which cross hazardous areas to be built with features that provide for either automatic shut-off or for quick repairs.</p> <p>7. Require submission of soils and geologic reports prepared by a certified engineering geologist</p>	<p>Substations include breakers that trip when there are transmission line failures.</p> <p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would maximize safety by implementing APMs GEO-APM3 through 8 and Mitigation Measures G2a (Conduct geotechnical studies for soils to assess characteristics and aid in appropriate foundation design), G-3b (Conduct geotechnical investigations for liquefaction, G4a (Minimize project structures within active fault zones, and G-5a (Conduct geotechnical surveys for landslides and protect against slope instability).</p>	YES
<i>Policies on Essential Facilities</i>		
<p>1. Ensure that facilities whose continuing functioning is essential to society, and facilities needed in the event of emergency, are so located and designed that they will continue to function in the event of a disaster.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would be constructed to minimize the risk of failure as a result of natural disasters.</p>	YES
<i>Scenic Highway Element (VI)</i>		
<p>Objective 2. Protect and enhance scenic resources within designated scenic highway corridors.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would adversely affect views from scenic highway corridors within San Diego County including Officially Designated State Scenic Highway SR78 and Eligible State Scenic Highways SR76, SR78, and SR79.</p>	NO

San Diego County General Plan

Applicable Policies Consistency Determination Consistent

Noise Element (VIII)

Policies

POLICY 3. Establish a coordinated program within the Environmental Development Agency and Public Works Agency to maximize efforts to de-amplify noise along its transmission paths.

*Receiver Site Standards and Controls*

POLICY 4a. Ensure acceptable noise levels at the receiver's site by incorporating appropriate regulations and standards in the County's development policies and ordinances.

POLICY 4b. Because exterior Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) above 55 to 60 decibels and/or interior CNEL levels above 45 decibels may have an adverse effect on public health and welfare, it is the policy of the County of San Diego that:

1. Whenever possible, development in San Diego County should be planned and constructed so that noise-sensitive areas are not subject to noise in excess of CNEL equal to 55 decibels.
2. Whenever it appears that new development will result in any (existing or future) noise-sensitive area being subjected to noise levels of CNEL equal to 60 decibels or greater, an acoustical study should be required.
3. If the acoustical study shows that noise levels at any noise-sensitive area will exceed CNEL equal to 60 decibels, the development should not be approved unless the following findings are made:
  - A. Modifications to the development have been or will be made which reduce the exterior noise level below CNEL equal to 60 decibels; or
  - B. If with current noise abatement technology it is infeasible to reduce exterior CNEL to 60 decibels, then modifications to the development have been or will be made which reduce interior noise below CNEL equal to 45 decibels. Particular attention shall be given to noise-sensitive interior spaces such as bedrooms.

And,

  - C. If finding "B" above is made, a further finding is made that there are specifically identified overriding social or economic considerations which warrant approval of the development without modification as described in "A" above.
4. If the acoustical study shows that noise levels at any noise-sensitive area will exceed CNEL equal to 75 decibels, the development should not be approved.

Definitions (applicable to paragraph 1 through 4 of Policy 4b)

"Development" means any physical development including but not limited to residences, commercial, or industrial facilities, roads, civic buildings, hospitals, schools, airports, or similar facilities.

"Noise-sensitive Area" means the building site of any residence, hospital, school, library, or similar facility where quiet is an important attribute of the environment.

Exemption

- B. Other Projects – CNEL = 60 dB(A), except if the existing or projected noise level without the project is 58 dB(A) or greater a 3 dB(A) increase will be allowed, up to the maximum permitted by Federal Highway Administration Standards.

The nighttime limit of 45 dBA Leq established by the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances would not be exceeded, and the Proposed Project and alternatives would not conflict and would be consistent with the San Diego County noise standards.

YES

San Diego County General Plan Part IV Lakeside Community Plan, Adopted December 19, 1975, Amended August 9, 2000

The Proposed Project and the I-8 Alternative would pass through the area included in the Lakeside Community Plan. Lakeside is located in the western foothills of the Cuyamaca Mountains on the San Diego River.

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>2. LAND USE, page 4</b>		
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
1. Industrial development should be clean, non-polluting and complementary to Lakeside's rural environment.	The I-8 Alternative 230 kV transmission line structures and conductors would cause the introduction of structural contrast, industrial character, and view blockage, resulting in significant (Class I) visual impacts. These characteristics would not be complementary to Lakeside's rural environment and they would not blend harmoniously with their surroundings. Also, because of the scale of the structures, it would not be feasible to screen them from view.	NO
4. Encourage new and existing industrial facilities to blend with their surroundings by utilizing harmonious architectural design, undergrounding utilities, landscaping, and a high standard of maintenance.		
11. Require adequate landscaping to screen unsightly industrial uses from surrounding properties and roadways through the use of the "D" Design Special Area Regulator.		
<b>5. PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES, page 26</b>		
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
15. Protect the public health and safety by requiring public agencies and utilities to adhere to air, water, noise and visual pollution standards.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include provisions to comply with applicable air, water, noise, and visual pollution standards.  These policies are more appropriately directed to substation facilities and not transmission towers. However, to the extent that the County in practice actually applies these policies and recommendations to transmission line facilities, it should be noted that the I-8 Alternative 230 kV transmission line structures and conductors would cause the introduction of structural contrast, industrial character, and view blockage, resulting in significant (Class I) visual impacts. These characteristics would not be consistent with the land use policies and recommendations cited previously. Also, because of the scale and location of the structures, it would not be feasible to provide landscaping of the individual tower sites.	NO <small>(IF APPLIED TO TRANSMISSION LINES)</small>
16. Require public agencies to landscape all of their facilities.		
19. Require aesthetic improvement of necessary above ground transformers and meters, and require landscaping and beautification of all utility plant facilities.		

**San Diego County General Plan Part IV Lakeside Community Plan, Adopted December 19, 1975, Amended August 9, 2000**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>6. CONSERVATION, page 32</b>		
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<p>1. Encourage types and patterns of development which minimize water pollution, air pollution, fire hazard, soil erosion, silting, slide damage, flooding, and severe hillside cutting and scarring.</p> <p>4. Identify and apply the Environmentally Constrained Area (ECA) Regional Category to areas containing rare and endangered plant and animal species, archaeological sites, agricultural preserves, and other environmentally sensitive sites that may experience adverse impacts from development.</p> <p>5. Ensure that land uses within or adjacent to recreational, natural preserve, agricultural, or industrial areas are compatible with those areas.</p> <p>6. Identify and apply the Scenic Area (S) special area regulator to sites where significant natural landmarks are located. (I)</p> <p>7. Identify and apply the Historic District Preservation Area (H) special area regulator to sites and structures which are historically significant. (I)</p> <p>10. Preserve mature trees on public and private property, and require equitable replacement of those removed. (R)</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to prevent increased water pollution, air pollution, fire hazard, soil erosion, slide damage, or flooding. Likewise, there are APMs and mitigation measures to ensure that cultural resources are identified and protected as required by law.</p> <p>However, The I-8 Alternative 230 kV transmission line would introduce structures along hills and ridgelines. Access and tower spur roads would also be constructed along the line. These roads would leave long-term, visible scars on the land.</p> <p>The I-8 Alternative 230 kV transmission line would result in the introduction of transmission line structures and conductors adjacent to El Monte County Park. The location of the line would impair the view of El Cajon Mountain from the park.</p>	NO
<b>8. SCENIC HIGHWAYS, page 40</b>		
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<p>1. Apply Scenic Area regulations to those scenic highway corridors identified in the General Plan and to areas adjacent to significant recreational, historic or scenic resources; including, but not limited to Federal and State Parks.</p> <p>4. Do not permit development which will detract from those unique environmental features which are intended to be protected by virtue of being located within or in clear view of a designated scenic corridor.</p>	<p>The I-8 Alternative 230 kV transmission line would result in the introduction of transmission line structures and conductors that would be located within clear view of Willow Road and El Monte Road, which are designated scenic corridors. Also, the placement of the transmission line at the base of El Cajon Mountain would impair the view of the mountain from El Monte Road.</p>	NO

**San Diego County General Plan Part XIV Ramona Community Plan, 1978, amended 2006**

The Proposed Project alignment as well as four alternatives — CNF Existing 69 kV Route, Oak Hollow Road Underground, Vicente Road Transition, and Chuck Wagon Road — would pass through the Ramona Community Plan area. The Ramona Community Plan found in the San Diego County General Plan (adopted October 5, 1978, and amended May 10, 2006) discusses the goals and policies of the community.

**San Diego County General Plan Part XIV Community of Ramona, County of San Diego**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Community Character Element, Pages 3-5</b>		
Goal 1: Preserve and enhance the existing rural atmosphere of the Ramona Community and encourage land uses, structural designs, and landscaping which are compatible with a country lifestyle.	In the vicinity of Ramona, the Proposed Project would include the installation of transition structures (cable poles) adjacent to San Vicente Road. These structures are complex and industrial in appearance. The resulting visual impact caused by these facilities would be significant (Class I). As a result, the Proposed Project would not be perceived as enhancing the existing rural atmosphere. See Figures D.3-21A/B for views of the existing landscape and proposed transition structures.	NO
Policy 1: Mature trees should be conserved wherever possible in all public and private development projects.	The project includes APMs and mitigation measures that promote preservation of mature trees, particularly along riparian drainages where most native trees occur.  The Proposed Project may result in the removal of mature trees. It is not known how many trees may be removed to accommodate the new transmission line. However, where possible, trees will be conserved.	YES
Policy 2: Mature trees which have been previously planted as street trees should be preserved.	The underground segment of the Proposed Project would not result in the removal of street trees, as the construction would be within the roadway.	YES
Policy 11: Site design shall minimize the destruction of existing trees, both native and non-native.	The project includes APMs and mitigation measures that promote preservation of mature trees, particularly along riparian drainages where most native trees occur.  The Proposed Project may result in the removal of mature trees. It is not known how many trees may be removed to accommodate the new transmission line. However, where possible, trees will be conserved.	YES
Policy 17: Grading shall be minimized. Streets, walkways, buildings, retaining walls and other improvements should not modify the natural landforms.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are primarily below ground in existing roads. Where above ground, it would not require substantial modification of land forms.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Pages 7-12</b>		
Policy 4: All development proposals shall demonstrate a diligent effort to retain significant existing natural features of the area's landscape. Existing topography and landforms, drainage course, rock outcroppings, vegetation and views shall be incorporated into the design of homesites to the maximum extent feasible.	In the vicinity of Ramona, the Proposed Project would include the installation of transition structures (cable poles) at each end of the underground segment. These structures are complex and industrial in appearance. The resulting visual impact caused by these facilities (moderate to high visual contrast, structural dominance, and moderate view blockage of the background hills) would be significant (Class I). As a result, the Proposed Project would be perceived as compromising the aesthetic values of the area's existing landscape. See Figures D.3-21A/B for a view of this area.	NO

**San Diego County General Plan Part XIV Community of Ramona, County of San Diego**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Policy 5: Ridgeline development should be discouraged. It should only be allowed if a viewshed analysis shows only minimal impact on adjacent properties and scenic roads identified in the Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan.	In the vicinity of Ramona, the Proposed Project would include the installation of transition structures (cable poles) adjacent to San Vicente Road. These structures are complex and industrial in appearance. The resulting visual impact caused by these facilities (moderate to high visual contrast, structural dominance, and moderate view blockage of the background ridgeline) would be significant (Class I). As a result, the Proposed Project would be perceived as compromising the views from San Vicente Road and nearby residential properties. See Figures D.3-21A/B for a view of this area.	YES
<b>Noise Element, Page 97</b>		
Goal 1: Provide adequate control of noise sources in the Planning Area to maintain an environment free of excessive and damaging noise to all residents.	The nighttime limit of 45 dBA Leq established by the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances would not be exceeded	YES
<b>Public Safety Element, Pages 107-109</b>		
Policy 7: All discretionary projects shall be reviewed for seismic safety.	The Proposed Project design process takes seismic risk into account and towers and tower sites would be designed accordingly.	YES

**San Diego County General Plan Part I Fallbrook Community Plan**

The Fallbrook Renewable Energy Facility (a component of the In-Area Renewable Generation Alternative) would be located within the area covered by San Diego County’s Fallbrook Community Plan. The site is east of I-15 and south of the San Luis Rey River; this is east of the community of Live Oak Park. The Fallbrook Community Plan was adopted December 31, 1974 and amended June 1, 1988.

**San Diego County General Plan Part I Fallbrook Community Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Industrial Goal, Page 3</b>		
<b>D. Industrial Goal:</b> It is the goal of the county of San Diego to limit future industrial development to those areas already designated for industry and to keep the development of this land to industries which serve the community and are compatible with the community’s general goal of preserving rural charm and village atmosphere.	The Fallbrook facility site is within an agricultural area, not an area designated for industry. While a large portion of the land would remain in agriculture, the facility would not be consistent with this goal.	NO
Policy 1: Discourage the establishment of heavy or “obnoxious” industries which create noise, dirt, air pollution or create congestion.	The facility would combust biomass (vegetation and similar material) to generate electricity. This material is generally not odor producing and any one load would not be onsite for more than 4 days. The facility is remote from neighboring properties. All equipment would be indoors and trucks would unload in a covered area. Noise would not be a problem. The frequency of truck arrivals and departures would not create congestion on the adjacent roads. Therefore the alternative is consistent with this policy.	YES

### San Diego County General Plan – Part XVII, Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan

The Pala Substation Peaker Plant (a component of the In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative) would be located adjacent to an existing substation located north of Pala Road (SR 76) in the Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan area. The Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan was adopted in January 1979 and amended in June 1988.

San Diego County General Plan Part XVII Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan		
Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
LAND USE, Page 3		
4. Numerous sensitive habitats occur in the Subregion, including oak woodland, extremely steep chaparral and woodland covered slopes, riparian areas along the San Luis Rey River, and small area of coniferous woodlands on the slopes of Mt. Palomar. Eight Resource Conservation Areas have been identified for the Subregion (see Appendix A); therefore, Protect sensitive biological resources through the resource conservation area (RCA) designation. Apply low density plan designations and zoning to resource conservation areas.	The alternative would be located adjacent to an existing substation, north of Pala Road (SR76), approximately 2000 ft from the San Luis Rey River. A large quarry operation exists between the site and the river. The site is an orchard. This would not be considered a sensitive habitat.	YES
5. Agricultural cropland currently occupies 9,450 acres of land within the Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan Area, or 11 percent of the total area. Soil, climate, land cost, and on-going agricultural activities combine to create highly favorable conditions for continuing agricultural success; therefore, designate existing agricultural areas as intensive agriculture, agricultural preserve or multiple rural use to limit the intrusion of incompatible land uses into existing Agricultural areas.	The alternative would require removal of approximately 15 acres of orchards. However, there is no other agriculture in the immediate vicinity, so this would not be considered an area suitable for an agricultural preserve or intensive agriculture. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	YES
CONSERVATION AND PARKS, page 8		
2. Resource Conservation Areas have been identified to help protect valuable resources throughout the area. It is the goal of the County of San Diego to protect the environmental resources designated as "Resource Conservation Areas" in the conservation element (see Appendix A)	The alternative would be located adjacent to an existing substation, north of Pala Road (SR76), approximately 2000 ft from the San Luis Rey River. A large quarry operation exists between the site and the river. The site is an orchard. This would not be considered a sensitive habitat. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	YES

### San Diego County General Plan Part XVIII North Mountain Subregional Community Plan, 1979, amended 2002

The Proposed Project and four of the alternatives would also pass through this subregion — the Santa Ysabel Existing ROW, Santa Ysabel Partial Underground, Santa Ysabel SR79 All Underground, and SDG&E Mesa Grande alternatives. The Top of the World Substation Alternative is also located in this plan area. The North Mountain Subregional Community Plan area is located between the western boundary of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and the community of Santa Ysabel.

**San Diego County General Plan Part XVIII North Mountain Subregional Community Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Community Character Element, Pages 2-3</b>		
Policy 3: Discretionary permit requests shall identify trees which will be removed and provide for two replacement trees for each tree removed at appropriate locations elsewhere on the subject property.	Because of the need for vegetation management in the ROW, it is likely that any trees removed could be replaced within the 'property' (ROW).	YES
Policy 4: Require revegetation and landscaping of all manufactured slopes in graded areas subject to a Grading Permit, Major Use Permit or Site Plan which will be altered by development. Use native or naturalizing plants to blend with the existing topography.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) for restoration and rehabilitation activities where native plantings are disturbed.	YES
<b>Land Use Element, Pages 4-6</b>		
Goal 1: Land use within the North Mountain Subregion shall retain and enhance the rural character of the community.	The Proposed Project and overhead alternatives would not be consistent with this goal. Development of transmission lines areas would not enhance the rural character of the communities, but, rather, it would detract from the rural character. Under-ground alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	NO YES
Policy 7: Encourage preservation of areas with rare, unique or endangered wildlife and plants.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species, and provide compensatory mitigation where impacts cannot be avoided.	YES
Policy 13: All projects proposed to be located within 2,000 feet of the intersection of State Routes 78 and 79 shall be submitted to the State Department of Health Services for review.	The Proposed Project and the Mesa Grande Alternative are farther than 2,000 feet from this intersection. The remaining three alternatives would pass within 2,000 feet of the intersection. This is an area that was identified as undergoing port-remediation monitoring due to past gasoline contamination of the underlying groundwater. SDG&E would be required to conduct a Phase I study and evaluate any potential contamination of the project ROW from this site per Mitigation Measure P-7a.	YES
<b>Conservation Element, Pages 12-17</b>		
<i>[There are seven Resource Conservation Areas (RCA) in the North Mountain Subregion, which include Aqua Caliente Wilderness RCA, Henshaw Basin RCA, Mesa Grande RCA, Palomar Mountain/Aqua Tibia Wilderness RCA, San Felipe Hills RCA, Volcan Mountain RCA, and San Ysidro Mountains RCA]</i>		
Goal 1: To ensure the careful management of the environmental resources in the Plan Area in order to prevent wasteful exploitation or degradation of those resources, and to preserve resources for future use.	The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, and exotic species introduction (i.e., pets).	YES
<b>Archaeology and History Element, Page 20</b>		
Goal 1: Protect archaeological and historic resources as provided by state law.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would be in compliance with state laws and therefore consistent with this goal.	YES

**San Diego County General Plan Part XVIII North Mountain Subregional Community Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Dark Sky Element, Page 21-23</b>		
Policy 3: All development proposals shall comply with the County Light Pollution Code (Ordinances 6900 and 7041 et al., San Diego County Code).	The Proposed Central East Substation and the Top of the World Substation alternative have the potential to cause significant (Class II) night lighting impacts. However, effective implementation of Mitigation Measure V-21a would reduce night lighting impacts to a level that would be less than significant, thereby making the Proposed Project and alternative consistent with Policy 3.	YES
Policy 4: The design, type, usage and location of lighting sources shall minimize light pollution impacts.	The Proposed Central East Substation and the Top of the World Substation alternative have the potential to cause significant (Class II) night lighting impacts. However, effective implementation of Mitigation Measure V-21a would reduce night lighting impacts to a level that would be less than significant, thereby making the Proposed Project and the alternative consistent with Policy 4.	YES
Policy 5: <i>Dust Sources</i> – Any proposal requiring discretionary permit approval shall evaluate the issues which are specific to their site concerning the transmission of any form of airborne particulate matter which may become suspended in the atmosphere. Applicants shall then perform mitigation measures which minimize the amount of airborne particulates generated, to the satisfaction of the Department of Planning and Land Use. Mitigation measures shall commence at the initial phase of construction and continue during the life of the approved development.	APMs AQ-AMP-2 and -3, and Mitigation Measure AQ-1a (Suppress dust at all work or staging areas and on public roads) address dust source control and satisfy the requirements of this policy.	YES
Policy 6: Any proposals requiring discretionary permit approval which anticipate uses which will take place on unvegetated and unpaved or graveled earth shall be mitigated with proper and enforceable measures which minimize the amount of airborne particulate matter generated.	APMs AQ-AMP-2 and -3, and Mitigation Measure AQ-1a (Suppress dust at all work or staging areas and on public roads) address dust source control and satisfy the requirements of this policy.	YES

**San Diego County General Plan Part XIX, Central Mountain Community Plan, Adopted January 3, 1979, Amended April 17, 2002**

The communities of Descanso, Pine Valley, and Buckman Springs are located within the San Diego County Central Mountain Community Plan area. These policies are applicable to the Route D Alternative.

**San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>1. COMMUNITY CHARACTER, page 4</b>		
<b>GOALS</b>		
1. Preserve the small-town, rural character of the communities in the subregion and the natural ambiance of mountains, hills, valleys and public lands.	This is a general goal. The alternative that would traverse the plan area would require construction of tall transmission towers. These structures are complex and industrial in appearance. The resulting visual impact caused by these facilities would be significant (Class I). As a result, the project would not be perceived as enhancing the existing rural atmosphere.	NO
2. Encourage the protection of existing vegetation, wildlife and other natural resources.		

San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p><b>A. GENERAL</b></p> <p>2. Mature healthy trees shall be preserved whenever possible in all public and private developments except when recommended for removal by a professional forester to promote the health of the forest or by a Fire Protection District.</p> <p>3. Stands and forests of oaks, coniferous and deciduous trees shall be conserved to maintain the ambiance which defines the character of the communities in the Subregion.</p> <p>5. Discretionary permit requests should identify trees which may need to be removed and provide for three replacement trees, preferably of the same species, for each tree removed at appropriate locations elsewhere on the subject property. Replacement trees are to be healthy and maintained until established.</p> <p>6. Creeks, rivers and wetlands shall be preserved as scenic open space and should be maintained in as natural a state as possible.</p> <p>8. Grading shall be strictly limited so that structures conform to the natural terrain.</p> <p>9. Revegetate and landscape all manufactured slopes subject to a grading permit, major use permit or site plan, using native or naturalizing plants.</p>	<p>The alternative includes APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) for restoration and rehabilitation activities where native plantings are disturbed. These include minimizing land disturbance and revegetating with native plant materials. To the extent feasible, mature trees would be preserved, consistent with the ROW maintenance requirements of a transmission line. Likewise, APMs and mitigation measures provided would minimize potential impacts to creeks, rivers, and wetlands. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>2. LAND USE, page 9</b></p> <p><b>GOALS</b></p> <p><b>A. General</b></p> <p>1. Preserve the integrity of the Cleveland National Forest and the Cuyamaca Rancho State Park by minimizing impacts of activities on private inholdings or adjacent properties.</p> <p>2. Minimize impacts of activities on public lands onto private lands.</p> <p>3. Restrict development to that consistent with rural communities.</p> <p>5. Retain and enhance the rural character of communities.</p> <p>6. Preserve the natural environment and natural habitat of wildlife to the greatest extent possible.</p> <p><b>B. Pine valley</b></p> <p>1. Encourage a continuing mountain atmosphere in Guatay by planning for a balanced community.</p> <p>2. Restrict types of development in Mount Laguna to those compatible with a federally designated recreation area.</p>	<p>The alternative would minimize impacts of activities through the use of APMs and mitigation measures.</p> <p>However, by its nature, an overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. This would result in visible tower structures and scarring visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>

San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p><b>A. GENERAL</b></p> <p>5. Preserve areas with rare, unique or endangered wildlife and plants.</p> <p>7. All new and existing electrical utilities, telephone, and cable shall be put underground for safety and a more reliable systems operation whenever feasible and not damaging to the environment.</p> <p>9. No development shall be permitted on significant or prominent mountain tops, ridgelines, or summits.</p> <p>10. In order to preserve the natural terrain, extensive, unsightly, or severe grading for development, both private and public, shall be prohibited.</p> <p>11. Parcels within agriculturally zoned lands are to maintain rural character, protect steep slopes, preserve and protect open space and agriculture.</p>	<p>For the alternative, APMs and mitigation measures would be included that protect rare, unique, or endangered species. The electrical utilities referenced in this set of policies are distribution systems and not long-distance transmission facilities. Grading is limited to that necessary for access to tower construction locations and to provide maintenance access.</p> <p>However, by its nature, an overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. This would result in visible tower structures and scarring visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>INDUSTRIAL GOALS</b></p> <p><b>A. GENERAL</b></p> <p>1. Restrict industrial developments to those that serve the residents and are compatible with the rural and scenic character of the subregion, and to those industrial uses that do not adversely impact the dark sky, air quality, noise, and/or groundwater goals in the conservation chapter.</p> <p>2. In all areas dependent upon groundwater quality: prohibit facilities which will transport, use, and/or store such quantities of toxic substances as a part of their normal operation because of the potential devastating impact to groundwater that could result from leakage or spills.</p>	<p>The alternative would not adversely impact the dark sky, air quality, noise, or groundwater goals of the community. Where applicable, APMs and mitigation measures incorporated into the project address these concerns.</p> <p>However, by its nature, an overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p><b>A. GENERAL</b></p> <p>1. All new industrial uses shall be consistent with the community's design or scenic objectives.</p>	<p>An overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>CIVIC GOALS</b></p> <p>1. To preserve the character of the existing landscape by retaining important natural features, landforms, and scenic resources.</p> <p>2. To preserve and promote design to maintain a mountain village character.</p> <p>3. To preserve and enhance the quality of scenic roads.</p> <p>4. To carefully integrate development with the existing landscape, and minimize visual impacts on the community's residential neighborhoods and scenic resources.</p>	<p>The community's goals and policies place a high priority on visual and scenic resources. By its nature, an overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>

**San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>F. Site Lighting</b></p> <p>1. Lighting should be used efficiently to aid safety, security, and to compliment architectural character without intrusion into adjacent properties, roadways, and the 'dark sky' conditions due to Mount Laguna Observatory.</p>	<p>Lighting would be restricted to that necessary for safety. There are no substations proposed in the community plan area. APMs and mitigation measures included in the project require minimizing vegetation impacts and restoring the landscape. Therefore, the Proposed Project and alternatives would be consistent with the lighting and landscaping policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>H. Landscaping</b></p> <p>1. Projects should demonstrate that a diligent effort has been made to retain as many significant trees as possible. Significant trees are defined as trees measuring more than 10 inches in diameter, or with a total diameter of any two trunks of at least 16 inches, as measured 4 feet above the root crown.</p> <p>2. Significant natural features characteristics of the community's landscape shall be retained to the maximum extent possible.</p>		
<p><b>5. SCENIC HIGHWAYS/ROUTES AND SCENIC PRESERVATION GOALS</b></p> <p>1. Protect and enhance scenic views, wildlife habitats, native plant materials, and historical and recreational resources within scenic highway corridors.</p> <p>2. Protect and enhance areas designated as having scenic value.</p>	<p>An overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>

San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>2. The County should request that the State designate Highway 79 and Interstate 8 as official scenic highways by adopting a resolution of intent as specified by current guidelines for the official designation of scenic highways published by Caltrans.</p> <p>3. All development subject to the scenic regulations per The Zoning Ordinance shall also be subject to the following Policies and Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All development shall be required to show on a Site Plan how lot sizes, structures, and open space easements relate to the road identified as scenic and/or to properties from which it is visible.</li> <li>b. Development on significant or prominent peaks and ridgelines, shall be discouraged. Factors to be considered when reviewing building sites on peaks and ridgelines shall be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) How visible the Proposed Project is from a scenic road or public area (such as a park), and whether the project can be substantially screened from view;</li> <li>(b) How close the ridgeline or peak is to public areas, or a scenic road, relative to other peaks or ridgelines;</li> <li>(c) How tall the peak or ridgeline is relative to other peaks or ridgelines; and</li> <li>(d) The relative uniqueness or significance of the peak or ridgeline on which the development is proposed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Structures shall be consistent with the natural contours of the land and shall not exceed 15 feet above the peak or ridgeline.</li> <li>d. Development along Interstate 8 should site and design structures and parking areas in a way that does not detract from the scenic vistas viewed by the highway traveler. Wherever possible, structures and parking areas should be integrated into the natural setting to minimize visual impacts.</li> <li>f. All utilities shall be undergrounded whenever feasible unless undergrounding would significantly impact environmental resources.</li> </ul>	<p>An overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>

San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>j. Brushing for fire protection shall be limited to the minimum required for safety.</p> <p>k. Scenic beauty in the form of wetland meadows, streams, waterfalls, spillways, floodplains, and riverbeds shall be preserved. No concrete channelization, concrete bank protection, or rip rap shall be allowed. Natural materials shall be used for bank protection. Any proposed bank protection shall be shaped to look natural.</p> <p>m. Existing open space easements and wildlife corridors, and existing easements to historic sites and to artifact locations, shall be retained whenever feasible.</p> <p>o. Natural wood finishes, or non-glaring earth tone colors should be used on all structures. Rock or other natural materials are also encouraged.</p> <p>p. Existing mature healthy trees should be retained whenever possible. Discretionary projects should identify trees which may need to be removed and provide for replacement trees with diameters equal to those of the trees to be removed and preferably of the same species. Replacement trees are to be maintained until established.</p> <p>q. County agencies reviewing site plans, landscaping plans, and grading plans shall favor the retention of existing native vegetation, especially mature, healthy trees.</p> <p>r. Grading of roads and pads shall utilize techniques to minimize visual impacts.</p> <p>s. Lighting shall be limited to the minimum necessary for safety.</p> <p>u. Potentially unsightly features shall be screened from view by landscaping or architectural details.</p>	<p>Fire protection would be limited to that required for safety. No channelization or other disturbance of streams would be required. By its nature, an overhead transmission line does not obstruct wildlife corridors. Tower surfaces would be non-glare and in a dull finish. APMs and mitigation measures provide for minimal disturbance of vegetation beyond what is necessary for construction and maintenance. Disturbed areas would be revegetated in native plant material. Access roads would be graded to conform with hillside terrain to the extent feasible, while minimizing the amount of scaring. This would reduce visual impacts. No lighting would be required. It is infeasible to screen transmission towers from view. Therefore, to the extent feasible, the alternative would be consistent with this set of policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>FIRE PROTECTION, page 77</b>		
<p><b>GOAL</b> Protect life and property from the high fire hazard potential which exists in the subregion.</p>	<p>Vegetation management around towers and under transmission lines would serve to protect these facilities, in compliance with this goal.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>WATERCOURSES, DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL, page 84</b>		
<p><b>GOALS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protect lives and property from uncontrolled flooding while protecting natural floodplain values.</li> <li>2. Conserve hydrological and biological resources of all lakes, rivers, streams, and other wetlands by controlling waste water discharge and run-off.</li> <li>3. Preserve natural waterways for their value as recharge basins and wildlife habitat.</li> </ol>	<p>The alternative would be constructed to withstand flooding in areas prone to flooding. There would be no waste water discharge, and runoff would be controlled by measures imposed in project APMs and mitigation measures. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these goals.</p>	<p>YES</p>

San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>2. The construction of artificial drainage structures should be avoided in favor of natural channels and streambeds. Run-off and drainage shall be used for groundwater recharging where safe.</p> <p>3. Floodways shall be maintained in their natural state unless findings can be made that a threat to public safety exists.</p> <p>4. Watercourses and associated sensitive resources in the natural, undisturbed forms shall be protected by requiring ample setbacks and buffers, thus negating the need for disruptive flood control measures.</p> <p>5. Applicants proposing projects in unmapped floodplains and floodways shall engage a registered engineer to map them.</p> <p>6. Road crossings of watercourses shall be strategically placed and minimized.</p>	<p>Runoff from the alternative would be limited to that occurring on access roads and at tower sites. APMs and mitigation measures provided would ensure that runoff is minimized and that best management practices are employed. Vegetation in floodways would be undisturbed except as required for ROW maintenance. Transmission line and road alignments would be perpendicular to watercourse, thereby minimizing impacts along the edge of these water bodies. Hydrologic analyses will be used to ensure that towers at risk of being within a floodway are designed to withstand flooding. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this set of policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>8. CONSERVATION, page 91</b></p>		
<p><b>GENERAL CONSERVATION GOALS</b></p> <p>1. Ensure the careful management of environmental resources in the plan area to prevent wasteful exploitation or degradation of those resources, and to preserve them for future generations.</p>	<p>All of the APMs and mitigation measures imposed on the alternative are designed to minimize and manage impacts to resources, thereby minimizing potential degradation of these resources.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>SOILS GOAL</b></p> <p>Preserve natural landforms, water resources, aesthetic resources and soils by preventing erosion due to the development process.</p>	<p>The alternative includes APMs and mitigation measures to prevent erosion. Therefore, the project is consistent with this goal.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>1. Large-scale developments, or those with a large potential to create excessive run-off or erosion, shall provide the following analysis as part of the environmental review process:</p> <p>a. Run-off calculations -- this includes run-off volumes, rates and peak run-off flows.</p> <p>b. Soil Loss Predictions -- this includes the annual soil loss in tons per acre (or fractions thereof) from the site prior to, during, and after construction per the County Grading Ordinance.</p> <p>c. Design Management Facilities -- this includes modification of the Proposed Project as necessary to reduce soil loss by such mitigating measures as slope stabilization, vegetation protection, revegetation and other techniques which will reduce soil loss to natural or lower levels.</p> <p>2. Future road construction and improvement plans within the planning area should include revegetation elements containing plant and tree types at locations which will mitigate associated soil erosion and degradation.</p> <p>3. Forestation of areas adjacent to existing roads, structures and grading sites will be encouraged in order to reduce soil erosion.</p>	<p>This set of policies is with regard to large-scale development. The term large-scale is undefined; however, it is taken to mean development that occurs in one location and covers a large contiguous area. Cumulatively, the alternative would disturb a substantial area, albeit not at one large contiguous area. The APMs and mitigation measures imposed on the project would reduce erosion by installation of erosion controls and revegetation of disturbed surfaces. Runoff would be localized, given the nature of the project. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this set of policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>

San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE GOALS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prevent the unnecessary alteration of the natural landscape and wildlife habitat within the planning area.</li> <li>2. Whenever possible protect all sensitive lands and habitat such as coniferous forests, high montane meadows, native grasslands, diegan sage scrub, oak woodlands, montane chaparral, riparian woodlands, Vernal pools, and any other wetlands.</li> <li>3. Create open space corridors of sufficient size to maintain biological diversity and functional access for wildlife to and from water, food, and breeding areas, and to prevent the creation of biological islands.</li> <li>4. Identify and preserve endangered, threatened, or sensitive habitats, and species of plants and wildlife.</li> <li>5. Encourage the use of vegetation native to the central mountain sub-region for revegetation and landscaping, including trees, shrubs, and groundcover.</li> </ol>	<p>The alternative includes APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) for restoration and rehabilitation activities where native plantings are disturbed. These include minimizing land disturbance and revegetating with native plant materials. To the extent feasible, mature trees would be preserved, consistent with the ROW maintenance requirements of a transmission line. Pre-construction species surveys would be required to identify sensitive species and their habitats. Likewise, APMs and mitigation measures provided would minimize potential impacts to creeks, rivers, and wetlands. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Cut/fill slopes shall be limited to five feet whenever possible.</li> <li>4. Cumulative effects of habitat disturbance should be addressed during evaluation of environmental impacts of development projects.</li> <li>7. For any project requiring environmental review, biological studies will be required that specifically address wildlife movement corridors and areas of wildlife concentration whenever applicable.</li> <li>8. Any identified wildlife corridors shall be preserved by the granting to the County of an open space easement. The width of the easement will depend on the type of wildlife using the corridor and the natural topography, plus a 50-foot buffer on either side of the corridor where feasible. [CP]</li> <li>9. Biological studies addressing corridors shall attempt to identify where the corridor continues off-site for a distance of one half mile beyond the borders of the property.</li> <li>10. Ensure that open space easements for corridors will continue on adjacent parcels by mapping all identified corridors on a Master Corridor Map.</li> <li>11. Biological studies shall be required for discretionary permits where deemed necessary by County environmental review staff. These studies shall specifically address, but not be limited to, the identification of endangered, threatened, and sensitive species.</li> <li>12. Spring surveys shall be required in areas where sensitive species are known to exist.</li> </ol>	<p>The alternative includes APMs and mitigation measures that require grading to be minimized and that cut slopes be stabilized. Disturbance of habitats and the need for revegetation are addressed by APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) requiring restoration and rehabilitation activities where native plantings are disturbed. These include minimizing land disturbance and revegetating with native plant materials. Wildlife corridors would not be affected by the project, as it would provide no impediments to wildlife movements. Pre-construction species surveys would be required to identify sensitive species and their habitats. Likewise, APMs and mitigation measures provided would minimize potential impacts to creeks, rivers, and wetlands. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>VISUAL RESOURCES GOAL</b> Prevent visual blight and degradation of the visual resources in the central mountain subregion.</p>	<p>An overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>

**San Diego County General Plan Part XIX Central Mountain Community Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
2. Development shall be designed to follow the natural contours of the land and preserve hillsides, ridgetops and horizons.	An overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.	NO
4. Development along scenic roads and highways shall be designed so as not to detract from the appearance of open spaces.		
5. The standard condition that utilities be undergrounded should not be waived.		

**San Diego County General Plan Part XX Mountain Empire Subregional Plan, Adopted January 3, 1979, Amended January 11, 1995**

The Interstate 8, BCD, and Modified D Alternatives would pass through the area of the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan. Boulevard and Jacumba are located in this subregional plan area.

**San Diego County General Plan Part XX Mountain Empire Subregional Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>2. LAND USE ELEMENT, page 3</b>		
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
1. The landforms of the Subregion are an important environmental resource that should be respected in new development. Hillside grading shall be minimized and designed to blend in with the existing natural contours.	The alternatives would minimize grading to the extent feasible. To the extent feasible, the project alignment would use landforms to screen the project from view. The project would not be within the international border buffer area. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this set of policies.	YES
2. Create a buffer area of one hundred and fifty (150) feet in width along the international boundary line inclusive of the existing sixty-foot (60') Public Reserve owned by the Federal Government.		
3. Apply a ninety (90') foot setback within which no new permanent building may be built northerly of the existing (60') foot Public Reserve line. Where such ninety (90') foot setback can be shown to adversely impact a property, the owner may apply for a waiver from complying with the setback as provided for in Section 7060 of The Zoning Ordinance. [P]		
<b>INDUSTRIAL GOAL</b> Provide a land use pattern which will permit those kinds of Industrial uses which will not detract from the rural charm and lifestyle of the subregion.	This is a general goal. See discussion below of implementing policies.	

San Diego County General Plan Part XX Mountain Empire Subregional Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>6. New industrial development should consider all views into the property from public streets, adjacent properties and residences on nearby hills.</p> <p>11. Deny future industrial or commercial development which adversely impacts the Mountain Empire Subregional area, such as wind turbine generators, for any of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Safety of the general public;</li> <li>b) Unmitigated visual impact on the rural environment;</li> <li>c) Noise pollution emanating from the site exceeding 65 (decibels) dBs at the property line, as it creates great human discomfort and adversely affects the tranquility of the rural environment;</li> <li>d) Such development may lead to the economic devaluation of contiguous properties.</li> </ul>	<p>An overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>6. CONSERVATION, page 18</b></p> <p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>1. All development shall demonstrate a diligent effort to retain as many native oak trees as possible.</p> <p>3. Avoid the construction of artificial drainage structures; utilize natural channels and streambeds and require that runoff and drainage be used for groundwater recharging where applicable.</p> <p>4. Floodways shall be maintained in their natural state unless findings can be made that a threat to public safety exists. [GEN]</p> <p>6. The dark night sky is a significant resource for the Subregion and appropriate steps shall be taken to preserve it.</p> <p>7. Development shall not adversely affect the habitat of sensitive plant and wildlife species or those areas of significant scenic value.</p>	<p>The alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures that minimize disturbance of habitats and the need for revegetation. These are addressed by APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) requiring restoration and rehabilitation where native plants are disturbed. These include minimizing land disturbance and revegetating with native plant materials. Wildlife corridors would not be affected by the project, as it would provide no impediments to wildlife movements. Pre-construction species surveys would be required to identify sensitive species and their habitats. The project would require no lighting that would affect dark night skies. Likewise, APMs and mitigation measures provided would minimize potential impacts to creeks, rivers, and wetlands. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>9. SCENIC HIGHWAYS, page 26</b></p> <p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>1. Mitigate the effects of development located within or in clear view of a designated scenic corridor.</p>	<p>An overhead transmission line requires construction of towers and roads to access the towers and ROW in order to maintain the line. This requires cutting roads into the landscape. Tower structures and scarring would be visible from within the community plan area. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>

San Diego County General Plan Part XI Alpine Community Plan, Adopted December 31, 1979

The I-8, Route D, and Modified D Alternatives would pass through the community of Alpine in San Diego County. Within the community of Alpine itself, the I-8 Alternative would be underground.

San Diego County General Part XI Alpine Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>1. COMMUNITY CHARACTER</b>		
<b>GOALS, Page 3</b>		
<p>1. Preserve and seek to enhance the rural character of Alpine by maintaining a pattern of land use consistent with the following regional land use categories.</p> <p>A. Country town Preserve and enhance the village character of the country town (town center) defined by the current central hub of industrial, commercial and higher density residential land use designations.</p> <p>B. Country residential development area (CRDA). Preserve and maintain the CRDA, (1 acre minimum zoning) as a buffer between the country town and the estate residential development area.</p> <p>C. Estate development area. Preserve and maintain the overall rural character of the estate residential development area (2 acre minimum zoning within the boundaries of the county water authority) as a transition between CRDA and the rural residential development area.</p> <p>D. Rural development area. Preserve and maintain the overall rural character of the rural development area (four acre minimum zoning outside the boundaries of the county water authority) outside the estate residential development area.</p>	<p>Although the alternative would be underground for approximately 8.8 miles through the community of Alpine, overhead structures would be constructed within the community plan area on either side of the town. Outside of town, tower structures and scarring from access roads would be visible. The line would be particularly visible where it would cross over I-8 on the east side of town. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	NO
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<p>4. Site designs should:</p> <p>a. Be in harmony with existing topography.</p> <p>b. Grading shall not unduly disrupt the natural terrain, or cause problems associated with runoff, drainage, erosion, or siltation. Landscape disturbed by grading shall be revegetated.</p> <p>c. Have grading plans which maximize retention of sensitive native vegetation, existing tree stands, and rock outcroppings, and natural topography.</p> <p>6. Require retention of mature trees wherever possible, in all public and private development projects.</p> <p>9. Consider the impact of proposed development on adjacent historic structures and archaeological sites.</p> <p>10. Riparian vegetation shall be maintained or enhanced in and along the existing floodways and creeks, wherever possible.</p> <p>11. Projects that propose to grade along the existing floodplain fringes shall landscape the creek embankments with natural vegetation and enhance the natural edge of the creek.</p> <p>12. Whenever channelization of existing floodways is necessary to protect existing structures, only natural materials shall be used for bank protection except at road crossings.</p> <p>14. Developments shall preserve and protect existing sensitive resources.</p>	<p>The alternative includes APMs and mitigation measures that minimize disturbance of habitats and the need for revegetation. These are addressed by APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) requiring restoration and rehabilitation where native plants are disturbed. APMs and mitigation measures provided in the alternative would minimize potential impacts to creeks, rivers, and wetlands. The proximity of cultural resources would be taken into account during construction and final siting of structures. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.</p>	YES

San Diego County General Part XI Alpine Community Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Industrial)</b></p> <p>5. Industrial uses shall be aesthetically compatible with the surrounding areas. Any industrial development shall be clean and non-polluting.</p> <p>7. All new industrial activities shall provide landscape buffering or screening.</p>	<p>Outside of town, tower structures and scarring from access roads would be visible. The line would be particularly visible where it would cross over I-8 on the east side of town. It is not feasible to make these aesthetically compatible or to use landscape screening. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>1. Encourage the use of open space easements, public ownerships and other means of preserving and enhancing scenic highway corridors.</p> <p>2. Support priorities for scenic highway corridors in the Alpine Plan area as follows: Interstate 8, second priority; Lyons Valley Road, third priority; Japatul Road for its intersection with Lyons Valley Road to its intersection with Interstate 8, third priority, pursuant to language of the Scenic Highway Element of the County General Plan.</p> <p>3. Proposed development within the following scenic view corridors should be done with extreme care to preserve these vistas, i.e., minimize grading, clearing and destruction of natural and topographical features. View corridors are:  -- From I-8 toward El Capitan Reservoir;  -- East and west views of Viejas Mountain from I-8; and  -- From I-8 south along Sweetwater River.</p>	<p>Although the alternative would be underground for approximately 8.8 miles though the community of Alpine, overhead structures would be constructed within the community plan area on either side of the town. Outside of town, tower structures and scarring from access roads would be visible. The line would be particularly visible where it would cross over I-8 on the east side of town. Therefore, the project would not be consistent with this policy with regard to scenic character.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p><b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p>1. Encourage the protection and conservation of unique resources in the Alpine Planning Area.</p> <p>6. Utilize all measures to preserve rare, threatened, or endangered plant life; including on-site protection through open space easement. Off-site propagation for reintroduction of suitable habitat to be coordinated by the Conservation Subcommittee.</p> <p>7. Protect the rare Engleman Oak wherever possible.</p> <p>9. In reviewing discretionary permits, special attention shall be given to oak trees and boulder outcroppings.</p> <p>11. Preserve Riparian woodland as an important component of habitat for wildlife, and as a necessary corridor of movement between different ecosystems, essential to the viability of wildlife populations.</p> <p>12. Wherever possible, the character of ridgelines shall be preserved. This policy shall not exclude two story structures. However, project design shall minimize visual impacts.</p> <p>13. Encourage the effective implementation of the Grading Ordinance as related to maintenance of revegetated slopes and enforcement of permit requirements.</p> <p>15. Protect surface and groundwater supplies from pollution.</p> <p>25. Promote the use of alternate and renewable, non-polluting energy system.</p>	<p>The Interstate 8 Alternative includes APMs and mitigation measures that minimize disturbance of habitats and the need for revegetation. These are addressed by APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) requiring restoration and rehabilitation where native plants are disturbed. These include minimizing land disturbance and revegetating with native plant materials. Wildlife corridors would not be affected by the project, as it would provide no impediments to wildlife movements. Pre-construction species surveys would be required to identify sensitive species and their habitats. Likewise, APMs and mitigation measures provided would minimize potential impacts to creeks, rivers, and wetlands. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>

**San Diego County General Part XI Alpine Community Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<p>3. Incorporation of open space areas as integral parts of project site designs, preserving environmental resources, providing recreation for residents, and buffers to maintain neighborhood identities.</p> <p>6. Encourage preservation of riparian habitat in corridors that connect larger habitats.</p> <p>7. Whenever channelization is necessary to protect existing structures, only natural materials shall be used for bank protection except at road crossings, and even then natural materials should be given preference to enhance the visual impact.</p> <p>8. Floodplains and watercourses in proposed developments should be protected.</p> <p>12. Enhance health and safety and conserve natural resources through the preservation of open space.</p>	<p>The alternative includes APMs and mitigation measures that minimize disturbance of habitats and the need for revegetation. These are addressed by APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) requiring restoration and rehabilitation where native plants are disturbed. These include minimizing land disturbance and revegetating with native plant materials. Wildlife corridors would not be affected by the project, as it would provide no impediments to wildlife movements. Pre-construction species surveys would be required to identify sensitive species and their habitats. Likewise, APMs and mitigation measures provided would minimize potential impacts to creeks, rivers, and wetlands. Therefore, the project would be consistent with these policies.</p>	YES

**San Diego County General Plan Part XXI Desert Subregional Plan, Adopted January 3, 1979, Amended January 11, 1995**

This subregional plan is applicable to two alternatives, the Borrego Springs Peaker Plant Alternative and the Borrego Springs Solar Thermal Renewable Generation Alternative, both of which would be located in Borrego Springs.

**San Diego County General Plan Part XXI Desert Subregional Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>1. COMMUNITY CHARACTER, page 3</b>		
<p>3. Emphasize drought tolerant landscaping for projects where landscape plans are required. Non-drought-tolerant plants may be used provided they are irrigated by an appropriate low-water-use system.</p> <p>5. Commercial property lighting shall emphasize down-lighting. Security lighting shall be allowed but limited to that essential to the function.</p>	<p>No landscaping would be required within the industrial sites; however, if landscaping is required around the sites or at entrance points, it would be in drought tolerant plants. Lighting would be down lighting, commensurate with needs for safety and security. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>	YES
<b>6. CONSERVATION, page 15</b>		
<p>6. To protect the dark night skies, which are necessary for the proper utilization of the nearby observatories, the lighting ordinance shall be revised so that the intensity of lights and the number necessary for safety purposes can be kept at an absolute minimum.</p> <p>8. Where new development occurs preserve and re-use existing native flora on the site to the extent feasible and practical.</p>	<p>No landscaping would be required within the industrial sites; however, if landscaping is required around the sites or at entrance points, it would be in drought tolerant plants. Lighting would be down lighting, commensurate with needs for safety and security. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>	YES

**San Diego County – Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve Draft Resource Management Plan, February 2006**

The Santa Ysabel Existing ROW alternative would pass through the area covered by the Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve Draft Resource Management Plan (dated February 24, 2006). The Plan is intended

to guide the Department of Parks and Recreation in the adaptive management of the preserve. This is a draft plan that will be revised. The first revision is expected after the adoption of the East County Multiple Species Conservation Plan (ECMSCP). The SYOSP Draft Resource Management Plan will be revised to conform to the management and monitoring requirements of the ECMSCP.

The preserve is divided into two areas: SYOSP East and SYOSP West. The eastern portion of the preserve is located east of SR79 and north of SR78 and covers approximately 3,800 acres; the western area is located west of SR79 and north of SR78 and covers approximately 1,512 acres.

<b>Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve Draft Open Space Resource Management Plan, 2006</b>		
<b>Applicable Policies</b>	<b>Consistency Determination</b>	<b>Consistent</b>
<b>Biological Element</b>		
<b>Flora, Pages 29-30</b>		
Goal 1: Maintain the quality and diversity of native habitat types onsite.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, access roads, surveying, applicable laws/regulations, brush clearing, exotic species introduction, etc.	YES
<b>Invasive Plant Species, Pages 30-31</b>		
Goal 1: Reduce, control, and where feasible eradicate invasive flora known to be detrimental to native species and/or local ecosystems.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat by invasive species. Mitigation Measure B-1a requires restoration of all temporarily disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, -20, -23, and -25 include restoration of disturbed areas with native species that address the potential for exotic species introduction.	YES
Goal 2: Maintain diverse populations of sensitive plant species.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat by invasive species. Mitigation Measure B-1a requires restoration of all temporarily disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, -20, -23, and -25 include restoration of disturbed areas with native species that address the potential for exotic species introduction.	YES
<b>Herpetofauna, Page 32</b>		
Goal: Maintain high quality habitat for herpetofauna.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures that address impacts to habitats and sensitive species. In addition, with regard to herpetofauna in particular, Mitigation Measure B-7a and APMs BIO-APM-24 and -26 address potential impacts to herpetofauna.	YES

**Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve Draft Open Space Resource Management Plan, 2006**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Ants, Page 32</b>		
Goal: Maintain the diverse native ant population.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project and include mitigation measures that address impacts to habitats and sensitive species. Projects that impact native ant populations are typically those that increase the presence of exotic ant species that out-compete native ants. Exotic ants, such as Argentine ants, can be introduced when permanent landscape irrigation is introduced next to native habitat areas, which is not the case with this project.	YES
<b>Avifauna, Pages 32-33</b>		
Goal: Maintain diverse and healthy populations of avifauna species.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project would be subject to APMs and mitigation measures that address impacts to habitats and sensitive species. With regard to avifauna in particular, BIO-APM-21 and Mitigation measures B-11a through -11e include measures to reduce collisions with transmission lines; protocol bird surveys and appropriate mitigation will be implemented for listed species (Mitigation measures B-7d and -7e; and Mitigation measures B-8a and B-13a requires avoidance of impacts to breeding birds.	YES
<b>Bats, Pages 33-34</b>		
Goal: Maintain diverse and healthy populations of bat species.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. Bat colonies could be affected by the alternatives. In addition to mitigation measures and APMs included for the project to reduce impacts to biological resources generally, Mitigation Measure B-9 would specifically address project impacts to bat colonies.	YES
<b>Small Mammals, Pages 34-35</b>		
Goal 1: Maintain diverse and healthy populations of small mammal species.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. Mitigation Measure B-7k requires surveys and implementation of mitigation for Stephens' kangaroo rat. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, including covering of construction holes and providing slopes in excavation trenches to allow for escape by small animals, including small mammals (APMs BIO-APM-24 and -26.	YES

Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve Draft Open Space Resource Management Plan, 2006

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Medium and Large Mammals, Page 35</b></p> <p>Goal: Maintain diverse and healthy populations of medium and large mammal species.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this policy. The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. Applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas, such as covering construction holes and trenches overnight to prevent wildlife from falling in (BIO-APM-24).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Cultural Resources Element</b></p>		
<p><b>Stewardship, Pages 35-36</b></p>		
<p>Preservation Objective: The DPR will preserve and maintain the cultural resources balancing the need for public access with the need to preserve cultural and natural resources.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this objective through implementation of Mitigation measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal: Identify, record, and assess significance of all cultural resources within SYOSP.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this objective through implementation of Mitigation measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan) and C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>Preservation, Pages 36-37</b></p>		
<p>Goal 1: Preserve and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.</p> <p>No ground disturbing activities are allowed on or in any cultural resource site in SYOSP until the impacts have been assessed and mitigation measures established. Any person conducting research of any kind within SYOSP shall obtain a Right of Entry Permit, which outlines the precautions to be taken to preserve and protect cultural resources</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this objective through implementation of Mitigation measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan), C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans), C-5a (Protect and monitor NRHP and/or CRHR-eligible properties).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Goal 2: Identify, eliminate, and/or reduce/mitigate impacts to cultural resources from natural or human-caused events.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this objective through implementation of Mitigation measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE), C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources), C-1c (Develop and implement Historic Properties Treatment Plan), C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans), C-5a (Protect and monitor NRHP and/or CRHR-eligible properties).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>All trails and roads in SYOSP shall avoid impacts to any cultural resources.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this objective through implementation of Mitigation measures C-1a (Inventory and evaluate cultural resources in the Final APE) and C-1b (Avoid and protect potentially significant resources).</p>	<p>YES</p>

**Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve Draft Open Space Resource Management Plan, 2006**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Consultation, Page 37</b>		
Goal: Conduct frequent consultation with the Santa Ysabel Tribe in order to identify appropriate management of precontact and ethnographic cultural resources.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with this objective through implementation of Mitigation Measure C-2a (Consult with agencies and Native Americans).	YES

**San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority – San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan (1994, update 2002)**

The Proposed Project as well as three Santa Ysabel alternatives — Santa Ysabel Existing ROW, Santa Ysabel Partial Underground, and Santa Ysabel SR79 Alternatives — would pass through the San Dieguito Park Concept Plan area. Various jurisdictions in San Diego County have created a concept plan for a park in the San Dieguito River watershed. The Proposed Project and alternatives would cross through the park area in the vicinity of Santa Ysabel. This park would involve a mix of public and private lands and, on private lands, would rely on easements to provide continuity among the various units of the planned park. At this time, there is no management plan for the planned park.

**San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
Policy: Public land shall be used only for the benefit of the public, and for uses consistent with the goals of the Park.	The Proposed Project and the alternatives would cross the San Dieguito River Park near Santa Ysabel west of Highway 79. They would not be on public land.	YES
<b>Floodplain Objectives, page 77</b>		
<p>The 100-year floodplain and sheetflow areas shall be maintained in open configuration with a natural channel and room for normal stream waters to meander through the floodplain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No infilling or encroachment in the floodplain which results in a net loss of flood water carrying capacity will be allowed.</li> <li>The 100-year floodplain and sheetflow areas will be reserved for open space uses such as recreation, wildlife habitat or agriculture; development will not take place within them.</li> </ul>	Installation of structures (towers) in floodplains is avoided where feasible. However, depending on final design, footings may be required in the 100-year floodplain, in which case the project would not be consistent with this objective.	MAYBE
<b>Conservation Objectives, page 77</b>		
<p>There shall be a continuous riparian habitat corridor along the entire San Dieguito River and its tributary canyons in the focused planning area in order to permit wildlife to move freely along the corridor and between water sources and habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The corridor shall have enough critical mass to ensure a fully functioning natural ecosystem.</li> <li>The natural character and visual quality of the open space corridor shall be preserved.</li> </ul>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to vegetation communities, including riparian habitat.</p> <p>The Proposed Project and overhead alternatives in the vicinity of the San Dieguito River Park would result in significant (Class I) visual impacts. Overhead arrangements would not preserve the visual quality of the open space corridor.</p> <p>However, the underground alternative along Route 79 would maintain the natural character and visual quality of the open space corridor.</p>	NO/YES

**San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Natural Economic Resources Objectives, pages 77-78</b>		
<p><b>Agriculture:</b> Agriculture is a significant resource which provides a valuable form of open space in San Diego County. This resource benefits the community as a whole, and is a land use compatible with many of the objectives of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Plan. Efforts should be made to encourage the continued viability of this valuable resource.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would not hinder the San Dieguito River Park's efforts to encourage the viability of agriculture, and it would not substantially affect the compatibility of agricultural uses with the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park. The Proposed Project and alternatives include a number of APMs and design/operation measures to allow continued agricultural use and maintain compatibility with agricultural operations, including, but not limited to, minimizing the placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations wherever feasible.</p>	YES
<b>Natural Economic Resources Objectives, pages 80-81</b>		
<p><b>Design:</b> The intent of the design objective is to retain to the extent possible the rural character and small scale of development so that it impinges as little as possible on the natural, open space of the focused planning area.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and overhead alternatives would cross the San Dieguito River Park in Santa Ysabel Valley. This would result in significant (Class I) visual impacts. Overhead arrangements would not preserve the visual quality of the open space corridor. However, the underground alternative along Route 79 would maintain the natural character and visual quality of the open space corridor.</p>	NO/YES
<p><b>Architecture:</b> Structures shall be fit to the land instead of the land to the structure.</p> <p>Structures in the park plan area shall be of a compatible color scheme and style which reflects the natural beauty of the surroundings.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would introduce prominent, structurally complex facilities with industrial character into the predominantly rural landscape of Santa Ysabel Valley. Project characteristics (scale, form, line, and color) would not be compatible with the existing landscape character. However, the underground alternative along Route 79 would maintain the natural character and visual quality of the open space corridor.</p>	NO/YES

San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Circulation (Roads and Trails) Objectives, page 81</b>		
<p>The number of road crossings of the river basin and focused planning area shall be minimized. Where crossings are necessary, utilize designs that are sensitive to the visual and natural quality of the River Park.</p> <p>Access roads and trails shall follow the natural contours of the land and shall be built as sensitively to the environment as possible.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing public roads and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would minimize motor vehicle impacts to surrounding biological resources. APMs BIO-APM-3, -17, and -18 specifically address the issue of motor vehicle access for the Proposed Project and alternatives, encouraging the use of existing ROW and access roads wherever possible. They require using sensitive practices for avoidance of resources when existing access roads cannot be used.</p> <p>The Proposed Project would include the introduction of access and spur roads into the valley landscape. New roads could compromise the integrity of the river basin by creating unnatural or more prominent lines of demarcation in vegetative patterns. Also, land scarring from construction activities would persist for an extended period of time due to the slow recovery and recruitment rates in semi-arid landscapes. However, effective implementation of Mitigation Measures V-2a through V-2c would reduce land scarring and road construction impacts to less than significant levels, thereby making the Proposed Project consistent with this objective.</p>	YES

San Diego County – Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan MCAS Miramar, ~~1977~~ 1992, amended 2004

The Proposed Project would pass through a portion of MCAS Miramar (formerly NAS Miramar). The Comprehensive Land Use Plan for MCAS Miramar was prepared by SANDAG with the assistance of the NAS Miramar Comprehensive Land Use Plan Advisory Committee. The role of the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) has since been transferred to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority. The purpose of the Miramar ALUCP is to protect the airport for incompatible land uses...and to ensure that no structures affect navigable airspace. This plan is mandated by Section 21675 of the Public Utilities Code.

Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan MCAS Miramar, San Diego, California, ~~1977~~ 1992, amended 2004

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Attachment A, Page 3</b>		
<p>iii. Designate as "Incompatible" any proposed development project that has been determined by the FAA to be a "hazard" to airspace navigation pursuant to FAR Part 77 requirements.</p>	<p>SDG&amp;E would obtain permits from both the FAA and DoD prior to any construction on military lands. Compliance with the permits would ensure that the project is compatible with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan MCAS Miramar.</p>	YES

**Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan MCAS Miramar, San Diego, California, ~~1977~~ 1992, amended 2004**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**VII. Height restriction and obstruction determination, Page 14**

<p>Height and observation restrictions are necessary to insure that no object will interfere with the safe operation of aircraft or deny operational capability of the Airport. Any development proposal that includes an object over two hundred (200) feet above ground level or which penetrates the 100:1 slope extending 20,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway must be submitted to the FAA for and obstruction evaluation (see pocket map). The Airport Authority and Miramar must be notified of these proposals by the applicant.</p>	<p>SDG&amp;E would obtain permits from both the FAA and DoD prior to any construction on military lands. Compliance with the permits would ensure that the project is compatible with height and observation restrictions.</p>	<p>YES</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

The following would be incompatible with the airfield's operations:

1. Objects penetrating the 100:1 surface (described above) that are not noticed to the FAA, ALUC and Miramar for analysis.
2. Objects determined to be an obstruction or hazard by FAR Part 77 or Department of Transportation/FAA Terminal Instrument Procedures, Chapter 12 criteria. (See below for FAR Part 77 discussion.)
3. Objects which would require a permanent change to air station flight operations, approach minimums or departure routes.

The following should also be examined for compatibility:

5. Used which emit or reflect light which would interfere with aircrew vision.
6. Used which produce emissions which would interfere with aircraft communications systems, navigation systems or other electrical systems.

**VII. FAR Part 77-Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Pages 14 and 15**

<p>Any proposed new construction or expansion of existing structures that would penetrate any of the FAR Part 77 imaginary surfaces of the Airport would be considered an incompatible land use. Therefore, any discretionary construction project that had been determined to be a "hazard" to airspace navigation by the FAA is not in conformance with the ALUCP.</p>	<p>SDG&amp;E would obtain permits from both the FAA and DoD prior to any construction on military lands. Compliance with the permits would ensure that the project is compatible with objects affecting navigable airspace policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

**SANDAG – Regional Comprehensive Plan, July 2004**

The Regional Comprehensive Plan would be applicable the Proposed Project and all alternatives that would occur in San Diego County and its incorporated cities. A primary purpose of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is to engage in regional cooperative comprehensive planning. Geographically, it covers San Diego County and its incorporated municipalities. The Regional Comprehensive Plan is based on local general and regional plans. The current Regional Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2004, integrates land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional framework, in cooperation with member agencies and the public.

SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Chapter 4D. Healthy Environment – Enhancing Our Natural Habitat, Air, Water, and Beaches.</b>		
<b>Natural Habitats Policy Objectives and Recommended Actions, Page 153</b>	As noted previously, the Proposed Project and alternatives include APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species.	YES
1. Preserve and maintain natural biological communities and species native to the region.		
2. Protect agricultural lands for future crop production and for functions described in habitat conservation plans.	The Proposed Project would not substantially hinder SANDAG's ability to protect agricultural lands for agricultural uses and other functions defined in HCPs. The Proposed Project establishes APMs and design/operation measures (e.g., avoiding placement of facilities such as new access roads in active agricultural areas and locating facilities along the edge of active agricultural operations wherever feasible) to minimize impacts to agriculture. A number of alternatives are being considered to further reduce agricultural impacts. Based on these considerations, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this objective. (Biological Resources, Agriculture)	
<b>Planning, Design, and Coordination Actions, Page 153</b>	The Proposed Project and alternatives facilities would require brush clearing and tree trimming in response to fire and safety issues. APM-BIO-9 and -16 address potential issues associated with brush clearing and tree trimming issues. The long-term impact of habitat lost due to brush clearing will be addressed by the required habitat mitigation under Mitigation Measure B-1a.	YES
4. Consider wildfires when designing future developments to increase public safety while avoiding excessive clearing, fragmentation and degradation of natural habitats.		
<b>Program and Project Development and Implementation, Page 154</b>	The Proposed Project and alternatives would not include landscaping features as part of project design. However, the Proposed Project does include APMs (i.e., BIO-APM-8, -13, -16, -19, -20, -22, -23, and -25) and mitigation measures (i.e., B-1a, -2a, and -5a) for restoration and rehabilitation activities where native plantings are disturbed.	YES
3. Identify and implement programs for the use of native plants in the landscaping of public facilities, and encourage the use of native landscaping in private landscaping.		
<b>Air Quality Policy Objectives and Recommended Actions, Page 182</b>	The Proposed Project would comply with regional air quality standards.	YES
<b>Program and Project Development and Implementation</b>		
1. Continue to implement the Regional Air Quality Strategy to achieve federal and state air quality standards.		
<b>Chapter 4F. Public Facilities-Strengthening the Social and Physical Infrastructure of Our communities</b>		
<b>Energy Policy Objectives and Recommended Actions, Page 221</b>	Refer to Section [redacted] (Environmental Justice) for a discussion of consistency determination.	YES
4. Locate energy facilities, such as power plants and/or transmission lines, so that lower income and minority communities are not disproportionately negatively affected.		

SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan, 2004

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Chapter 6. Social Equity &amp; Environmental Justice Assessment – Fair Planning and Development for All Communities</b>		
Urban Form Goals, Policy Objectives, and Recommended Actions, Page 297	While the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be considered a development project that preserves natural resources, per se, APMs and mitigation measures have been included for the Proposed Project to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species. In addition, applicable APMs and mitigation measures include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate work practices in sensitive areas  The design and siting of the proposed route would be located in designated corridors in the most developed areas of the County, but not all locations. However, the proposed route would vary from existing corridors in the Central Link. The Proposed Project establishes APMs and design/operation measures to minimize land use related impacts (e.g., locating facilities between open space and agricultural land to avoid urban areas). Within San Diego County, the Proposed Project would result in adverse visual impacts ranging from significant and unmitigable (Class I) to adverse but less than significant (Class III). In all cases where adverse visual impacts occur, the project would not be perceived as preserving the natural resource, the aesthetics of the natural resource, or the view of the natural resource. See Figures D.3-6A/B through D.3-27A/B for views within San Diego County.	NO
1. Implement development projects and plans that : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve our natural resources</li> <li>• Avoid and mitigate incompatible land uses, for example, by establishing buffers or transition zones between housing and industrial uses or major transportation corridors that could pose health risks.</li> </ul>		
Public Facilities, Page 303	Refer to Section H Other CEQA and NEPA Requirement (Environmental Justice) for a discussion of consistency determination.	YES
1. Locate energy facilities, such as power plants and/or transmission lines, so that lower income and minority communities are not disproportionately negatively affected.		

City of San Diego General Plan and Updates (1979 *et seq.*)

The Proposed Project as well as three alternatives — Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North, Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road, and Black Mountain to Park Village Road Underground Alternatives — would be in the area covered by the City of San Diego’s General Plan. The Plan was adopted in April 1979. Since that date there have been numerous amendments to the plan. A comprehensive update of the General Plan is underway. The Draft EIR for the plan was released in April 2007. As of this writing, adoption of the new plan is anticipated to occur in fall 2007.

City of San Diego General Plan and Updates (1979 *et seq.*)

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element (July 2006 Draft)</b>		
E. Open Space Lands and Resource-Based Parks Goals	The Proposed Project and alternatives would adversely affect the views from Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve. Therefore, it would not be consistent with this goal.	NO
a. Include only those development features and amenities that do not encroach upon or harm the feature or resource that inspires the open space or resource-based park.		

**City of San Diego General Plan and Updates (1979 *et seq.*)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Urban Design Element (May 2006 Draft)</b>		
<b>Buildings Adjacent to Natural Features</b> UD-A.3: Design development adjacent to natural features in a sensitive manner to highlight and complement the natural environment in areas designated for development.	The Proposed Project and alternatives would be located adjacent to a variety of natural features (deserts, inland valleys, mountains, and ridges). The Proposed Project characteristics (structural prominence and complexity, visual contrast, and industrial character) would not be consistent with or complementary to the existing natural landscape features.	NO
<b>Conservation Element (May 2006 Draft)</b>		
<b>Goals/Policies</b> CE-A.1. Open Space Preservation. Protect and conserve the landforms and open spaces that define the city's urban form, serve as habitat, and provide recreational opportunities. c. Ensure the protection of urban canyons and other community open spaces that have been designated in community plans for long-term open space use primarily because of their value in protecting landforms, providing buffers within and between communities or potentially incompatible land uses, providing visually appealing open spaces, and protecting watershed and other open space systems of community importance (see also Recreation Element, RE-F.2, for urban canyons).	The Proposed Project and alternative would adversely affect the views from and toward Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve. Therefore, it would not be consistent with this goal.	NO
<b>E. Biological Diversity Goal</b> A healthy regional ecosystem with biological diversity and conservation of endangered, threatened, and key sensitive species and their habitats. CE-E.1. Preserve natural habitats pursuant to the MSCP, preserve rare plants and animals to the maximum extent practicable, and manage all city-owned native habitats to ensure their long-term biological viability. b. Discourage the planting of any invasive plant species adjacent to open space preserves.	While the Proposed Project and alternatives would not be subject to local regulatory policies, including the MSCP, the project includes APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to habitat and sensitive species, and where avoidance of impacts is not possible, provide compensatory mitigation. Mitigation Measure B-1a requires restoration of all temporarily disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, -20, -23, and -25 include restoration of disturbed areas with native species that address the potential for exotic species introduction.	YES
<b>Historic Preservation Element (July 2006 Draft)</b>		
Integration of historic preservation planning in the larger planning process. Identification of the historical resources of the City. e. Encourage the consideration of historical and cultural resources early in the development review process. f. Make the results of historical and cultural resources planning efforts available to land use planning agencies, the public and other interested parties to the extent legally permissible.	The Proposed Project and alternatives are consistent with these goals through implementation of APMs and mitigations measures requiring compliance with state and federal laws and regulations regarding cultural resources.	YES
<b>Noise Element (May 2006 Draft)</b>		
<b>Goals/Policies</b> A. Noise and Land Use Compatibility Goal Consider existing and future noise levels when making land use planning decisions to minimize people's exposure to excessive noise. NE-A.1. Separate excessive noise-generating uses and residential and other noise-sensitive land uses with sufficient spatial buffer of less sensitive uses.	While the Proposed Project and alternatives would cause a substantial noise increase, the future noise levels would not exceed the noise level thresholds for compatible land uses. The project includes APMs and mitigation measures to minimize construction impacts.	YES

**City of San Diego General Plan and Updates (1979 *et seq.*)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>NE-A.2. Assure the appropriateness of proposed developments relative to existing and future noise levels by consulting the guidelines for noise-compatible land use (shown on Table NE1) to minimize the effects on noise-sensitive land uses.</p> <p>NE-A.4. Require an acoustical study showing the ability to meet noise guidelines for proposed developments in areas where the existing or future noise level exceeds or would exceed the “compatible” noise level thresholds as indicated on the Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table NE-2).</p> <p>G. Construction, Refuse Vehicles, Parking Lot Sweepers, and Public Nuisance Noise Goal</p> <p>Minimal exposure of residential and other noise-sensitive land uses to excessive construction, refuse vehicles, and parking lot sweeper-related noise.</p> <p>NE-G.1. Limit the hours of operation for non-emergency construction activity in residential areas.</p> <p>H. Typical Noise Attenuation Methods Goal</p> <p>Attenuate the effect of noise on future residential and other noise-sensitive land uses by applying feasible noise mitigation measures.</p> <p>NE-H.1. Require noise attenuation measures to reduce the noise to an acceptable noise level for proposed developments to ensure an acceptable interior noise level, as appropriate, in accordance with California’s noise insulation standards (CCR Title 24) and Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.</p>		

**City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan Subarea Plan – 1997**

The City of San Diego’s MSCP Subarea Plan has been prepared to meet the requirements of the California Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act. The Plan applies to the Proposed Project and the alternatives within the city — the Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North, Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road, and Black Mountain Park Village Road Underground Alternatives. This Subarea Plan forms the basis for the implementing agreement that is the contract between the City and wildlife agencies that ensures implementation of the Subarea Plan and allows the City to issue take permits at the local level.

**City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan – 1997**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>1.4.1 Compatible Land Uses</p> <p>The following land uses are considered conditionally compatible with the biological objectives of the MSCP and thus will be allowed within the City’s MHPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utility lines and roads in compliance with Policies in 1.4.2 below</li> </ul>	<p>See below.</p>	

City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan – 1997

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>1.4.2 General Planning Policies and Design Guidelines The following general planning policies and design guidelines should be applied in the review and approval of development projects within or adjacent to the MHPA.</p> <p>Roads and Utilities – Construction and Maintenance Policies</p> <p>1. All proposed utility lines (e.g., sewer, water, etc.) should be designed to avoid or minimize intrusion into the MHPA. These facilities should be routed through developed or developing areas rather than the MHPA, where possible. If no other routing is feasible, then the lines should follow previously existing roads, easements, rights of way, and disturbed areas, minimizing habitat fragmentation.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would minimize motor vehicle impacts to surrounding biological resources. That portion of the project which would be located in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve MHPA is being undergrounded in an existing dirt road and in an existing ROW corridor to minimize impacts to the preserve. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>2. All new development utilities and facilities within or crossing the MHPA shall be planned, designed, located and constructed to minimize environmental impacts. All such activities must avoid disturbing the habitat of MSCP covered species and wetlands. If avoidance is infeasible, mitigation will be required.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project and alternatives would use existing ROW and access roads to the greatest extent possible, which would minimize motor vehicle impacts to surrounding biological resources. That portion of the project which would be located in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve MHPA is being undergrounded in an existing dirt road and in an existing ROW corridor to minimize impacts to the preserve. Mitigation for impacts to sensitive vegetation communities is provided (See Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>3. Temporary construction areas and roads, staging areas, or permanent access roads must not disturb existing habitat unless determined to be unavoidable. All such activities must occur on existing agricultural lands or in other disturbed areas rather than in habitat. If temporary habitat disturbance is unavoidable, then restoration of, and/or mitigation for, the disturbed area after project completion will be required.</p>	<p>Temporary construction areas will be identified and either revegetated or mitigated (See Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a). Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>4. Construction and maintenance activities in wildlife corridors must avoid significant disruption of corridor usage. Environmental documents and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs covering such development must clearly specify how this will be achieved, and construction plans must contain all the pertinent information and be readily available to crews in the field. Training of construction crews and field workers must be conducted to ensure that all conditions are met. A responsible party must be specified.</p>	<p>APMs and mitigation measures are included in the Proposed Project and alternatives that ensure that construction and maintenance activities minimize impacts to wildlife corridors. Applicable APMs include measures specific to personnel training regarding appropriate construction and work practices in sensitive areas. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan

The Proposed Project alignment is through the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve. The Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan (dated November 1998) prepared for the City of San Diego and County of San Diego discusses the management and development of Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve.

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is located in the City of San Diego between the I-5 and I-15 freeways, some 12 miles north of the City’s urban center. The Preserve is composed of two large coastal canyons and currently includes over 3,000 acres of publicly owned property.

The responsibilities for operating and maintaining the Preserve are currently divided among several entities by virtue of land ownership or lease agreements. The partners in this effort will include the City and County of San Diego and their private lessees and concessionaires, as well as private landowners and utility companies. San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) has an easement over City owned land. Certain trails in the Preserve are actually utility service roads following SDG&E transmission lines or sewer lines. Maintenance of these roads is the responsibility of the respective utility.

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan – 1998		
Applicable Segment: Coastal Link		
Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>General Concept, Page 4</b>		
<p>Concept 1: The primary objective of Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve should be the preservation and enhancement of its natural and cultural resources. Recreational and educational use by the public should be the secondary objective.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project includes APMs and mitigation measures that are intended to avoid and minimize impacts from construction and during operation, and to provide mitigation where avoidance is not possible. Mitigation for impacts to sensitive vegetation communities is provided (See Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a.) Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>Long-Range Management, Page 6</b>		
<p>Goal 4: Rules and regulations should be strictly enforced, with particular emphasis on environmental preservation and vehicle and fire control.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures and APMs included in the Proposed Project minimize impacts to sensitive resources. Post-construction maintenance vehicle travel associated with maintenance of the line is expected to be no different that concurrently occurs, and there would be no increased fire hazards. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>Operating Responsibilities and Revenues Element, Pages 50-51</b>		
<p>Certain trails in the Preserve are actually utility service roads following SDG&amp;E transmission lines or sewer lines. Maintenance of these roads is the responsibility of the respective utility. Maintenance of these roads should include sensitive brush and weed control to reduce fire hazard, erosion control, and removal of obstructions such as tree limbs.</p>	<p>Access roads for the project will be located in areas where roads already exist or in non-sensitive areas. Project personnel will receive training regarding sensitive use and maintenance of access roads. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan – 1998

Applicable Segment: Coastal Link

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Environmental Management Element, Pages 52-54</p> <p>Protection of environmental resources is the motivating factor behind many regulations. The following activities should be specifically prohibited:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Private motorized vehicles, with particular reference to off-road vehicles, except within designated parking areas, or as authorized by permit.</li> <li>2. Smoking or fires, except within designated picnic or other authorized areas.</li> <li>3. No dogs shall be permitted west of Black Mountain Road. Dogs are to be kept on a leash in the parking lot and vicinity.</li> <li>4. Damage and vandalism to vegetation.</li> <li>5. Collection and/or removal of Preserve plants, animals, or archaeological artifacts.</li> <li>6. Feeding of wild animals.</li> <li>7. Leaving trash or food anywhere other than in designated receptacles.</li> <li>8. Any human activity within designated wildlife corridors, unless otherwise posted.</li> </ol>	<p>The Proposed Project includes APMs and mitigation measures that are intended to avoid and minimize impacts from construction and during operation, and to provide mitigation where avoidance is not possible. Mitigation for impacts to sensitive vegetation communities is provided (See Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a). Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Findings to which corrective attention should be paid include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Destruction of habitats through human activity or overuse.</li> <li>2. Disappearance of wildlife species such as large mammals or predators.</li> <li>3. Increases in populations of small animals such as rodents.</li> <li>4. Infestations of exotic or undesirable plant materials.</li> <li>5. Compaction or erosion.</li> <li>6. Damage to or denudation of vegetation.</li> <li>7. Deterioration of sensitive species such as oaks.</li> <li>8. Impact on fish population and fishing in the Preserve.</li> <li>9. Damage or vandalism at archaeological sites.</li> </ol>	<p>The Proposed Project includes APMs and mitigation measures that are intended to avoid and minimize impacts from construction and during operation, and to provide mitigation where avoidance is not possible. Mitigation for impacts to sensitive vegetation communities is provided (See Mitigation Measures B-1a, -2a, -5a.) The project includes APMs that address potential impacts from construction and operation activities. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Landscaping Guidelines Element, Pages 53-54</p> <p>Criteria for landscape planting in the Preserve vary according to the particular area being considered. Three basic conditions occur, each with special problems and requirements. These conditions are 1) <u>developed sites</u> within the Preserve, 2) <u>transition areas</u> between the Preserve and adjacent development, and 3) <u>natural areas</u>.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project includes APMs and mitigation measures that require restoration of temporarily disturbed areas with native landscaping. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan – 1998

Applicable Segment: Coastal Link

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Planting in <u>undeveloped natural areas</u> is primarily for erosion control or repair of damaged sites, although enhancements such as shade or screening may be desired in certain spots such as rest stops. A detailed <i>Revegetation Plan</i> should be prepared by a qualified biologist and landscape architect for all proposed development, including future trail development and trail closures. Any sensitive habitat areas adjacent to construction should be fenced or flagged to prevent disturbance. Ecological suitability is critical for the survival of such plantings, as they may receive little or no maintenance. Species should be selected according to the biotic community in which they are being planted. Native species are preferable. Certain exotics could be introduced in the immediate vicinity of developed sites if appropriate for historical restoration. No exotics which are aggressive and spread freely, such as Scotch broom, eucalyptus or pampas grass, should be introduced. Where these occur already, consideration should be given to removing them. However, removals should be handled in a resource-sensitive manner. Along creek embankments, tree removal should occur only during no-rainfall, low-flow conditions with steps taken to prevent runoff of sediment. Mature trees with nest sites should be left in place. Trunks of removed exotic trees may be left of the canyon floor to provide habitat for ground dwellers. Planting should be by direct seeding or liners, and should be done at the beginning of the rainy season to permit maximum establishment before the stress of dry weather begins. Suggested plants appropriate to the various biotic communities in the Preserve are listed below.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project includes APMs and mitigation measures to restore native habitats in areas temporarily disturbed by the project, and to minimize potential impacts to surrounding areas by invasion of exotic species. Mitigation Measure B-1a includes restoration of disturbed areas with native species. APMs BIO-APM-19, -20, -23, and -25 include restoration of disturbed areas with native species that address the potential for exotic species introduction. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>

City of Chula Vista General Plan, December 13, 2005

The Chula Vista General Plan applies to the Proposed Project (South Bay Substation Upgrade) and the In-Area All-Sources Generation Alternative (South Bay Replacement Project). The project would be required to undergo a detailed CEQA-equivalent review by the California Energy Commission, and gain Commission approval for construction. This process has been initiated. The CEC review process includes consideration of alternatives to a proposed project. A joint planning effort by the Port of San Diego and City of Chula Vista is underway to develop an updated Bayfront Master Plan focused on natural resource protection and enhancement of the waterfront for civic- and tourist-oriented uses.

City of Chula Vista General Plan, December 13, 2005

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Land Use and Transportation Element</b>		
<p>LUT 7.5 Projects within TFA shall provide appropriate and sufficient features to soften the transaction to adjacent buildings and properties, through the following techniques.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project landscape plans should include shade tree and screening plantings to reduce heat gain upon, and visually soften building edges.</li> <li>• Exterior lighting designs shall focus internally in order to reduce light pollution on neighboring properties.</li> <li>• Fencing and/or buffers shall be required to screen features such as dumpsters, rear entrances, utility and maintenance structures, and loading facilities.</li> <li>• Walls or fencing along project edges shall be articulated and incorporate features to avoid presenting a monotonous or blank wall to the street or adjacent property.</li> </ul>	<p>The CEC review process would afford the City opportunities to present its expectations with regard to landscaping, screening, lighting, and other aspects of site design. The facility would be separated from the nearest residential area by I-5 and an existing light industrial/commercial area. However, it is unknown to what degree this policy would be implemented.</p>	MAYBE
<p>LUT 11.5 Require a design review process for all public and private discretionary projects (which includes architectural, site plan, landscape and signage design) to review and evaluate projects prior to issuance of building permits to determine their compliance with the objectives and specific requirements of the City's Design Manual, General Plan, and appropriate zone or Area Development Plans.</p>	<p>The CEC review process would afford the City opportunities to present its expectations with regard to landscaping, screening, lighting, and other aspects of site design. The facility would be separated from the nearest residential area by I-5 and an existing light industrial/commercial area. However, it is unknown to what degree this policy would be implemented.</p>	MAYBE
<p>LUT 13.3 Screen unsightly industrial properties on the Bayfront, or convert such properties to uses that are consistent with the desired visual character of the Bayfront.</p>	<p>The CEC review process would afford the City opportunities to present its expectations with regard screening. However, it is unknown to what degree this policy would be implemented.</p>	MAYBE
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES ELEMENT</b>		
<p>PFS 22.4 Review energy facility requests and encourage siting and design techniques that minimize community impacts. Such techniques may include: undergrounding facilities, where possible; co-locating new facilities with existing utility infrastructure; locating facilities in non-residential areas; and implementing architectural details and landscaping that help facilities that blend with the surrounding area. The development and operation of natural gas-fired plants within the City shall utilize "best available control technology" to the greatest extent practicable.</p>	<p>The power plant would have underground transmission lines to the existing South Bay substation. It would be located close to that facility, and be in a non-residential area. Based on past decisions, it is presumed that CEC and the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District would require best available control technology on the power plant. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.</p>	YES
<p>Objective E1 - Conserve Chula Vista's sensitive biological resources.</p>	<p>The power plant would be at an existing disturbed industrial site with minimal biological resources. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this objective.</p>	YES
<b>Environmental Element</b>		
<p>Objective -E 2 Protect and improve water quality within surface water bodies and groundwater resources within and downstream of Chula Vista.</p>	<p>The facility has no undergone complete CEC review; therefore, the degree to which this objective would be met is unknown at this time.</p>	MAYBE
<p>Objective -E 6 Improve local air quality by minimizing the production and emission of air pollutants and toxic air contaminants and limit the exposure of people to such pollutants.</p>	<p>The power plant would be required to meet San Diego County APCD requirements. Therefore, it would be consistent with this objective</p>	YES

**City of Chula Vista General Plan, December 13, 2005**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
E 6.15 Site industries in a way that minimizes the potential impacts of poor air quality on homes, schools, hospitals, and other land uses where people congregate.	Approximately 1000 feet would separate the alternative from residential development. The site is separated by a 300 ft easement, commercial/light industrial uses along Bay Blvd, and I-5. The power plant would be required to meet San Diego County APCD requirements. Therefore, it would be consistent with this objective	YES
E 11.8 Develop a greenbelt park and/or open space system across the bayfront to link the Sweetwater and Otay rivers and to buffer sensitive natural resources from development.	The existing and proposed industrial development on the Bayfront would affect the ability to develop a continuous greenbelt/open space system. However, there is a buffer between the propose power plant site and the bay, which could provide this link. Therefore, the alternative would be consistent with this policy.	YES
Objective -E 21 Protect people from excessive noise through careful land use planning and the incorporation of appropriate mitigation techniques.	Approximately 1000 feet would separate the alternative from residential development. The site is separated by a 300 ft easement, commercial/light industrial uses along Bay Blvd, and I-5. This would protect people from excessive noise.	YES

**City of Chula Vista – Municipal Code (Local Coastal Program)**

The Chula Vista Local Coastal Program, Bayfront Specific Plan was adopted by the City of Chula Vista in October 1992 as Ordinance No. 2532. It was certified by the California Coastal Commission in the same year. The program applies to both the Proposed Project (South Bay Substation Upgrade) and the In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative.

**Chula Vista Local Coastal Program, City of Chula Vista Municipal Code – Ordinance No. 2532 (1992)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>F. Form and Appearance</b></p> <p>The following objectives shall serve as guidelines for use of land and water resources to preserve a sound natural environment:</p> <p>a. Preserve existing wetlands in a healthy state to ensure the aesthetic enjoyment of marshes and the wildlife which inhabit them.</p> <p>b. Change the existing industrial image of the Bayfront, and develop a new identity consonant with its future prominent public and commercial recreational role.</p>	<p>a. The Proposed Project includes APMs and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to native habitats, including wetlands.</p> <p>The Proposed Project would include the addition of new structures and equipment to the existing South Bay Power Plant in Chula Vista. However, to the extent that the new facilities would be noticeable within the context of the existing, highly industrialized power plant site, they would only slightly increase the overall structural complexity and industrial character of the site. The resulting visual impact would be adverse but less than significant and would not noticeably impact the aesthetic enjoyment of nearby marshes.</p>	YES

**Chula Vista Local Coastal Program, City of Chula Vista Municipal Code – Ordinance No. 2532 (1992)**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p><b>Grading and Drainage</b></p> <p>2. All development for properties within the coastal zone shall comply with the following requirements:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. A grading plan that incorporates runoff and erosion control procedures to be utilized during all phases of project development shall be prepared and submitted concurrently with subdivision improvement plans or planned unit development plans where such development is proposed to occur on lands that will be graded or filled. Such a plan shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and shall be designed to ensure that runoff rates will be controlled to minimize the potential for siltation in wetlands. The erosion control measures and hydrology calculations shall be based on the six-hour, ten-year design storm, or on the storm intensity designated in the City of Chula Vista's Subdivision Manual, in the event that the Subdivision Manual requirement is more stringent. Runoff control shall be accomplished by establishing on-site or at suitable nearby locations catchment basins, detention basins, and siltation traps along with energy dissipating measures at the terminus of storm drains, or other similar means of equal or greater effectiveness.</p>	<p>APM WQ-APM-4 requires preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). This plan will manage runoff and erosion so as to protect off-site resources.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>2. A silt fence (or equal) shall be installed between graded areas and wetlands. A distance of 10 feet is required between the silt fence and the toe of any manufactured slope. The maximum slope permitted is 3:1.</p>	<p>APM WQ-APM-4 requires preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). This plan will manage runoff and erosion so as to protect off-site resources.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p><b>SUBAREA-SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS</b></p>		
<p>Public &amp; Quasi-Public: In areas designated as Public Quasi-Public the following uses are permitted:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">(e) Electrical substations and gas regulators;</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">d. Prohibited Uses: Any business or activity that produces noise above 60 CNEL at the exterior boundaries of this land use district.</p>	<p>There are no sensitive receptors that would be affected.</p>	<p>YES</p>

**Riverside County General Plan, 2003**

Portions of the LEAPS Transmission-Only Alternative and the LEAPS Generation and Transmission Alternative would occur in Riverside County, in the Elsinore Plan Area. While much of the alternatives would be in Cleveland National Forest, a portion would be in county jurisdiction in the vicinity of Lee Lake, at the north end of the alternatives, and adjacent to Lake Elsinore, in the central part of the alternatives.

**Riverside County General Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
---------------------	---------------------------	------------

**LAND USE ELEMENT**

**Open Space, Habitat & Natural Resource Preservation**

**Hillside Development & Slope**

<p>LU 11.1: Apply the following policies to areas where development is allowed and that contain natural slopes, canyons, or other significant elevation changes, regardless of land use designation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Require that hillside development minimize alteration of the natural landforms and natural vegetation.</li> <li>b. Require that areas with slope be developed in a manner to minimize the hazards from erosion and slope failures.</li> <li>c. Restrict development on visually significant ridgelines, canyon edges and hilltops through sensitive siting and appropriate landscaping to ensure development is visually unobtrusive.</li> <li>d. Require hillside adaptive construction techniques, such as post and beam construction, and special foundations for development when the need is identified in a soils and geology report which has been accepted by the County.</li> <li>e. Encourage the limitation of grading, cut, and fill to the amount necessary to provide stable areas for structural foundations, street rights-of-way, parking facilities, and other intended uses.</li> </ol>	<p>The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15 and other roadways in the area. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars.</p>	<p>NO</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

**Scenic Corridors**

<p>LU 13.1: Preserve and protect outstanding scenic vistas and visual features for the enjoyment of the traveling public.</p>	<p>The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15 and other roadways in the area. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>LU 13.3: Ensure that the design and appearance of new landscaping, structures, equipment, signs, or grading within Designated and Eligible State and County scenic highway corridors are compatible with the surrounding scenic setting or environment.</p>	<p>The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15 and other roadways in the area. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>LU 13.4: Maintain at least a 50-foot setback from the edge of the right-of-way for new development adjacent to Designated and Eligible State and County Scenic Highways.</p>	<p>The alternatives would require transmission lines that would cross and be visible from I-15. The substation at I-15 would be greater than 50 ft from the road, but would be visible. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway.</p>	<p>NO</p>

**Open Space - Rural**

<p>LU 20.1: Require that structures be designed to maintain the environmental character in which they are located.</p>	<p>Power line ROWs and transmission towers alter would alter the character of the rural area in which they would occur. Therefore, the alternatives would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>LU 20.2: Require that development be designed to blend with undeveloped natural contours of the site and avoid an unvaried, unnatural, or manufactured appearance.</p>	<p>Power line ROWs and transmission towers alter would alter the character of the rural area in which they would occur. Therefore, the alternatives would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>

**Riverside County General Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
LU 20.4: Ensure that development does not adversely impact the open space and rural character of the surrounding area.	Power line ROWs and transmission towers alter would alter the character of the rural area in which they would occur. Therefore, the alternatives would not be consistent with this policy.	NO

**Project Design**

LU 24.8: Require that industrial development be designed to consider their surroundings and visually enhance, not degrade, the character of the surrounding area.	Power line ROWs and transmission towers alter would alter the character of the rural area in which they would occur. Therefore, the alternatives would not be consistent with this policy.	NO
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

**CIRCULATION ELEMENT**

**Scenic Corridors**

C 19.1: Preserve scenic routes that have exceptional or unique visual features in accordance with Caltrans' Scenic Highways Plan.	The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15 and other roadways in the area. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars.	NO
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

**Environmental Considerations**

C 20.7: Incorporate specific requirements of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan into transportation plans and development proposals.	The project developers would be required to obtain resource agency approvals. These would consider the requirements of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	YES
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

**Major Utility Corridors**

C 25.2: Locate new and relocated utilities underground when possible. All remaining utilities shall be located or screened in a manner that minimizes their visibility by the public.	It is not feasible to screen transmission towers. Therefore, the alternatives could not meet this policy expectation.	NO
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

**Vegetation**

OS 9.3: Maintain and conserve superior examples of native trees, natural vegetation, stands of established trees, and other features for ecosystem, aesthetic, and water conservation purposes.	The area where the transmission lines and sub-station would be located is sparsely vegetated and lacking in trees. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.	YES
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

**Scenic Resources**

OS 21.1: Identify and conserve the skylines, view corridors, and outstanding scenic vistas within Riverside County.	The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15 and other roadways in the area. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars.	NO
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

**Scenic Corridors**

OS 22.1: Design developments within designated scenic highway corridors to balance the objectives of maintaining scenic resources with accommodating compatible land uses.	Transmission tower locations would be selected to minimize visual impacts along the I-15 corridor. This would meet the intent of this design policy.	YES
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Riverside County General Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>SAFETY ELEMENT</b>		
<b>Fault Rupture</b>		
<p>S 2.1: Minimize fault rupture hazards through enforcement of Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act provisions and the following policies:</p> <p>a. Require geologic studies or analyses for critical structures, and lifeline, high-occupancy, schools, and high-risk structures, within 0.5 miles of all Quaternary to historic faults shown on the Earthquake Fault Studies Zones map.</p> <p>b. Require geologic trenching studies within all designated Earthquake Fault Studies Zones, unless adequate evidence, as determined and accepted by the County Engineering Geologist, is presented. The County may require geologic trenching of non-zoned faults for especially critical or vulnerable structures or lifelines.</p> <p>c. Require that lifelines be designed to resist, without failure, their crossing of a fault, should fault rupture occur.</p>	<p>The area is known to have extensive faulting. Geologic studies would be undertaken to identify risks to facilities from fault rupture and to design accordingly.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>Seismically-Induced Liquefaction, Landslides, and Rock Falls</b>		
<p>S 2.5: Require that engineered slopes be designed to resist seismically-induced failure. For lower-risk projects, slope design could be based on pseudo-static stability analyses using soil engineering parameters that are established on a site-specific basis. For higher-risk projects, the stability analyses should factor in the intensity of expected ground shaking, using a Newmark-type deformation analysis.</p>	<p>The area is known to have soils and slopes susceptible to liquefaction or landslide. Geologic studies would be undertaken to identify risks to facilities from these hazards and to design accordingly.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<b>Landslides, Rockfalls, and Debris Flows</b>		
<p>S 3.1: Require the following in landslide potential hazard management zones, or when deemed necessary by CEQA:</p> <p>a. Preliminary geotechnical and geological investigations.</p> <p>b. Evaluation of site stability, including any possible impact on adjacent properties, before final project design is approved.</p> <p>c. Consultant reports, investigations, and design recommendations required for grading permits, building permits, and subdivision applications be prepared by State-licensed professionals.</p>	<p>The area is known to have soils and slopes susceptible to liquefaction or landslide in the vicinity of I-15 and Lake Elsinore. Geologic studies would be undertaken to identify risks to facilities from these hazards and to design accordingly.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>S 3.3: Before issuance of building permits, require certification regarding the stability of the site against adverse effects of rain, earthquakes, and subsidence.</p>	<p>The area is known to have soils and slopes susceptible to liquefaction or landslide in the vicinity of I-15 and Lake Elsinore. Geologic studies would be undertaken to identify risks to facilities from these hazards and to design accordingly.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>S 3.6: Require grading plans, environmental assessments, engineering and geologic technical reports, irrigation and landscaping plans, including ecological restoration and revegetation plans, as appropriate, in order to assure the adequate demonstration of a project's ability to mitigate the potential impacts of slope and erosion hazards and loss of native vegetation.</p>	<p>Full documentation would be available for the LEAPS project. Therefore, these alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>

**Riverside County General Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Subsidence and Expansive &amp; Collapsible Soils</b>		
<p>S 3.8: Require geotechnical studies within documented subsidence zones, as well as zones that may be susceptible to subsidence, as identified in Figure S-7 and the Technical Background Report, prior to the issuance of development permits. Within the documented subsidence zones of the Coachella, San Jacinto, and Elsinore valleys, the studies must address the potential for reactivation of these zones, consider the potential impact on the project, and provide adequate and acceptable mitigation measures.</p>	<p>The area is known to have soils and slopes susceptible to liquefaction or landslide in the vicinity of I-15 and Lake Elsinore. Geologic studies would be undertaken to identify risks to facilities from these hazards and to design accordingly.</p>	<p>YES</p>

**Riverside County General Plan - Elsinore Area Plan**

The LEAPS Transmission-Only Alternative and the Leaps Generation and Transmission Alternative would occur in Riverside County in the area covered under the County’s Elsinore Area Plan. While these alternatives would largely be in Cleveland National Forest, small portions would be in county jurisdiction — in the vicinity of Lee Lake, at the north end of the alternatives, and adjacent to Lake Elsinore, in the central portion of the alternatives.

**Riverside County General Plan - Elsinore Area Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>Warm Springs</b>		
<p>Located in the northern portion of the plan area, Warm Springs includes a rural area set within the steep slopes of the Gavilan Hills. The ridge line and slopes of the Gavilan Hills are biological and visual assets to the region.</p> <p>Policies:</p> <p>ELAP 1.1 Protect the life and property of residents and maintain the character of the Gavilan Hills through adherence to the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element, the Environmentally Sensitive Lands section of the Multipurpose Open Space Element, and the Slope and Soil Instability section of the General Plan Safety Element.</p> <p>ELAP 1.3 Require that all commercial and industrial uses be sensitive to environmental hazards (i.e., flooding) and not substantially impact environmental resources (i.e., biological and water quality).</p>	<p>The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15 and other roadways in the area. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars. The alternatives would be outside of the 100-year flood zone. However, because of visual impacts, the alternatives would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>

Riverside County General Plan - Elsinore Area Plan

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<p>Temescal Wash</p> <p>Temescal Wash, extending 28 miles from Lake Elsinore to the Santa Ana River, is the principal drainage course within the Temescal Valley. The Wash also serves as an important component of the Western Riverside County MSHCP and has the potential for providing recreational amenities to serve the planning area. The preservation and enhancement of this feature is an important component of the Elsinore Area Plan land use plan. This policy area is synonymous with the 100 year flood zone for the Wash.</p> <p>Policies:</p> <p>ELAP 2.1 Protect the multipurpose open space attributes of the Temescal Wash through adherence to policies in the Flood and Inundation Hazards section of the General Plan Safety Element, the Trails section of the Circulation Element, and the Open Space, Habitat and Natural Resource Preservation section of the Land Use Element.</p> <p>ELAP 2.2 Encourage the maintenance of Temescal Wash in its natural state, with its ultimate use for recreational and open space purposes such as trails, habitat preservation, and groundwater recharge.</p>	<p>Except where it crosses I-15, the LEAPS alternatives would not be within the 100-year flood zone. The transmission towers would be located out of the flood zone. The proposed substation would be in an existing developed area. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Lake Elsinore Environs Policy Area</p> <p>ELAP 7.1 The Open Space-Conservation designation within this area is based on concerns related to flooding hazards. Following adoption of this General Plan, the County of Riverside will review the most accurate flood mapping information in conjunction with the County's consistency zoning program. If property not within the 100-year flood plain is designated as Open Space-Conservation, the County will initiate a general plan amendment to an appropriate Community Development foundation component designation, or include such a change in a general plan amendment of greater scope. Such a general plan amendment shall be exempt from the 5-year limit placed on Foundation Component amendments as described in the Administration Element. Additionally, privately initiated amendments within this Policy Area may be exempted from the 5-year limit provided that any area proposed for removal from the Open Space-Conservation designation is located outside the 100-year flood plain and that the proposed new designation is a Community Development Foundation Component designation</p>	<p>Except where it crosses I-15, the LEAPS alternatives would not be within the 100-year flood zone. The transmission towers would be located out of the flood zone. The proposed substation would be in an existing developed area. Therefore, the alternatives would be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Scenic Highways</p> <p>ELAP 13.1 Protect Interstate 15 and State Route 74 from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of adjacent properties through adherence to the Scenic Corridors sections of the General Plan Land Use and Circulation Elements.</p>	<p>The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15 and other roadways in the area. I-15 is considered eligible to be a scenic highway. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars.</p>	<p>NO</p>
<p>Slope</p> <p>ELAP 23.1 Identify and preserve the ridgelines that provide a significant visual resource for Elsinore through adherence to the Hillside Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element and the Scenic Resources section of the Multi-purpose Open Space Element.</p>	<p>The alternatives would require transmission lines that cross steep hillsides and ridges and would be visible from I-15. Access roads to transmission towers would also alter natural landforms and present visible scars. Towers that alter ridgelines would not be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>NO</p>

**Riverside County General Plan - Elsinore Area Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
ELAP 23.3 Protect life and property and maintain the character of the Elsinore area through adherence to the Slope and Soil Instability section of the General Plan Safety Element, the Hill-side Development and Slope section of the General Plan Land Use Element, and the Rural Mountainous land use designation.	The area is known to have soils and slopes susceptible to liquefaction or landslide. Geologic studies would be undertaken to identify risks to facilities from these hazards and to design accordingly.	YES

**Orange County General Plan**

The Margarita Substation Peaker Plant (a component of the New All-Source Generation Alternative) would be located immediately east of the Landera Planned Community, in Orange County. The peaker would be immediately adjacent to the existing substation on land designated in the General Plan as open space.

**Orange County General Plan**

Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
CHAPTER III. LAND USE ELEMENT		
6. NEW DEVELOPMENT COMPATIBILITY To require new development to be compatible with adjacent areas. The purpose of the New Development Compatibility Policy is to ensure that new development is compatible with adjacent areas and that it provides either a land use buffer or transition to reduce the effects of one land use on the other. Sensitive treatment is required where one urban use transitions to another and where an urban use is introduced into an essentially undeveloped area.	The peaker plant would be immediately adjacent to the existing substation and would be a compatible use. The property is fronted by Antonio Parkway, a 6-lane road plus median, that separates the site for residential areas 700 ft to the west. To the north is another residential area approx. 600 ft away. Open space is found on three sides of the property. This location provides a buffer between the residential area and the peaker. The treatment between the facility and open space is unknown at this time.	MAYBE
3. LAND USE COMPATIBILITY To coordinate facility planning in a manner compatible with surrounding land uses and to review planned land uses adjacent to facilities for their compatibility with facility operations.	The peaker plant would be immediately adjacent to the existing substation and would be a compatible use. The property is fronted by Antonio Parkway, a 6-lane road plus median, that separates the site for residential areas 700 ft to the west. To the north is another residential area approx. 600 ft away. Open space is found on three sides of the property. This location provides a buffer between the residential area and the peaker. The treatment between the facility and open space is unknown at this time.	MAYBE
3. SITE DESIGN CRITERIA Require all land use proposals to implement adequate site design so as to maximize fire protection and prevention in order to minimize potential damages. The site design criteria shall be established to reflect the levels of protection needed for projects in various fire hazard areas. Such criteria shall include consideration as to: structure type and density, emergency fire flow and fire hydrant distribution, street pattern and emergency fire access, fuel modification programs, automatic fire sprinkler systems, and other requirements as determined by the Fire Chief.	The peaker plant site would be paved in asphalt or rock and free of vegetation. Fire access would be from nearby Antonio Parkway. The facility would be consistent with this policy.	YES

Orange County General Plan		
Applicable Policies	Consistency Determination	Consistent
<b>VI. RESOURCES ELEMENT</b>		
1. To develop and support programs which improve air quality or reduce air pollutant emissions.	The alternative would be required to comply with the requirements of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Therefore, it would be consistent with this policy	YES
GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES : Open Space		
Goal 1 Retain the character and natural beauty of the environment through the preservation, conservation, and maintenance of open space.	The alternative would require use of 3 acres of undeveloped land adjacent to open space. This would not be consistent with this policy.	NO
<b>CHAPTER VIII. NOISE ELEMENT</b>		
OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES Page 21		
A key objective of this Noise Element is to ensure that each County resident's quality of life is not affected adversely by high noise levels. Thus mitigation of noise is of paramount importance. Noise affects all land uses. Residential uses are the most noise sensitive because of structural design, 24-hour per day duration of use and because such uses typically need, and are designed to incorporate outdoor living areas. Other noise sensitive uses include schools, hospitals, and places of worship. ... In general, any development that results in a situation where there is an unacceptable level of noise in any living area (interior or exterior), must be mitigated or the project or use revised to avoid the conflict. ...Previous policy decisions by the Board of Supervisors have endorsed the 65-decibel CNEL as the critical sound-level criterion in guiding planning decisions for sensitive land uses....	Until equipment selection and site design are completed, the level of noise at sensitive receptors is unknown. However, peaker plants typically operate at times of high demand, which would be during afternoon hours. This would reduce the potential for nighttime impacts.	MAYBE
<b>CHAPTER IX. SAFETY ELEMENT</b>		
GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES: Fire		
Review and impose conditions of approval at the appropriate project development level to assure that adequate site design, fire safe construction materials, and fire detection and protection systems are incorporated into the proposal in order to achieve maximum fire protection and to minimize extent of loss associated with fire incidence.	The peaker plant site would be paved in asphalt or rock and free of vegetation. Fire access would be from nearby Antonio Parkway. The facility would be consistent with this policy.	YES