
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

September 14, 2018

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 07-01-031 ET AL.

At the Commission Meeting of August 23, 2018, President Michael Picker reserved the right to file a concurrence to Decision 18-08-026. The decision was mailed on August 31, 2018.

The concurrence of President Picker is now available and is attached herewith.

/s/ ANNE E. SIMON

Anne E. Simon

Chief Administrative Law Judge

AES:lil

Attachment

**CONCURRENCE OF PRESIDENT MICHAEL PICKER ON ITEM 26A ON
THE COMMISSION VOTING MEETING AGENDA OF AUGUST 23, 2018,
DECISION REGARDING APPLICATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
EDISON COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE
AND NECESSITY FOR THE ALBERHILL SYSTEM PROJECT**

Decision 18-08-026 (issued August 31, 2018) grants Southern California Edison Company's (SCE's) petition to modify the permit to construct the Valley Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission Line Project that was previously granted in Decision 10-08-009 to realign portions of the subtransmission line route, underground a portion of the line and modify the construction method and techniques. It also de-consolidates Application 09-09-022 from Applications 07-01-031 and 07-04-028 and holds Application 09-09-022 open to further review SCE's Application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the Alberhill System Project. I support this decision with reservations which I note in this concurrence.

I support the decision to leave open the Alberhill proceeding. Taking this approach will ultimately be more efficient, conserve Commission resources, and save ratepayer funds in resolving this matter, once and for all. This decision does not award SCE anything in regards to the Alberhill project. It only affords SCE the opportunity to make its final case regarding changing load forecasts, system peak demand, and the feasibility of a limited number of alternatives to the Alberhill project.

The decision certifies both the Ivyglen and Alberhill projects as being in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It is important that we complete the Commission's review of the Alberhill project

while its Environmental Impact Review (EIR) is current and fresh. This will insure that the EIR process need not be started over again at a later date.

Much of the consternation surrounding the Alberhill project has focused on when the Valley South system will reach its maximum capacity limit and the difference between SCE's load forecast as compared to the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) load forecasts.

SCE brought the Alberhill project forward to address two primary issues. First, the Valley Substation, which serves all of southwestern Riverside County, is nearing its maximum capacity and projected to have shortfalls in the 2019-2021 time period. The proposed Alberhill Substation would split the existing load between the Valley South and Alberhill systems. Second, the Valley South System is "islanded" with no ties to other systems within SCE's grid. The Alberhill project would also create system ties to allow for load transfers to correct system imbalances, overloads, reliability concerns, and provide flexibility during operations and maintenance.

This decision concludes that SCE's load forecasts are unconvincing and requires additional analysis of Valley South System outages. I remind us that the utilities have a mandate to provide safe and reliable service. The utilities are expected to propose projects well in advance of their forecasted need to allow sufficient time to implement them. The absence of past reliability issues does not suggest that a project is not necessary; it may simply be the result of prudent planning.

Although CAISO originally approved the Alberhill project in 2009, the Valley South system is no longer subject to the CAISO planning criteria. From a practical matter, it is still unclear to me how in the case of the Ivyglen project, the

CAISO forecast supports the need for Ivyglen project, but in the case of the Alberhill project, the same CAISO forecast supports the rejection of the Alberhill project. That said, the expectation is for SCE is to come back with new and improved load forecast data and Valley South system peak demand data that utilizes industry accepted methods for estimating load growth and incorporating load reduction programs due to energy efficiency, demand response, and behind-the-meter generation.

Another concern is in regards to the late-introduced alternatives from parties in this case. We all must continue to improve the review process of transmission and sub transmission projects. During the CEQA process, thirty-three alternatives were identified for the Alberhill project. This represents a significant number of alternatives. After screening out the alternatives that fail to meet the project objectives or lack feasibility, three alternatives were retained for consideration.

In this proceeding, parties, late-in-the-game, brought in numerous alternatives in the form of undergrounding alternatives and functional alternatives to the proposed Alberhill project. As stated in the Scoping Memo, the time and place for the consideration of project alternatives is during the environmental review process (during the CEQA process) not after the Final EIR is published.

Going forward, our expectations are that parties will fully engage in the CEQA process to vet their recommended alternatives so that all of those alternatives are considered (and adopted or dismissed) in the Final EIR.

The decision is not an Alberhill “do over” per se, as the Alberhill EIR is now certified. Alternatives that were considered and dismissed during the CEQA process will not be relitigated or reanalyzed.

Finally, under the continuation of the Alberhill proceeding, SCE has an opportunity to make good on its recent commitment to engage with all of the affected cities to address community concerns and find solutions and compromises that works in favor of everyone, even if that means alterations to the proposed project.

Dated September 14, 2018, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MICHAEL PICKER
Michael Picker
President

Decision 18-08-026 August 23, 2018

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
COMPANY (U338E) for a Permit to
Construct Electrical Facilities with
Voltages between 50kV and 200 kV:
Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission
Line Project.

Application 07-01-031

And Related Matters.

Application 07-04-028

Application 09-09-022

**DECISION GRANTING PETITION TO MODIFY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT
THE VALLEY-IVYGLEN 115 KV SUBTRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT AND
HOLDING PROCEEDING OPEN FOR CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE ALBERHILL SYSTEM PROJECT**

Table of Contents

Title	Page
DECISION GRANTING PETITION TO MODIFY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE VALLEY-IVYGLEN 115 KV SUBTRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT AND HOLDING PROCEEDING OPEN FOR CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE ALBERHILL SYSTEM PROJECT	1
Summary	2
1. Procedural Background	2
2. Scope of Issues.....	5
3. Environmental Impact of Proposed Projects	7
3.1. Project Locations and Components.....	7
3.2. Valley-Ivyglen Project Impacts	8
3.3. Alberhill Project Impacts	9
4. Alternatives.....	10
4.1. Valley-Ivyglen Project Alternatives	11
4.2. Alberhill Project Alternatives	12
5. Environmentally Superior Alternatives	12
5.1. Valley-Ivyglen Project	12
5.2. Alberhill Project.....	13
6. CEQA Compliance	13
6.1. Aesthetics Impacts	15
6.1.1. Views and Viewer Groups	15
6.1.2. Single versus Double Circuit Pole.....	16
6.1.3. Response to Comment	16
6.2. Air Quality Impacts	17
6.3. Noise Impacts	18
6.4. Socioeconomic Impacts and Environmental Justice Concerns	19
6.5. Alternatives and Mitigation	20
6.6. Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	24
6.7. Compliance Enforcement.....	24
7. Infeasibility	25
8. Overriding Considerations, Including Project Need for Alberhill Project	25
8.1. Valley-Ivyglen Project	26
8.2. Alberhill Project.....	28
9. EMF Compliance	34
10. Maximum Reasonable and Prudent Cost of Alberhill Project.....	35

**Table of Contents
(Cont'd)**

Title	Page
11. Ruling Striking TURN Testimony	36
12. Comments on Proposed Decision	37
13. Assignment of Proceeding	37
Findings of Fact.....	37
Conclusions of Law	41
ORDER	42

Appendix A - Mitigation, Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan

**DECISION GRANTING PETITION TO MODIFY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE
VALLEY-IVYGLEN 115 KV SUBTRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT AND
HOLDING PROCEEDING OPEN FOR CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE ALBERHILL SYSTEM PROJECT**

Summary

This decision grants Southern California Edison Company's petition to modify the permit to construct the Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission Line Project that we previously granted in Decision 10-08-009 to realign portions of the subtransmission line route, underground a portion of the line and modify the construction method and techniques. It deconsolidates Application 09-09-022 from Applications 07-01-031 and 07-04-028 and holds Application 09-09-022 open to further review Southern California Edison Company's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the Alberhill System Project. Applications 07-01-031 and 07-04-028 are closed.

1. Procedural Background

By Application (A.) 09-09-022, filed September 30, 2009, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) seeks a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct the Alberhill System Project (Alberhill project) to relieve projected electrical demand that would exceed the operating limit of the two load-serving Valley South 115 kilovolt (kV) System 500/115 kV transformers within the Electrical Needs Area, and to provide electricity in place of the Alberhill 115 kV System during maintenance, during emergency events, or to relieve other operational issues on one of the systems.

By its petition in A.07-01-031 to modify Decision (D.) 10-08-009,¹ filed April 2, 2013, SCE proposes a modification to the previously-approved permit to construct the Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission Line Project (Valley-Ivyglen project), which purpose is to relieve loads on the existing Valley-Elsinore-Fogarty 115 kV Subtransmission Line and provide a second source of power to Ivyglen Substation. Specifically, SCE seeks to modify the project design by, among other things, realigning portions of the subtransmission line route and undergrounding a portion of the line and to modify the construction method and techniques by, among other things, using shooflies, blasting, and helicopters.

Both projects are subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to General Order (GO) 131-D. CEQA requires the Lead Agency (the Commission in this case) to conduct a review to identify environmental impacts of the projects and ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage. If the initial study shows that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, then the Lead Agency must prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that (1) identifies the environmental impacts of the proposed project, (2) identifies project alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant impacts, and (3) identifies the environmentally superior project alternative. The Commission may not approve the project unless it reviews and considers the EIR, requires the environmentally superior project alternative and all of the identified mitigation

¹ D.10-08-009, issued in A.07-01-031 and A.07-04-028, granted SCE a permit to construct the Fogarty Substation Project and the Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission Line Project. D.10-08-009 was previously modified by D.14-08-047.

measures (unless they are found to be infeasible), and determines that there are overriding considerations that merit project approval despite the unavoidable significant impacts.²

The Commission's Energy Division deemed the Alberhill project application complete in May 2011.³ Before the Energy Division was able to issue a Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the Alberhill project, on April 2, 2013, SCE filed a petition to modify the decision permitting it to construct the Valley-Ivyglen project and, on May 23, 2014, filed an amendment to its petition. The Energy Division deemed that petition complete in April 2015. Because components of the Valley-Ivyglen project are required for construction of the Alberhill project, Energy Division consolidated the environmental review of the projects. The Energy Division issued a Notice of Preparation of the EIR on May 6, 2015, the draft EIR was issued in April 2016, and the final EIR was issued in April 2017.⁴

A prehearing conference was conducted on June 5, 2017. Evidentiary hearing was held on October 17, 18, and 19, 2017. SCE, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), The Utility Reform Network (TURN), Forest Residents Opposing New Transmission Lines (FRONTLINES), the City of Lake Elsinore (City), the Nevada Hydro Company (Nevada Hydro), and, jointly, Castle & Cooke California, Inc. and Castle & Cooke Alberhill Ranch, LLC (Castle &

² In addition, pursuant to GO 131-D and D.06-01-042, the Commission will not approve a project unless its design is in compliance with the Commission's policies governing the mitigation of electromagnetic field (EMF) effects using low-cost and no-cost measures.

³ See CEQA Guideline § 15060(a). SCE amended its application in March 2010 to modify transmission line alignments.

⁴ The Energy Division issued errata to the EIR on February 23, 2018.

Cooke) filed opening briefs on November 30, 2017, and briefs on January 4, 2018, upon which this matter was submitted.⁵

2. Scope of Issues

The assigned Commissioner's June 19, 2017, Scoping Memo identifies the following issues to be determined:

1. What are the significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed projects? This issue encompasses consideration of whether the project designs comport with Commission rules and regulations and other applicable standards governing safe and reliable operations.
2. Are there potentially feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives that will avoid or lessen the significant adverse environmental impacts? This issue encompasses consideration of how to design the proposed projects in a manner that ensures their safe and reliable operation.
3. As between the proposed projects and the project alternatives, which is environmentally superior?
4. Was the EIR completed in compliance with CEQA, did the Commission review and consider the EIR prior to approving the project or a project alternative, and does the EIR reflect our independent judgment?
5. Are the environmentally superior alternatives and/or mitigation measures infeasible?
6. To the extent that the proposed projects and/or project alternatives result in significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, are there overriding considerations that nevertheless merit Commission approval of the proposed project or project alternative? This issue encompasses consideration of whether:

⁵ Nevada Hydro did not file a reply brief.

- a. With respect to the Valley-Ivyglen project, is there a need to relieve loads on the existing Valley-Elsinore-Fogarty 115 kV Subtransmission Line and provide a second source of power to Ivyglen Substation?
- b. With respect to the Alberhill project, is there a need to relieve projected electrical demand that would exceed the operating limit of the two load-serving Valley South 115 kV System 500/115-kV transformers within the Electrical Needs Area, and to provide electricity in place of the Alberhill 115 kV System during maintenance, during emergency events, or to relieve other operational issues on one of the systems?
7. Are the proposed projects and/or project alternative designed in compliance with the Commission's policies governing the mitigation of EMF effects using low-cost and no-cost measures?
8. Does the Alberhill project serve a present or future public convenience and necessity? This issue directly overlaps issue 6, above.⁶ (*See* Pub. Util. Code § 1001.)⁷
9. What is the maximum prudent and reasonable cost of the Alberhill project? (*See* Pub. Util. Code § 1005.5.)⁸

As stated in the Scoping Memo, the record regarding the first three issues, (i.e., environmental impacts, alternatives, and environmentally superior alternative), was to be developed through the CEQA environmental review

⁶ With respect to the Alberhill project, this issue also encompasses consideration of recreational and park areas, historical and aesthetic values, and influence on the environment pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1002(a)(2-4).

⁷ Pursuant to GO 131-D, this issue does not pertain to a permit to construct the Valley-Ivyglen project.

⁸ Pursuant to GO 131-D, this issue does not pertain to a permit to construct the Valley-Ivyglen project.

process including public comment on the draft EIR and responses thereto as reflected in the final EIR.⁹

3. Environmental Impact of Proposed Projects

3.1. Project Locations and Components

The proposed projects would be located within unincorporated and incorporated areas of western Riverside County.

The Valley-Ivyglen project would include as its main components:

- Construction of a new, single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission line and fiber optic line running approximately 27 miles and constructed within approximately 23 miles of new right-of-way.
- Installation of overhead fiber optic lines on the proposed structures and underground in new and existing conduit.
- Transfer of existing distribution circuits along portions of the proposed line to new 115 kV structures or to underground positions.
- Installation of new 115 kV switching and protective equipment at Valley and Ivyglen Substations.

The Alberhill project would include as its main components:

- Construction of a new 1,120 megavolt ampere (MVA) 500/115 kV substation to increase electrical service capacity to the area presently served by the Valley South 115 kV System.
- Construction of two new 500 kV transmission line segments to connect the new substation to SCE's existing Serrano-Valley 500 kV transmission line.
- Construction of a new 115 kV subtransmission line (approximately three miles in length) and modifications to four existing 115 kV subtransmission lines to transfer five existing 115/12 kV substations (Ivyglen, Fogarty, Elsinore, Skylark, and

⁹ Scoping Memo at 5.

Newcomb Substations) presently served by the Valley South 115 kV System to the new Alberhill 500/115 kV Substation.

- Installation of telecommunications improvements to connect the new facilities to SCE's telecommunications network.

3.2. Valley-Ivyglen Project Impacts

The Valley-Ivyglen project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality during project construction and on noise during project construction and maintenance. While construction-related daily exhaust emissions of Nitrogen Oxide (NO_x) and Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation, Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan (MMCRP) (attached hereto as Appendix A), these measures would not reduce PM₁₀ emissions below its regional threshold of significance, resulting in emissions that could contribute to a violation of ozone air quality standards, which would be individually significant as well as cumulatively considerable. Construction and maintenance activities would cause substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity that can be mitigated, but not to less-than-significant levels. In conjunction with other developments that affect or could affect the project area, the Valley-Ivyglen project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions and a significant, unavoidable cumulative impact to non-covered species under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

The Valley-Ivyglen project would not have any other significant environmental impacts on air quality or noise, or any significant environmental impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, public services and utilities, and transportation that cannot be mitigated to a

less-than-significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the MMCRP.

The Valley-Ivyglen project would have no impact or a less-than-significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources; geology, soils, and mineral resources; greenhouse gases, population and housing, and recreation.

3.3. Alberhill Project Impacts

The Alberhill project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality and noise during project construction, and on noise during maintenance activities. While construction-related daily exhaust emissions of NO_x can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the MMCRP, these measures would not reduce PM_{2.5} or PM₁₀ emissions below their regional threshold of significance, resulting in emissions that could contribute to a violation of ozone air quality standards, which would be individually significant as well as cumulatively considerable. While the mitigation measures can reduce many of the noise impacts, construction-related and maintenance activities would generate short-term increases to ambient noise levels that would continue to be significant and unavoidable after mitigation. In conjunction with other developments that affect or could affect the project area, the Alberhill project would have significant cumulative impacts with respect to the visual impacts in the Alberhill substation area, it would result in a cumulatively consideration net increase of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions, and a significant, unavoidable cumulative impact to non-covered species under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

The Alberhill project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics. Construction activities in the Alberhill substation area would last

21 months, during which time a substantial number of viewers with moderately high visual sensitivity would be exposed to the degraded visual quality in foreground views. After construction, views of the Alberhill substation, portions of the 500-kV transmission lines, and portions of the 115 kV transmission lines would be visible from Interstate 15 in a scenic highway corridor where visual sensitivity is considered to be moderately high, substantially degrading the natural and rural visual character, vividness, intactness, and visual unity in the area. Even with the implementation of mitigation measures, visual impacts at these sites would remain significant.

The Alberhill project would not have any other significant environmental impacts on air quality, aesthetics or noise, or any significant environmental impacts on biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, public services and utilities, and transportation that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the MMCRP.

The Alberhill project would have no impact or a less-than-significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources; geology, soils, and mineral resources; greenhouse gases; population and housing; and recreation.

4. Alternatives

In total, 14 alternatives were identified for the Valley-Ivyglen project and 33 alternatives were identified for the Alberhill project. After screening from consideration for failing to meet the basic project objectives, failing to lessen significant impacts, lacking feasibility, and/or representing a reasonable range of alternatives, six alternatives were retained for consideration for the

Valley-Ivyglen project and three alternatives were retained for consideration for the Alberhill project.

4.1. Valley-Ivyglen Project Alternatives

Three alternatives would relocate Segment VIG8 of the 115 kV transmission line which, under the proposed project, would continue from the end of 115 kV Segment VIG7 in a new underground conduit along Temescal Canyon Road across Interstate 15, to a point located across from Ivyglen Substation, from which it would transition to an overhead position prior to entering the substation. Under VIG Alternative A, Segment VIG8 would be installed underground along the west side of De Palma Road and Campbell Ranch Road. Under VIG Alternative B1, Segment VIG8 would be installed underground along De Palma Road, Santiago Canyon Road, Maitri Road, and an unnamed road. Under VIG Alternative B2, the alignment would be similar to VIG Alternative B1, but it would be installed mostly overhead.

Under the proposed project, Segment VIG6 would run over land along the south side of Interstate 15. VIG Alternative C would relocate a section of the segment to the north side of Interstate 15 and underground the section along Temescal Canyon Road and south on Horsethief Road to De Palma Road.

VIG Alternative M would underground the entire proposed project alignment.

VIG No Project Alternative includes no construction of the Valley-Ivyglen project and no construction of the Alberhill project as proposed (as, without the Valley-Ivyglen project, it would be infeasible to construct the Alberhill project as proposed).

4.2. Alberhill Project Alternatives

Under ASP Alternative B, the Alberhill substation would be constructed as a 500/115 kV substation with all gas-insulated switchgear for an ultimate build-out of three transformers and one spare transformer.

Under ASP Alternative DD, the 500 kV switchrack would be all open air and the microwave antenna tower would be from 120 feet to 195 feet tall. The initial build-out would connect the 500 kV transmission lines from the substation directly north to tie into the existing Serrano Valley 500 kV transmission line, and the ultimate build-out may include up to five 500 kV transmission lines, including a future generation interconnection. ASP Alternative DD would require reconfiguring the proposed project alignment to accommodate double-circuits and additional circuits that would be required.

Under ASP No Project Alternative, the Valley-Ivyglen project would be constructed, the Alberhill project would not be constructed, and SCE would modify its planning approach and operating procedures so that the C-Section transformer at the Valley Substation would provide additional power transfer capability and mitigate potential overload conditions on D-Section transformers.

5. Environmentally Superior Alternatives

5.1. Valley-Ivyglen Project

VIG No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. Among the other alternatives, the proposed Valley-Ivyglen project is the environmentally superior alternative.¹⁰ Although VIG Alternative C is slightly

¹⁰ If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6.)

superior for several resource areas, it could have severe impacts on biology and hydrology, which would by far outweigh the impact levels of other resources. Although VIG Alternatives A, B1 and B2 are superior for some resource areas, none would reduce the significant and unavoidable noise impacts and would increase the severity of the impact in favor of slight reductions in impacts that would already be less than significant with mitigation. In addition, VIG Alternatives B1 and B2 could affect vernal pool habitat. Finally, VIG Alternative M would have much greater impacts across all resource areas.

5.2. Alberhill Project

ASP No Project is the environmentally superior alternative. Among the other alternatives, the proposed Alberhill project is the environmentally superior alternative. Although ASP Alternative DD would reduce traffic impacts, increased impacts to other resource areas would far outweigh them. In addition, the alternative could potentially include the construction of two substations and thereby double the impacts and significantly increase cumulative impacts. Although ASP Alternative B would require less ground disturbance, it is not possible without significant additional engineering to assess whether it would reduce impacts on certain resources.

6. CEQA Compliance

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15090(a), prior to approving a project the lead agency shall certify that the EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR prior to approving the project, and that the EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

The Commission's Energy Division issued and distributed an initial Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the Alberhill project on April 13, 2010, and

conducted an initial public scoping meeting on April 29, 2010. The Energy Division issued and distributed a second Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the Alberhill project on July 28, 2011, and conducted a second public scoping meeting on August 18, 2011. The Energy Division issued a third Notice of Preparation of an EIR on May 6, 2015, this time for both the Alberhill and Valley-Ivyglen projects, and conducted a public scoping meeting for the combined project on May 18, 2015.

The Energy Division issued the draft EIR on April 14, 2016, and granted an extension of the May 31, 2016, deadline for public review and comment to July 15, 2016. In the interim, the Energy Division conducted public meetings on May 11 and 12, 2016, in Lake Elsinore and Perris, respectively, to explain the proposed projects, to discuss the proposed projects' significant impacts, and to receive public comments. Approximately 400 government agencies, public and private organizations, and individuals provided comments on the draft EIR.

The final EIR documents and responds to all written and oral comments made on the draft EIR, as required by CEQA. As also required by CEQA, the final EIR examines the environmental impacts of the proposed projects and alternatives, including the No Project Alternative; it identifies their significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures that will avoid or substantially lessen them, where feasible; and it identifies the environmentally superior alternatives.

We have reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR. We find that substantial evidence supports the EIR's findings, and we certify that the EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA, that we have reviewed and considered the information contained in it, and that, with the revisions to the

mitigation measures reflected in the MMRP attached to this order, it reflects our independent judgment.

We address the parties' challenges to the EIR below.

6.1. Aesthetics Impacts

6.1.1. Views and Viewer Groups

Using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) 1988 guidelines for Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects 8 guidelines, the EIR notes that people who are driving for pleasure, are engaging in recreational activities, or are homeowners have high viewer sensitivity to changes to views, while people who are commuting to and from work, engaged in their work, or engaged in personal business activities have lower viewer sensitivity. The EIR therefore evaluates the proposed projects' aesthetic impacts on views in highway corridors seen by the high sensitivity viewer groups rather than views from streets within the city seen by the lower sensitivity viewer groups. The City asserts that this analysis violates CEQA by dismissing the sensibilities of residents, workers, commuters and people engaged in commerce in stark contrast to the California cities' development policies which routinely mandate the undergrounding of utilities in new subdivisions and commercial centers and by failing to use the FHWA's recently revised 2015 guidelines.

To the contrary, the EIR's selection and application of the 1988 guidelines is fully supported by substantial evidence.¹¹ As it explains:

The FHWA has recently revised its guidelines for visual impact assessment to allow different levels of documentation and be more readily understood and practical in its application (FHWA 2015).

¹¹ See Pub. Res. C. § 21168.5.

However, the new FHWA guidelines now focus more on transportation projects and no longer emphasize several key concepts from the earlier guidelines that are applicable to various types of projects, such as transmission lines, substations, and similar industrial-type development projects, in rural, suburban, and urban landscapes. Although the new FHWA guidelines incorporate many elements from those issued in 1988, the earlier guidelines remain most applicable for assessing aesthetic impacts of proposed projects situated within diverse landscape types and on private lands. (EIR, at 4.1-16 – 4.1-17.)¹²

6.1.2. Single versus Double Circuit Pole

The City objects that the EIR's visual impact analysis is premised on its review of simulated views showing single circuit poles, even though it acknowledges that the Alberhill project will hang a second circuit on Valley-Ivyglen project poles on three segments within Lake Elsinore. The City asserts that the EIR's failure to review simulated views of double circuits on the three segments deprives decisionmakers of a fair and accurate analysis of visual impacts. To the contrary, as clarified in the errata to the EIR, the visual simulation for Key Viewpoint 13 (Figure 4.1-4n) provides an example of the incremental impact associated with adding an additional circuit to the proposed Valley-Ivyglen structures. The EIR's conclusion that these changes would be incremental and would not raise the level of significance beyond that disclosed under AES-3 (VIG) is reasonable.¹³

6.1.3. Response to Comment

The City asserts that the EIR failed to adequately respond to its comments on the draft EIR because it offers a single response to all eight paragraphs of the

¹² See also, Final EIR Errata-1 through Errata-2.

¹³ Final EIR Errata at Errata-4.

City's discussion of "Aesthetic Impacts with the City of Lake Elsinore." To the contrary, all eight paragraphs are substantively repetitive; the single response adequately addresses them.¹⁴ Furthermore, paragraphs 248-2 and 248-7 have since been revised to augment the responses.¹⁵

6.2. Air Quality Impacts

FRONTLINES objects that the EIR's air quality analysis considers the air quality impacts of the Alberhill project separately from the air quality impacts of the Valley-Ivyglen project and thereby understates the air quality impacts that will occur if both projects are simultaneously constructed. FRONTLINES identifies no law or principle that prohibits consideration the air quality impacts of the separate project and none is apparent. Furthermore, there is no merit to FRONTLINES' assertion that the EIR fails to consider the air quality impacts resulting from simultaneous construction. To the contrary, the EIR identifies the potential air quality impacts resulting from overlapping construction in the cumulative air quality analyses for each project as well as in the EIR's cumulative impacts analysis.¹⁶

FRONTLINES asserts that the EIR's air quality analysis is flawed because, by failing to acknowledge that not all helicopter landing and takeoff activity will take place on paved areas, it does not properly account for fugitive dust emissions and, by extension, fails to address concerns regarding Valley Fever that FRONTLINES raised in its comment on the draft EIR. The February 23, 2018 errata to the EIR amends the response to FRONTLINES' comment to addresses

¹⁴ Appx. M, City comment letter at 2-4.

¹⁵ Final EIR Errata at Errata-2.

¹⁶ EIR at 4.3-17, 4.3-25, and 6-12 through 6-13.

these shortcomings by acknowledging that helicopter activity may also take place on non-paved landing pads, and by explaining that residents are unlikely to contract Valley Fever as a result of helicopter activity because the non-paved helicopter pads are not located close to residences and that construction workers are required to comply with Cal/OSHA policies related to Valley Fever, and it amends the discussion in the EIR accordingly.¹⁷

6.3. Noise Impacts

FRONTLINES asserts that the EIR's Table 4.11-6 materially misstates that Valley-Ivyglen construction noise impacts will be less than significant at 200 feet from tower construction sites by omitting helicopter noise impacts. To the contrary, as indicated in its title, Table 4.11-6 does not purport to represent all Valley-Ivyglen construction noise impacts; rather, it expressly represents Valley-Ivyglen construction noise impacts "excluding blasting and helicopter use." Further to the contrary, in the paragraph immediately following Table 4.11-6, the EIR finds that there will be temporary significant increases in noise impacts at 200 feet from construction and that they are significant and unavoidable.¹⁸

FRONTLINES asserts that the EIR makes a number of omissions and material misstatements of fact regarding the helicopter noise impacts, and that the EIR ignores FRONTLINES' comments on the draft EIR wherein

¹⁷ Final EIR Errata at Errata-1.

¹⁸ EIR at 4.11-30.

FRONTLINES pointed them out. To the contrary, the EIR appropriately summarizes and responds to FRONTLINE's comments.¹⁹

6.4. Socioeconomic Impacts and Environmental Justice Concerns

The City asserts that the EIR fails to address the proposed projects' socioeconomic impacts and that the proposed projects will heavily impact residential and commercial development by making planned and foreseeable land uses undesirable or economically unviable, which may lead to blight or urban decay. The City's assertions are merely argument and speculation, and not substantiated by any offer of evidence.²⁰ In contrast, as the EIR explains, substantial evidence demonstrates that the project would result in less than significant aesthetic impacts or impacts that would be mitigated to less than significant, so it is not reasonably foreseeable that the construction of the project would result in blight or urban decay.²¹

The City objects that the EIR fails to address environmental justice concerns caused by the fact that, while the proposed projects will provide benefits to the Cities of Murrieta, Murrieta Springs, Perris, Menifee, Wildomar, and Lake Elsinore along with portions of the County of Riverside, the proposed projects' impacts will primarily affect the City of Lake Elsinore. To the contrary, the issue of environmental justice concerns "the fair treatment of people of all

¹⁹ EIR, Appx. L, Response to comments # 99-59 through 99-72.

²⁰ See Pub. Res. C. § 21082.2(c), "Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, evidence which is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence of social or economic impacts which do not contribute to, or are not caused by, physical impacts on the environment, is not substantial evidence. Substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts."

²¹ EIR, Appx. L, Response to comment # 248-16.

racess, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.”²² As the EIR states in response to the City’s comment on the draft EIR regarding this subject, the evaluation of the 2015 census data demonstrates that “Lake Elsinore as a whole is not a population at risk due to its minority or low income population.”²³ The City offers no evidence to the contrary that would implicate environmental justice concerns.

6.5. Alternatives and Mitigation

The City objects that the EIR does not analyze any alternatives that include undergrounding through Lake Elsinore (other than Alternative M to the VIG project), and asserts that undergrounding through portions of Lake Elsinore would reduce impacts to aesthetics, socioeconomic impacts and urban decay to less than significant.²⁴ Similarly, Castle & Cooke asserts that the Commission must underground a segment of the Alberhill 500 kV transmission line that is visible from Interstate 15 because it is feasible and would mitigate significant visual impacts, which we take to mean that Castle & Cooke challenges the EIR for failing to consider such undergrounding as a project alternative.²⁵

²² Gov. C. § 65040.12(e).

²³ FEIR, Appx. L, Response to comment # 248-17.

²⁴ The City also asserts, without support, that the EIR’s conclusion (at 5-27) that undergrounding would neither create nor avoid a land use conflict is “clearly false.” (City opening brief at 22.) To the contrary, the EIR finds that the proposed projects do not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation or, with mitigation, with any applicable conservation plan (EIR at 4.10-13 through 4.10-28), and the City does not cite to any evidence to suggest that an underground alternative through portions of Lake Elsinore would fare differently.

²⁵ Castle & Cooke also makes the assertion that undergrounding Segment VIG5 of the Valley-Ivyglen project is feasible because it can be accomplished in a reasonable period of time,

Footnote continued on next page

To the contrary, the EIR considers a reasonable range of alternatives. Under CEQA, the range of alternatives “shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant impacts.”²⁶ It “need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. ... There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.”²⁷ Here, the EIR did consider a number of undergrounding alternatives. Furthermore, as the EIR notes, it is not apparent that undergrounding alternatives will prove to be environmentally superior to non-undergrounding alternatives, as they may result in reduced aesthetic impacts at the expense of greater impacts on other resource areas.²⁸

TURN and FRONTLINES assert that the EIR improperly precluded consideration of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Alberhill project because it identified the construction of a new 500/115-kV substation as one of the project objectives. To the contrary, as explained in Appendix K to the EIR,

and that it should be done because it would avoid the impacts of relocating the line in the future and improve the visual impact to the entrance of the City along the I-15 freeway and along Lake Street. (Castle & Cooke opening brief at 4-5.) Castle & Cooke does not identify an issue in the proceeding to which these assertions go, and none are apparent. The EIR does not find any significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact of the Valley-Ivyglen project, so there was no cause for it to evaluate alternatives that would mitigate such impact.

²⁶ CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(c).

²⁷ CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(a).

²⁸ EIR, Appx. L, Response to Comment 248-18.

the EIR considered a number of non-substation alternatives and rejected them because they did not meet *any* of the project objectives.²⁹

FRONTLINES argues that the EIR violates CEQA by failing to identify any alternative to the Valley-Ivyglen project that did not include the use of helicopters in construction activities notwithstanding that use of helicopters will result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts and contribute to significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. This argument is without merit. SCE petitions to modify D.10-08-009 in order to permit the use of helicopters in construction. The EIR appropriately assesses and, where possible, reduces or avoids the environmental impacts of granting SCE's petition.

FRONTLINES argues that the EIR's analysis of the Alberhill No Project Alternative is materially deficient because it does not discuss actions that SCE would pursue pursuant to its planning criteria, such as installing reactive equipment, developing system tie lines, and implementing demand shifting.³⁰ The February 23, 2018, errata amends the discussion to eliminate the reference to one possible action that SCE might take so as to remove any suggestion that there are no other possible actions.³¹

²⁹ See CEQA Guideline § 15126.6(a), "Alternatives to the Proposed Project. An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly attain *most* of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives...." (Emphasis added.)

³⁰ FRONTLINES opening brief at 37, citing to SCE testimony that identifies, as benefits that constitute overriding considerations, (a) sufficient transformer capacity to safely and reliably serve forecasted electrical demand through the project's Electrical Needs Area, (b) 115 kV tie-lines between the Alberhill System and the Valley South System, and (c) operational flexibility to transfer load between the two systems. (Ex. SCE-1 at 9:19-27.)

³¹ Final EIR Errata at Errata-3 to Errata-4.

FRONTLINES asserts that the EIR improperly failed to consider the installation of a third transformer or shifting demand among SCE's existing 115 kV systems as feasible alternatives to the Alberhill project that avoid adverse environmental impacts and address Valley South overload concerns indicated by SCE's peak demand forecast. To the contrary, the Alternatives Screening Report considered both of these alternatives, and eliminated them from consideration because neither would meet any of the project objectives.³²

FRONTLINES asserts that the EIR improperly failed to consider upgrading the Valley-Elsinore-Fogarty line with higher capacity conductor or rebuilding it in a double-circuit configuration as feasible alternatives to the proposed Valley-Ivyglen project notwithstanding information that FRONTLINES presented in comment on the draft EIR that allegedly demonstrates their feasibility. To the contrary, the EIR provides substantial evidence for rejecting those proposals by explaining that the conductor capacity upgrade proposal would reroute the line through a congested area and require the addition of 115 kV capacity to the Alberhill project and would not achieve the project purpose of a redundant circuit.³³

ORA asserts that the Valley-Ivyglen project "will lead to the existing Valley leg of the Valley-Elsinore-Fogarty three-terminal line, approximately 13 miles long, not being used most of the time" and that the proposed project

³² EIR, Appx. D at 34-39, evaluating ASP Alternative E (installing a third transformer) and ASP Alternative F (demand-shifting). In addition, the demand-shifting alternative ASP Alternative F would not reduce any environmental impacts but would increase air quality impacts.

³³ EIR, Appx. L, Response to comments 99-38 through 99-45.

“should be refined to include only those elements that are needed.”³⁴ This bare assertion does not inform the issue of whether there are feasible alternatives to the proposed project. In any event, as stated in the Scoping Memo, the time and place for the consideration of project alternatives was during the environmental review process in comment on the draft EIR.³⁵

6.6. Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative

Citing to CEQA Guideline § 15126.6(e)(2), TURN argues that the EIR violates CEQA for failing to identify a project alternative to the Alberhill project (other than the No Project Alternative) that is environmentally superior to it. This argument has no merit. CEQA Guideline § 15126.6(e)(2) does not preclude the proposed project from being identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

6.7. Compliance Enforcement

FRONTLINES argues that the EIR is legally deficient because it fails to require SCE to operate its construction activities in a manner consistent with the EIR’s assumptions. To the contrary, the EIR’s analysis is properly based on SCE’s expectations for its construction activities. If SCE requires a “Minor Project Refinement”³⁶ to conduct greater activity than is assumed in the EIR, the Commission will review and approve it if there is no increase in the severity of the impact, or conduct additional environmental review if the impact would be

³⁴ ORA opening brief at 6.

³⁵ Scoping Memo at 5.

³⁶ See Ordering Paragraph 2, below.

severely increased.³⁷ Indeed, SCE's petition to modify D.10-08-009 to allow it to use helicopters in construction is an example of that process.

7. Infeasibility

Where construction of a project alternative would have significant environmental effects, the Commission may not approve the project without the mitigation identified to reduce or avoid those effects unless the Commission finds that the identified mitigation or project alternative is infeasible for specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3).) No party asserts that the environmentally superior project alternatives and associated mitigation measures are infeasible, and we find that they are not infeasible.

8. Overriding Considerations, Including Project Need for Alberhill Project

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15093, the Commission may approve a project that results in significant and unavoidable impacts only upon a finding that there are overriding considerations. Section 15093(a) describes the analysis as follows:

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the

³⁷ EIR, Appx. L, Response to Comments 99-59.

adverse environmental effects may be considered acceptable.
(CEQA Guidelines § 15093(a).)

We find that the Valley-Ivyglen project's ability to serve projected electrical demand requirements in the Lake Elsinore Electrical Needs Area and provide the reliability benefits of a second 115 kV line to Ivyglen Substation are benefits that outweigh its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, as discussed in Part 8.1, below.

We find that the Alberhill project's ability to serve projected electrical demand requirements and to provide operational flexibility in the Valley Substation area requires more information to determine if benefits outweigh its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, as discussed in Part 8.2, below.

8.1. Valley-Ivyglen Project

The Commission in D.10-08-009 granted SCE a permit to construct the environmentally superior Valley-Ivyglen project alternative. In so doing, the Commission found that the need to increase the operating capacity of the facilities serving the Lake Elsinore Electrical Needs Area and provide greater reliability in the event of an outage on the single line that currently served them were overriding considerations that supported approval of the project, notwithstanding its significant and unavoidable impacts.³⁸ We reaffirm that the need to provide a second source line to serve the Lake Elsinore Electrical Needs Area is an overriding consideration that merits approval of the Valley-Ivyglen

³⁸ D.10-08-009, Conclusion of Law 13.

project as modified, despite its significant and unavoidable impacts on impacts on air quality, noise and biological resources.

Currently, the primary 115 kV source line that provides power to this electrical needs area is the Valley-Elsinore-Fogarty 115 kV line, which supplies power to the Fogarty and Ivyglen substations serving approximately 15,000 of SCE's metered customers. Since 2010, SCE has identified this source line as being at risk of exceeding its maximum operating limits under emergency conditions if an N-1 outage were to occur during heat storm conditions. Since 2016, SCE has also identified this line as being at risk of exceeding its maximum operating limits under normal conditions when all facilities are in service. In the event of an outage of the line, there would be a complete loss of electrical power to all 15,000 metered customers. In fact, outage reports from 2010 to early 2017 identified 23 electrical service outages to either or both Ivyglen or Fogarty substations due to both substations receiving power from a single 115 kV source line.³⁹

We find that the need to provide the reliability benefits of a second 115 kV line to Ivyglen Substation is an overriding consideration that outweighs the modified project's significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality during construction and on noise during construction and maintenance, and its significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts on air quality and biological resources.⁴⁰

³⁹ Ex. SCE-1 at 5-6.

⁴⁰ As this is a sufficient overriding consideration on its own to merit project approval, we do not reach the issue of whether the need to increase subtransmission capacity is also an overriding consideration.

ORA asserts that SCE has not shown that the purported need for the Valley-Ivyglen project is an overriding consideration meriting project approval, explaining that the Valley-Ivyglen line will lead to the existing Valley leg of the Valley-Elsinore-Fogarty three-terminal line not being used most of the time and asserting that the project should be “refined” to include only needed elements.⁴¹ To the extent that ORA means to suggest a project alternative, the time and place to do so was in the course of the CEQA review and in comment on the draft EIR.⁴² These assertions do not inform the issue of whether there is a need to achieve the Valley-Ivyglen project’s project objectives.

8.2. Alberhill Project

SCE asserts that the need to serve forecasted local area demand and to increase operating flexibility in the Valley Substation area is an overriding consideration that merits approval of the Alberhill project. Currently, the Valley Substation is the only 500/115 kV substation serving electrical demand from approximately 325,000 metered customers in the San Jacinto Region of southwestern Riverside County. The Valley Substation transforms voltage from 500 kV to 115 kV using four 560 MVA transformers, two of which serve the Valley North 115 kV System and two of which serve the Valley South 115 kV System. The maximum amount of electrical load that each system can serve is limited to the amount of electrical power that their respective two transformers can serve, which is 1119 MVA. SCE currently forecasts that peak electrical demand under 1-in-5-year heat storm conditions will increase and come to

⁴¹ ORA opening brief at 5-6.

⁴² See Scoping Memo at 5.

exceed the operating limit of the Valley South System's two 500 MVA/115 kV transformers by as early as 2021.⁴³ SCE's forecast is "bottom-up" in that it is based on historic recorded local peak demand, adjusted to normalize for weather conditions and to account for the "dependability" of behind-the-meter resources (as will be discussed below), to which SCE adds expected load growth.

TURN, ORA and FRONTLINES⁴⁴ challenge SCE's forecast on several counts. First, the parties challenge SCE's failure to use the California Independent System Operator's (CAISO) forecast, which forecasts demand on the Valley South system under 1-in-10-year heat storm conditions to be 956 megawatts (MW) in 2021 and 950 MW in 2026.⁴⁵ However, because the Valley South system is radially configured (meaning that all of its electrical demand flows through a single substation), the Valley South system is not under CAISO control or subject to its planning criteria.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the CAISO forecast predicts the local area's demand at the time of the system-wide peak, not the local area's non-coincident peak demand, which is inappropriate for local area planning: If the local area demand at the time that the system as a whole peaks is lower than local area demand when it is at its non-coincident peak, then

⁴³ Ex. SCE-2 at 15.

⁴⁴ Subsequent references to "parties" refer to two or more of these three parties.

⁴⁵ Ex. ORA-1 at 5. The parties assume that, in order to convert MW to MVA, the MW value may be divided by a conversion factor of 1.0. SCE asserts that the conversion factor is 0.96. (Ex. SCE-2 at 7.)

⁴⁶ TURN and FRONTLINES claim that the Commission relied on the CAISO's load projection in evaluating San Diego Gas & Electric Company's application to build a project similar to the Alberhill project, notwithstanding that it was a radially configured system. (TURN reply brief at 9, citing to FRONTLINES opening brief at 7.) To the contrary, the Commission concluded that the proposed project was a part of the "Bulk Electric System" and subject to CAISO standards. (D.16-12-064, Finding of Fact 3 and Conclusion of Law 13.)

planning based on local area demand at the time of the system-wide peak will not meet the local area's peak demand. SCE's forecast is of the local area's non-coincident peak demand and more appropriately used for local area planning.

The parties go on to challenge SCE's adjustments to the "raw data" for historic recorded local peak demand. First, SCE adjusts the data for the historical average peak temperature and then for extreme weather conditions. The parties object that the effect of this is to increase the demand forecast. Nevertheless, adjusting the data for weather is consistent with demand forecasting by other utilities as well as the California Energy Commission,⁴⁷ and the parties offer no persuasive evidence or argument that SCE's methodology for doing so is unreasonable.

Next, SCE adjusts the data to add distributed generation amounts that are not determined to be "dependable generation," which SCE generally defines as the reasonably expected output amount of a generation source that is on-line at least 90 percent of the on-peak demand hours over the summer months. SCE determines whether the generation source is dependable by monitoring the power output of facilities over 1 MW and, for residential rooftop solar photovoltaics below 1 MW, by using solar output curves developed from smart meter data to determine a percentage of maximum output of the installation.⁴⁸ SCE does not include demand response in its forecast, arguing that many of the programs trigger demand response based on broader system-level events or

⁴⁷ Ex. SCE-2 at 12.

⁴⁸ Ex. SCE-2 at 10, fn. 5; SCE/McCabe, Reporter's Transcript (RT) 71, 195-197.

market-based signals and thus are not a reliable resource for local area planning. Finally, SCE does not include energy storage in its forecast, arguing that there are few examples to demonstrate its impact on a consistent and reliable basis.

The parties argue that this approach fails to reflect future gains in energy efficiency that are reflected in legislation expanding customer eligibility for energy efficiency incentive programs and in the energy efficiency goals that the Commission adopted for SCE in D.17-09-025. However, the parties offer no evidence or explanation as to how these State-wide and system-wide incentives and goals will impact peak demand in the Valley South system specifically. In contrast, SCE offers a reasonable explanation for why it discounts distributed energy based on its proven dependability at peak times, and for excluding demand response for purposes of forecasting peak demand at the local level. Nevertheless, as SCE witness McCabe states, “Forecasting of any type is not an exact science.”⁴⁹ Indeed, while SCE predicted in its application that Valley South peak demand would exceed its capacity by 2011, its successive forecasts have predicted decreasing rates of load growth, with its most recent forecast now predicting load growth of 0.89 percent per year from 2017 to 2026, and pushing out the now relatively modest projected need for the Alberhill project to 2021.⁵⁰ Considering SCE’s point that the CAISO’s and SCE’s forecasts are not directly comparable without adjustment, we note that the CAISO predicts declining electric demand at the Valley South system.⁵¹ Also considering SCE’s point that there are few examples of energy storage to demonstrate what its impact will be,

⁴⁹ Ex. SCE-2 at 14:8.

⁵⁰ Ex. TURN-1, Figure 6 at 20; Ex. SCE-1 at 10; Ex. SCE-2 at 15.

⁵¹ Ex. TURN-6.

there is no reason to expect it to have other than a downward impact on peak demand that increases as the technology continues to develop. Taken together with SCE's track record in forecasting local peak demand, these factors lead us to request SCE to supplement the record with additional analyses to better determine whether it is likely that local peak demand in the Valley South system will exceed its capacity as soon as SCE predicts.⁵²

SCE also points to the Alberhill project's reliability and operational flexibility benefits as contributing overriding considerations for approving the project. Specifically, the project would create system ties between the new 115 kV system and the Valley South 115 kV system that would enable either system to provide electricity in place of the other during maintenance or to relieve other operation issues. However, while these benefits would flow from the Alberhill project, they might be achievable through a project of a different scope.⁵³ For these reasons, we direct SCE to supplement the existing record with additional analyses of alternatives which may satisfy the needs of the Valley South system. Nevada Hydro points to the ability of its proposed Lake Elsinore Advanced Pumped Storage (LEAPS) project to interconnect with SCE's transmission system as an overriding consideration meriting project approval. The proposed LEAPS project is a 500 MW pumped hydro project that would connect with SCE's 500 kV system through the yet unapproved and unbuilt

⁵² SCE mistakenly asserts that the EIR affirms SCE's load forecasts. To the contrary, while the EIR affirms that SCE's methodology is consistent with industry forecasting methodology, it does not present an independent forecast. Rather, it relies on SCE's forecasts for purposes of evaluating the Valley-Ivyglen and Alberhill project objectives and for developing a range of alternatives based upon those objectives. (EIR, Appx. K.)

⁵³ SCE/McCabe, RT 159-160.

Talega-Escondido/Valley-Serrano transmission project that would extend from San Diego Gas & Electric Company's 230 kV Talega-Escondido transmission line to SCE's Serrano-Valley 500 kV transmission line. Nevada Hydro does not have authority from this Commission to construct the Talega-Escondido/Valley-Serrano transmission project, or any pending application to obtain such authority. There is no basis on this record to find that the ability to interconnect the possible LEAPS project to SCE's system is an overriding consideration meriting approval of the Alberhill project.

CEQA and Pub. Util. Code § 1001 require us to weigh the uncertain and relatively modest projected need for the Alberhill project against its certain significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics. We also take note of the Alberhill project cost of \$464 million or more.⁵⁴ This decision takes no action on the Alberhill project at this time. SCE is directed to supplement the existing record with additional analyses including but not limited to:

- a) Load forecast including industry accepted methods for estimating load growth and incorporating load reduction programs due to energy efficiency, demand response, and behind-the-meter generation;
- b) Identification of all subtransmission planning areas in the SCE system with similar reliability issues;
- c) A planning study that supports the project need and includes applicable planning criteria and reliability standards;

⁵⁴ SCE seeks approval of a "preliminary" maximum cost of \$464 million, noting that this estimate may change due to permitting and environmental requirements and other factors and the potential need for the Commission to adjust the maximum cost to reflect such changes. (SCE opening brief at 27-28.)

- d) An analysis of several years of electric reliability performance for the Valley systems to demonstrate existing customer service level;
- e) An analysis of outages over the past 5 years by root cause for the Valley South systems in comparison to SCE system average and to other subtransmission radial systems;
- f) The forecasted impact of the proposed project on service reliability performance, using electric service reliability metrics where applicable;
- g) Cost/benefit analysis of several alternatives for:
 - enhancing reliability
 - providing additional capacity including evaluation of energy storage, distributed energy resources, demand response or smart-grid solutions;
- h) Identify capital investments or operational changes effectuated to address reliability issues in the absence of construction of Alberhill Substation and associated costs for such actions;
- i) Detailed justification of the recommended solution as the best solution, including an explanation of how the proposed project ranks in the SCE capital investment portfolio of infrastructure upgrades.

9. EMF Compliance

The Commission has examined EMF impacts in several previous proceedings.⁵⁵ We found the scientific evidence presented in those proceedings was uncertain as to the possible health effects of EMFs and we did not find it appropriate to adopt any related numerical standards. Because there is no agreement among scientists that exposure to EMF creates any potential health risk, and because CEQA does not define or adopt any standards to address the

⁵⁵ See D.06-01-042 and D.93-11-013.

potential health risk impacts of possible exposure to EMFs, the Commission does not consider magnetic fields in the context of CEQA and determination of environmental impacts.

However, recognizing that public concern remains, we do require, pursuant to GO 131-D, Section X.A, that all applications for authority to construct electric facilities over 50 kV include a description of the measures taken or proposed by the utility to reduce the potential for exposure to EMFs generated by the Proposed Project. We developed an interim policy that requires utilities, among other things, to identify the no-cost measures undertaken, and the low-cost measures implemented, to reduce the potential EMF impacts. The benchmark established for low-cost measures is four percent of the total budgeted project cost that results in an EMF reduction of at least 15 percent (as measured at the edge of the utility right-of-way).

With respect to the Valley-Ivyglen project, the project will use taller poles; it will use a triangular type pole-head configuration for single-circuit segments and a double-circuit pole-head configuration for double-circuit segments; and it will phase the subtransmission line with respect to the adjacent existing transmission and subtransmission lines. This design complies with the Commission's policies regarding incorporating no-cost and low-cost EMF reduction measures into electric facilities project design.

10. Maximum Reasonable and Prudent Cost of Alberhill Project

Because we do not take action regarding the approval of the Alberhill project, we do not reach the issue of its maximum reasonable and prudent cost.

11. Ruling Striking TURN Testimony

TURN seeks reversal of the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) ruling striking its prepared testimony regarding alternatives to the Alberhill project that the EIR did not consider and that TURN alleges can more cost-effectively meet the project objective of relieving growth in the system's electrical demand. The ruling stands. Pursuant to CEQA, the EIR evaluates potentially feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives that will avoid or lessen the significant adverse environmental impacts and identifies the environmentally superior project alternative, and the Commission may not approve a project other than the environmentally superior project alternative and all of the identified mitigation measures (unless they are found to be infeasible). Accordingly, the ALJ's April 28, 2016 ruling gave notice, and the assigned Commissioner's June 19, 2017, Scoping Memo affirmed, that no evidence would be taken beyond the final EIR regarding the identification of alternatives, and that any person who wished to present information regarding that issue should do so through public comment on the draft EIR. TURN's offer of evidence outside of the CEQA review process is untimely and serves no permissible purpose under CEQA.

TURN argues that the stricken testimony goes to the issue of whether there is a public convenience and necessity for the Alberhill project⁵⁶ by demonstrating that there are potentially cheaper alternatives that would remove any need for the Alberhill project. That argument improperly conflates the issues of need and alternatives to meet that need. As the Scoping Memo's statement of issues reflects, the issue of whether there is a public convenience and necessity for the

⁵⁶ See Issue 8, above. ("This issue directly overlaps issue 6, above.")

Alberhill project is not whether there is a superior project alternative, either for environmental or cost reasons, but rather whether there is a need to achieve the proposed project's objectives in the first place.⁵⁷

12. Comments on Alternate Proposed Decision

The alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Guzman Aceves in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on July 19, 2018 by the City of Lake Elsinore, SCE, and TURN. Reply comments were filed on July 24, 2018 by SCE, TURN, and ORA. In response to comments, Commissioner Guzman Aceves modified the alternate proposed decision to keep the proceeding open and made minor edits. The Commission adopts the alternate proposed decision as revised.

13. Assignment of Proceeding

Martha Guzman Aceves is the assigned Commissioner and Hallie Yacknin is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The Valley-Ivyglen project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality during project construction.
2. The Valley-Ivyglen project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on noise during project construction and maintenance.

⁵⁷ See Issue 6.b, above. ("With respect to the Alberhill project, is there a need to relieve projected electrical demand that would exceed the operating limit of the two load-serving Valley South 115 kV System 500/115-kV transformers within the Electrical Needs Area, and to provide electricity in place of the Alberhill 115 kV System during maintenance, during emergency events, or to relieve other operational issues on one of the systems?")

3. The Valley-Ivyglen project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions and a significant, unavoidable cumulative impact to non-covered species under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

4. The Valley-Ivyglen project would not have any other significant environmental impacts on air quality or noise, or any significant environmental impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, public services and utilities, and transportation that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the MMCRP.

5. The Valley-Ivyglen project would have no impact or a less-than-significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources; geology, soils, and mineral resources; greenhouse gases, population and housing, and recreation.

6. The environmentally superior alternative to the Valley-Ivyglen project is the VIG No Project Alternative.

7. Among the other Valley-Ivyglen project alternatives, the proposed Valley-Ivyglen project is the environmentally superior alternative.

8. The Alberhill project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality and noise during project construction, and on noise during maintenance activities.

9. The Alberhill project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics during construction when a substantial number of viewers with moderately high visual sensitivity would be exposed to the degraded visual quality in foreground views, and after construction when views of the Alberhill substation, portions of the 500 kV transmission lines, and portions of the 115 kV

transmission lines would be visible from Interstate 15 in a scenic highway corridor where visual sensitivity is considered to be moderately high, substantially degrading the natural and rural visual character, vividness, intactness, and visual unity in the area.

11. In conjunction with other developments that affect or could affect the project area, the Alberhill project would have significant cumulative impacts with respect to the visual impacts in the Alberhill substation area, it would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions, and a significant, unavoidable cumulative impact to non-covered species under the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

12. The Alberhill project would not have any other significant environmental impacts on air quality, aesthetics or noise, or any significant environmental impacts on biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, public services and utilities, and transportation that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the mitigation measures identified in the MMCRP.

13. The Alberhill project would have no impact or a less-than-significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources; geology, soils, and mineral resources; greenhouse gases; population and housing; and recreation.

14. The environmentally superior alternative to the Alberhill project is the ASP No Project.

15. Among the other Alberhill project alternatives, the proposed Alberhill project is the environmentally superior alternative.

16. The environmentally superior alternatives are not infeasible.

17. Currently, the primary 115 kV source line that provides power to this electrical needs area is the Valley-Elsinore-Fogarty 115 kV line, which is at risk of exceeding its maximum operating limits under emergency conditions if an N-1 outage were to occur during heat storm conditions, risking electrical service outages.

18. The Valley-Ivyglen project would install a second 115 kV source line to Ivyglen Substation.

19. SCE currently forecasts that local peak electrical demand under 1-in-5-year heat storm conditions will increase and come to exceed the operating limit of the Valley South System's two 500 MVA/115 kV transformers by as early as 2021. The Alberhill project would increase the capacity of the Valley South System to accommodate that forecasted increase in local peak electrical demand.

20. SCE's forecasts of local area peak demand in the Valley South area have proven to overestimate local area peak demand on a regular basis.

21. SCE's successive forecasts have predicted decreasing rates of load growth, with its most recent forecast predicting load growth of 0.89 percent per year from 2017 to 2026, and have pushed out the projected need for the Alberhill project from 2011 to 2021.

22. The CAISO predicts declining electric demand for its transmission planning area which includes the Valley South system.

23. Energy storage is expected to have a downward impact on peak demand that increases as the technology continues to develop.

24. It is uncertain whether the Alberhill project will be needed in the near or foreseeable future.

25. The uncertain and relatively modest projected need for the Alberhill project is not an overriding consideration meriting project approval at this time.

26. The Alberhill project's reliability and operational flexibility benefits are not overriding considerations meriting project approval at this time.

27. The Alberhill project's ability to enable the possible LEAPS project to interconnect to SCE's system is not an overriding consideration meriting approval of the Alberhill project.

Conclusions of Law

1. The EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA, and it reflects the Commission's independent judgment and analysis on all material matters.

2. The reliability benefits of a second 115 kV line to Ivyglen Substation outweigh the modified project's significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality during construction and on noise during construction and maintenance, and its significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts on air quality and biological resources.

3. The Valley-Ivyglen project should be granted a permit to construct, in conformance with the MMCRP attached to this order.

4. No action should be taken, at this time, regarding the application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct the Alberhill project.

5. The rulings of the ALJ should stand.

6. A.09-09-022 is deconsolidated from A.07-01-031 and A.07-04-028.

7. A.09-09-022 shall remain open.

8. A.07-01-031 and A.07-04-028 are closed.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Southern California Edison Company is granted a permit to construct the Valley-Ivyglen project in conformance with the Mitigation, Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan attached to this decision as Appendix A.

2. Energy Division may approve requests by Southern California Edison Company for minor project refinements which meet the fixed criteria described below and that may be necessary to complete the Valley-Ivyglen project due to final engineering or other reasons. Minor project refinements cannot create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact, based on the thresholds used in the Environmental Impact Report. They cannot require new conditions for approval, without which the refinements would result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact. They cannot conflict with any mitigation measure or applicable law or policy or trigger an additional permit requirement. Specifically, they must not change mitigation measures. Minor project refinements must be located within the geographic boundary of the study area of the Environmental Impact Report. Southern California Edison Company shall seek any other project refinements by a petition to modify this decision.

3. No action is taken, at this time, regarding Southern California Edison Company's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct the Alberhill project.

4. Southern California Edison Company is directed to supplement the existing record with additional analyses of alternatives which may satisfy the

needs of the Valley South system. The new information should comprehensively present the business case justifying the project, cost/benefit analysis of the scope of alternatives considered, and forecasted improvements in service reliability performance that the proposed project would impact. SCE is directed to supplement the existing record with additional analyses including but not limited to:

- a) Load forecast including industry accepted methods for estimating load growth and incorporating load reduction programs due to energy efficiency, demand response, and behind-the-meter generation;
- b) Identification of all subtransmission planning areas in the SCE system with similar reliability issues;
- c) A planning study that supports the project need and includes applicable planning criteria and reliability standards;
- d) An analysis of several years of electric reliability performance for the Valley systems to demonstrate existing customer service level;
- e) An analysis of outages over the past 5 years by root cause for the Valley South systems in comparison to SCE system average and to other subtransmission radial systems;
- f) The forecasted impact of the proposed project on service reliability performance, using electric service reliability metrics where applicable;
- g) Cost/benefit analysis of several alternatives for:
 - enhancing reliability
 - providing additional capacity including evaluation of energy storage, distributed energy resources, demand response or smart-grid solutions;
- h) Identify capital investments or operational changes effectuated to address reliability issues in the absence of construction of Alberhill Substation and associated costs for such actions;

- i) Detailed justification of the recommended solution as the best solution, including an explanation of how the proposed project ranks in the SCE capital investment portfolio of infrastructure upgrades.
- 5. The rulings of the Administrative Law Judge are affirmed.
- 6. Application (A.) 09-09-022 is deconsolidated from A.07-01-031 and A.07-04-028.
- 7. Application (A.) 07-01-031 and A.07-04-028 are closed and A.09-09-022 remains open.

This order is effective today.

Dated August 23, 2018, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL PICKER
President
CARLA J. PETERMAN
LIANE M. RANDOLPH
MARTHA GUZMAN ACEVES
CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN
Commissioners

I reserve the right to file a concurrence.

/s/ MICHAEL PICKER
Commissioner

Appendix A

Mitigation, Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan

9. Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan

The purpose of this Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan (MMCRP) is to ensure effective implementation of the Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures required by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) that Southern California Edison (the applicant) has agreed to implement as part of the proposed Valley-Ivyglen 115-kilovolt (kV) Subtransmission Line Project (proposed Valley-Ivyglen project). The MMCRP, which is outlined in Table 9-1, includes:

- Each impact evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR);
- Project Commitments and mitigation measures that the applicant is required to implement as part of the proposed project;
- Compliance documentation and consultation requirements for each Project Commitment and mitigation measure;
- Monitoring requirements; and
- Timing for implementation of the Project Commitments and mitigation measures.

This MMCRP is a draft program. The CPUC will finalize this MMCRP prior to construction to include protocols that will be followed prior to, during, and after construction by the CPUC's and the applicant's designated environmental monitors and project staff. Drafted language for the following topics is provided below:

- Roles/ Responsibilities;
- Communication;
- Compliance Verification and Reporting;
- Project Changes, including Minor Project Refinements; and
- Dispute Resolution.

The CPUC will develop the final language of the MMCRP in consultation with the applicant.

A CPUC Monitor (see Section 9.2.1, “CPUC Project Manager and Compliance Managers and Monitors”) will monitor construction of the approved project to ensure full implementation of each Project Commitment and mitigation measure. The CPUC Compliance Manager (see Section 9.2.1) will issue a warning for non-compliance activities that don’t present an immediate risk to environmental resources. Continued non-compliance of low risk activities or non-compliance activities that present a more severe risk to environmental resources will be reported to the CPUC Project Manager (see Section 9.2.1). Any decisions to halt work due to non-compliance will be made by the CPUC Project Manager. The CPUC Compliance Manager will keep a record of any incidents of noncompliance with mitigation measures, Project Commitments, or other conditions of project approval. The CPUC Compliance Manager will provide copies of these documents to the applicant and CPUC Project Manager.

If the CPUC approves the proposed project and mitigation measures, further project construction-related details will be added to the MMCRP.

13.1. 9.1 Regulatory Background

Under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15097, the Lead Agency (in this case, CPUC) is responsible for developing a mitigation monitoring or reporting program to ensure that all project revisions and mitigation measures described in the findings associated with approval of the project are implemented. Monitoring refers to the ongoing or periodic process by which project construction and operation are overseen by the lead agency and ensures that the applicant’s compliance with project conditions is checked on a regular basis. Reporting, which comprises written reviews of the applicant’s compliance with Project Commitments and mitigation measures, ensures that the lead agency is informed of compliance with Project Commitments and mitigation measures. The CPUC views the MMCRP as a working guide to facilitate not only the applicant’s implementation of Project Commitments and mitigation measures, but also the monitoring, compliance, and reporting activities of the CPUC and its monitors. The CEQA Guidelines encourage lead and responsible agencies to cooperate in mitigation monitoring and reporting, where possible.

13.2. 9.2 Roles and Responsibilities

This section outlines roles and responsibilities specific to the MMCRP.

**13.2.1. 9.2.1 CPUC Project Manager and Compliance
Managers and Monitors**

The CPUC Project Manager will assign monitoring and reporting responsibilities to a third-party contractor as described below and will oversee the work of the third-party contractor through review of weekly and monthly status reports. The CPUC Project Manager will be notified of non-compliance situations and may suggest measures to help resolve the issue(s). All minor project refinement requests (further discussed in Section 9.4, "Minor Project Refinements") will be submitted to the CPUC Project Manager for review and approval.

The CPUC Project Manager will assign a Compliance Manager (CPUC Compliance Manager) as the designated point of contact. The CPUC Compliance Manager will be a third-party contractor and will report to the CPUC Project Manager. The CPUC Compliance Manager will consult with the CPUC Project Manager to determine the appropriate level of inspection frequency and intensity and will also oversee one or more Compliance Monitors. Compliance Monitors are on-the-ground personnel responsible for observing and reporting compliance with the terms and conditions of the CPUC Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. The number of Compliance Monitors and frequency of site inspections will depend on the number of concurrent construction activities and their locations. The CPUC Compliance Manager will be an integral part of the project team and will stay apprised of construction activities, schedule changes, and construction progress. The CPUC Compliance Manager and Compliance Monitors will document compliance through daily site inspection forms, the use of tables tracking Project Commitments and mitigation measures, and monthly reports to the CPUC Project Manager.

13.2.2. 9.2.2 Construction Personnel

Applicant Construction Management Team

The applicant's construction management team will oversee, manage, and coordinate with the Construction Crews or Contractor, if utilized, to ensure overall project construction is completed as required by the project conditions and contract, and within the schedule. The applicant's construction management team must ensure that Project Commitments, mitigation requirements, and

project conditions are implemented and that any work stoppages are appropriately communicated and coordinated.

Construction Crews/Contractors

The Construction Crews/Contractors will provide daily construction work schedules and describe the number, types, and activities of the construction scheduled to occur to ensure adequate monitoring resources are provided. The Construction Crews/Contractors will also report deviations from compliance and any spills (e.g., fuel or water) to the Compliance Monitors.

The Construction Crews/Contractors will be responsible for compliance with the environmental requirements of the project. They will be responsible for incorporating all Project Commitments, mitigation requirements, and project conditions into daily construction activities.

Key environmental responsibilities for Construction Crews/Contractors include, but are not limited to:

- Verifying that all construction workers attend the project environmental training program prior to beginning work;
- Reviewing and understanding the Project Commitments, mitigation requirements, and project conditions; and
- Implementing Project Commitments, mitigation requirements, and project conditions during construction and maintaining compliance with the MMCRP.

13.2.3. 9.2.3 Monitoring

As the Lead Agency under CEQA, the CPUC is required to monitor the project to ensure that the Project Commitments, mitigation requirements, and project conditions are implemented. The CPUC will have primary responsibility for ensuring full compliance with the provisions of the monitoring program. The Compliance Monitors, under the supervision of the CPUC Compliance Manager, will monitor construction activities in the project areas on a regular basis, particularly when construction activities have the potential to impact a sensitive resource.

The applicant may elect to have one or more full-time environmental monitor on site on a daily basis to coordinate specialty monitors (such as biologists and archaeologists), assist construction crews with interpreting Project Commitments

1 and mitigation measures, and help correct any compliance issues in a timely
2 manner. Environmental monitors will also provide environmental training.
3

4 **13.2.4. 9.2.4 Enforcement**

5
6 The CPUC has the authority to halt any construction activity associated with the
7 project if the activity is determined to be a deviation from the approved project,
8 adopted Project Commitments, mitigation measures, or conditions of approval.
9 CPUC Compliance Monitors will inform the applicant's environmental monitor
10 or construction contractor of a compliance issue and report compliance issues to
11 the CPUC Project Manager via the CPUC Compliance Manager.
12

13 **13.2.5. 9.2.5 Mitigation Compliance**

14
15 The applicant is responsible for successfully implementing all the adopted
16 Project Commitments and mitigation measures listed in the MMCRP. The
17 applicant shall inform the CPUC Project Manager and CPUC Compliance
18 Manager in writing of any mitigation measures that are not or cannot be
19 successfully implemented. The CPUC Project Manager and CPUC Compliance
20 Manager will identify the appropriate subsequent actions.
21

22 **13.3. 9.3 Communication**

23
24 Communication is a critical component of a successful environmental
25 compliance program. To avoid project delays and possible work stoppages,
26 environmental and construction representatives will need to interact regularly
27 and maintain professional, responsive communications at all times. Similarly,
28 representatives of the applicant will need to coordinate closely with the
29 Compliance Monitors to address and resolve issues in a timely manner. A
30 communication protocol to accurately disseminate information regarding
31 ongoing surveys and mitigation measures, construction activities, contractors,
32 and planned or upcoming work to all levels of the project will be established
33 prior to the commencement of construction.
34

35 **13.3.1. 9.3.1 Monthly Environmental Compliance** 36 **Report**

1 The applicant will prepare and distribute a monthly environmental compliance
2 report to the CPUC Project Manager and CPUC Compliance Manager. The
3 CPUC Compliance Manager will review the monthly report to ensure that the
4 status of Project Commitments and mitigation measures is consistent with
5 observations in the field. The monthly environmental compliance report will also
6 be used to keep all parties informed of construction progress and any schedule
7 changes.
8

9 **13.3.2. 9.3.2 Coordination with Other Agencies**

10
11 Several local, state, and federal agencies have jurisdiction over portions of the
12 land in the project area. In addition, some Project Commitments and mitigation
13 measures were derived from specific agency input. The applicant will be
14 responsible for contacting agencies and immediately notifying them of
15 compliance issues within their jurisdiction. The CPUC Compliance Manager may
16 request copies of email correspondences, phone logs, or other documentation
17 between the applicant and agencies to avoid direct involvement of Compliance
18 Monitors. However, if an issue regarding compliance with an Project
19 Commitment, mitigation measure, or permit requirement under the jurisdiction
20 of an agency remains unresolved, the Compliance Monitors may elect to contact
21 the agency to discuss resolution.
22

23 **13.4. 9.4 Minor Project Refinements**

24
25 This section describes the CPUC's process for staff approval of a minor project
26 refinement (MPR) requested by the applicant. An MPR may be necessary as a
27 result of the applicant's final engineering of project elements. The CPUC will
28 only grant approval of an MPR if the refinement achieves or exceeds the level of
29 environmental protection approved in the Final EIR, is consistent with CEQA
30 requirements, and complies with the intent of the mitigation measures in the
31 Final EIR. The CPUC will require a Petition for Modification for any request that
32 does not meet all of the criteria of an MPR.
33

**13.4.1. 9.4.1 Minor Project Refinements Request
Process**

The applicant's request for CPUC staff approval of an MPR must be made in writing and should include the following information:

- A detailed description of the proposed MPR, including an explanation of why the MPR is necessary;
- Photos, maps, and other supporting documentation illustrating the difference between the existing conditions in the project area, the approved project, and the proposed MPR;
- A discussion of each environmental impact of the proposed MPR with supporting data verifying that the proposed MPR would not increase an existing impact of the project or create a new impact, after application of previously adopted mitigation;
- Whether the MPR conflicts with any Project Commitments or mitigation measures;
- Whether the MPR conflicts with any applicable guideline, ordinance, code, rule, regulation, order, decision, statute, or policy; and
- Construction schedule of the MPR.

The CPUC staff may request additional information, agency consultations, or a site visit in order to process the request. The CPUC staff will process the MPR once it is determined that sufficient information about the MPR has been received. The CPUC Project Manager will provide the applicant with a denied MPR with provided justification or a signed, approved MPR.

**13.4.2. 9.4.2 Requirements for Staff Approval of
Minor Refinements**

An MPR must meet all of the following requirements for CPUC staff approval. An MPR must not:

- Be outside the geographic boundary of the study area as defined in the CEQA document;

- Create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact, based on the thresholds used in the environmental document;
- Trigger less restrictive or new discretionary permit requirements;¹
- Conflict with any Project Commitments or mitigation measures or any applicable guideline, ordinance, code, rule, regulation, order, decision, statute, or policy; or
- Require new conditions for approval, without which the refinements would result in a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

Examples of refinements that may be approved by staff after final engineering include, but are not limited to:

- Adding a temporary extra work area or substituting a work area, including lay-down and staging, for another work area that is as suitable as or more suitable than the originally proposed work area. The temporary extra work area or substitute work area must be located in a disturbed area, must be restored to either its initial condition² or an improved condition,³ and must not create any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.
- Adjusting the alignment of a project component within the study area that was defined in the original environmental analysis to avoid sensitive resources or effects on homeowners, or adapt to conditions on the ground that vary from the conditions that existed at the time of the original environmental analysis, so long as the adjustment does not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.
- Finalizing the engineering design for a project component that was not specifically described in the Final EIR or that requires adjustments in order to facilitate construction. The finalized design must not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified impact.

¹ For example: In the event that dredging activities are added to a project, new conditions may be required under a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit or a California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement.

² The initial condition of the area is the condition prior to its use as a work area.

³ For example, trash has been cleaned up that was originally on the site, or the site is replanted with native vegetation.

13.5. 9.5

Dispute Res

The following procedure will be observed for dispute resolution:

- **Step 1.** Disputes and complaints (including those of the public) should be directed first to the CPUC Project Manager for resolution. The CPUC Project Manager will attempt to resolve the dispute.
- **Step 2.** Should this informal process fail, the CPUC Project Manager may initiate enforcement or compliance action to address deviations from the proposed project or adopted MMCRP.
- **Step 3.** If a dispute or complaint regarding the implementation or evaluation of the MMCRP cannot be resolved informally or through enforcement or compliance action by the CPUC, any affected participant in the dispute or complaint may file a written “notice of dispute” with the CPUC Executive Director. This notice should be filed in order to resolve the dispute in a timely manner, with copies concurrently served on other affected participants. Within 10 days of receipt, the Executive Director or designee(s) shall meet or confer with the filer and other affected participants for the purposes of resolving the dispute. The Executive Director shall issue an Executive Resolution describing his/her decision, and serve it on the filer and other affected participants.
- **Step 4.** If one or more of the affected parties is not satisfied with the decision as described in the resolution, such party(ies) may appeal to the CPUC via a procedure to be specified by the Commission.

Parties may also seek review by the CPUC through existing procedures specified in the CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure for formal and expedited dispute resolution, although a good faith effort should first be made to use the foregoing procedure.

13.6. 9.6

Mitigation, M

Table 9-1 presents the MMCRP, which incorporates all changes to the proposed project and mitigation measures that were made as a result of public review of the Draft EIR and Recirculated Draft EIR and further consideration of the proposed project by the CPUC. If the CPUC Commissioners approve the

1 proposed project, CPUC staff will compile the Final MMCRP based on this table
2 and the final project conditions.
3

4 Table 9-1 is the core document for the proposed project's environmental
5 requirements and will serve as the primary guideline for determining
6 compliance with the MMCRP. A copy of the table should be kept with each crew
7 working on the proposed project, and all supervisory staff working on the
8 proposed project should be familiar with the content of the table. CPUC staff will
9 use a modified version of the MMCRP table to accurately track the status of
10 Project Commitments and mitigation measures and will also be used by the
11 applicant's Environmental Monitors, Compliance Monitors, project managers,
12 supervisory staff, and other members of the project team.
13

14 **13.6.1. 9.6.1 Effectiveness Review**

15
16 The CPUC may conduct a comprehensive review of conditions that are not
17 effectively mitigating impacts at any time it deems appropriate, including as a
18 result of the Dispute Resolution procedure outlined in section 9.2, "Roles and
19 Responsibilities." If the CPUC determines that, based on the review, any
20 conditions are not adequately mitigating significant environmental impacts
21 caused by the project, the CPUC may impose additional reasonable conditions to
22 effectively mitigate these impacts. These reviews will be conducted in a manner
23 consistent with the CPUC's rules and practices.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Aesthetics			
Impact AES-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway.		Verify preparation and implementation of landscaping and irrigation plan	After construction
		Verify preparation and implementation of habitat restoration and revegetation plan	Prior to Construction and after construction
	MM AES-1: Staging Area Screening. Staging areas will be screened with perimeter screening fences at least 8 feet tall. Perimeter screening fences will be dark in color and covered with a dark-colored (e.g., dark green, brown, or black) fabric or other material that provides at least 50 percent screening.	Verify staging areas are screened	During construction
	MM AES-2: Segment VIG2 Wood Poles and Undergrounding. 115-kV Segment VIG2 shall be placed on wood poles with the exception of an approximately 1.5-mile section that will be placed underground between Crumpton Road and Conard Avenue.	Verify placement of subtransmission line	Prior to, during, and post construction
		Verify implementation of visual treatments as recommended by a CA RLA	Prior to, during, and post construction
		Verify implementation of visual treatments	Prior to, during, and post construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Impact AES-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	Project Commitment D: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan. MM AES-1: Staging Area Screening.	See above	See above
	MM AES-3: Glare Reduction. To reduce glare from components of the project, reduce color contrast between the project components and the surrounding landscape, and visually unify the project components with the surrounding landscape, the applicant shall use non-specular conductor and guy wire for all powerlines installed as part of the projects. Only use lightweight steel, hybrid, guy, and TSPs and LSTs with a galvanized steel that has been treated to create a dulled finish (unless otherwise required by MM AES-7 or MM AES-8).	Verify implementation of glare reduction measures	Prior to, during, and post construction
	MM AES-4: Lake Street Pole Placement and Landscaping. Poles installed along Lake Street for 115-kV Segment VIG5 and for the Fogarty-Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission line shall adhere to the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poles shall be set back an average of 20 feet from Lake Street's edge of pavement. • Wood or galvanized steel poles with surface coatings with appropriate colors, finishes and textures to most effectively blend the structures with the visible backdrop landscape shall be used along Lake Street. The applicant shall submit preferences for specific colors, finishes, and textures to the CPUC for approval. • SCE shall plant trees with a maximum height and spread of 25 feet at maturity and a minimum height of 10 feet at planting, large shrubs, and other plants within the setback area between the subtransmission alignment and the Lake Street edge of pavement along the segment. Plantings shall be placed at intervals and in locations to maximize screening of lower portions of the transmission structures in views from the road. Plantings shall be drought tolerant. SCE shall coordinate with the City of Lake Elsinore prior to finalizing landscaping design. SCE shall submit the design to the CPUC, along with evidence that SCE has coordinated with the City of Lake Elsinore, prior to pole erection along Lake Street. 	Verify pole placement and landscaping	Prior to, during, and post construction
		Verify pole material	Prior to, during, and post construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
		Verify placement of subtransmission line	Prior to, during, and post construction
Impact AES-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	MM AES-3: Glare Reduction.	See above	See above
	MM AES-5: Night Lighting during Construction. To minimize the effect on any nearby sensitive receptors, lighting for construction activities, staging areas, and maintenance activities will be the minimum necessary to ensure safety and security for nighttime activities. All lighting used for nighttime construction activities will be oriented downward and shielded to eliminate off-site light spill at times when the lighting is in use. Any new safety and security lighting at staging areas or other areas established for long-duration construction activities, such as laydown areas, will be motion-activated or use timers to reduce impacts of nighttime lighting.	Verify utilization of night lighting	During construction
Agriculture and Forestry			
Impact AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.	Project Commitment I: Agricultural Uses:	Verify continued agricultural use	Post construction
Air Quality			
Impact AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	Project Commitment J: Air Emissions Controls.	Verify utilization of fugitive dust control measures	During construction
	MM AQ-1: Minimize NO_x and PM emissions from off-road diesel powered construction equipment. To the extent available, the applicant shall utilize off-road diesel-powered construction equipment with engines greater than 150 horsepower that comply with Tier 4 interim or Tier 4 road emission standards (Tier 4 Standards). In the event that equipment with a Tier 4 Standards compliant engine is not available, that equipment shall be operated with tailpipe retrofit controls that reduce NO _x and PM to no more than Tier 3 emission standards (Tier 3 Standards) levels. Equipment with a non-Tier 4 Standards compliant engine shall be utilized only when the applicant has made an unsuccessful good faith effort to locate equipment with a Tier 4 Standards compliant engine in the Valley-Ivyglen	Verify utilization of Tier 4 Standard equipment	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>Project vicinity (defined as within 200 miles of the applicable project site). Each such good faith effort shall be documented with written correspondence (or signed statement and electronic mail) by the appropriate construction contractor, along with written correspondence from at least two construction equipment rental firms within the defined vicinity confirming the unavailability of equipment with a Tier 4 Standards compliant engine.</p> <p>The applicant shall make available to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) a copy of the certified tier specification, best available control technology documentation, and/or CARB or SCAQMD operating permit for each piece of construction equipment, as applicable, at the time the equipment is mobilized.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain construction equipment according to manufacturing specifications and use low-emissions equipment; • Reduce emissions of PM and other pollutants by using, whenever feasible, alternative clean fuel technology to power vehicles and equipment instead of gasoline- or diesel-powered engines (e.g., electric, hydrogen fuel cell, propane, natural gas, or compressed natural gas-powered equipment with oxidation catalysts); • Ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained and shut off when not in direct use; • Prohibit engine tampering to increase horsepower; • Locate engines, motors, and equipment as far as possible from residential areas and other sensitive receptors, such as schools, daycare centers, and hospitals; • Encourage carpooling to and from staging yards to construction sites to minimize private vehicle use; • Minimize construction-related transport of workers and equipment including trucks; and • Require that on-road vehicles utilized during construction meet CARB fleet regulations. 		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	MM AQ-2: Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) Credits. The remaining emissions of NO _x resulting from construction of the proposed projects shall be mitigated through the purchase of Regional Clean Air Incentive Market Trading Credits (RTCs), Mobile Source Emission Reduction Credits (MSERCs), or a combination of RTCs and MSERCs for every pound of NO _x in excess of the SCAQMD regional significance threshold of 100 pounds per day, as measured per project. The total amount of NO _x RTCs to be purchased shall be calculated once the construction schedules for each project are finalized. The applicant shall purchase and submit documentation of purchase of the required RTCs to the SCAQMD prior to the start of construction of each project. The applicant shall also track actual daily emissions during construction of each project according to a monitoring plan, which shall require keeping records of equipment and vehicle usage for each project.	Verify the purchase of NO _x credits	Prior to and after construction
	MM AQ-3: Dust Control Plan. The applicant shall prepare a Dust Control Plan based on final engineering and pursuant to Rule 403 of the SCAQMD. The applicant shall submit the Plan to the CPUC prior to commencement of ground disturbing activities.	Verify utilization of fugitive dust control measures	During construction
		Verify the purchase of VOC credits	Prior to and after construction
Impact AQ-3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	Project Commitment J: Air Emissions Controls. MM AQ-1: Minimize NO_x and PM emissions from off-road diesel powered construction equipment. MM AQ-2: Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) Credits. MM AQ-3: Dust Control Plan.	See above	See above
Impact AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations		See above	See above
Impact AQ-5: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	MM AQ-4: Odor Reduction at Staging Yard VIG13. At Staging Yard VIG13, heavy equipment use shall be conducted at least 36 feet away from the Southern California Online Academy property.	Verify use of heavy equipment	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Biological Resources			
Impact BR-1: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.	Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.	Verify the preparation and implementation of worker environmental awareness plan	Prior to and during construction
	Project Commitment C: Raptor Protection on Power Lines.	Verify implementation of APLIC recommendations	Prior to and during construction
	Project Commitment D: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan.	See above	See above
	Project Commitment H: Noise Control.	Verify implementation of noise control measures	During construction
	Project Commitment I: San Diego Ambrosia.	Verify implementation of measure	During construction.
	Project Commitment J: ARL Land.	Verify restoration. Confirm that ARL equivalency analysis has been submitted as part of MSHCP PSE submittal.	After construction.
	Project Commitment K: Wildlife Movement.	Review retaining wall design to verify that wildlife movement is not restricted.	Prior to construction of retaining wall.
	MM BR-1: Limit Construction to Designated Areas and Avoid Riparian, Aquatic, and Wetland Areas. Vehicular traffic (including movement of all equipment) shall be restricted to approved access roads and established construction areas shown in Figure 2.6 of the EIR. These areas shall be delineated in the field with flagging and signage. If disturbance is required outside the established construction areas, CPUC notification and approval shall be required. Sensitive resources such as waterbodies, oak trees, and special status plant populations shall be clearly marked for avoidance with flagging and signage. Nighttime lighting, if necessary adjacent to aquatic areas, shall be shielded away from these areas to prevent impacts on aquatic wildlife.	Verify avoidance of wetlands	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	MM BR-2: Preconstruction Surveys. Qualified biologists shall conduct preconstruction surveys within two weeks of the start of construction in any given project construction area. Surveyors shall focus on areas proposed for vegetation removal or ground disturbance that are within habitat that a qualified biologist has deemed suitable for sensitive species. As part of preconstruction surveys, the composition of the vegetation community shall be surveyed to establish baseline conditions prior to construction and to guide post-construction restoration efforts. The surveys shall be conducted to determine the presence of special status plants, noxious weeds, and all wildlife species for the purpose of preventing direct loss of vegetation and wildlife and the spread of noxious plant species. Preconstruction surveys shall be performed for each discrete work area prior to the start of ground disturbance, or if work has lapsed for longer than 30 days. Biologists shall document survey results in a daily logbook or report.	Verify the completion of survey	Prior to construction
	MM BR-3: Biological Monitoring During Construction. In areas where sensitive resources may be impacted by construction activities, a qualified biological monitor shall be present during construction activities. The monitor shall have the authority to temporarily stop work that he or she determines to be threatening to a special status wildlife or plant species or nesting bird. The monitor shall determine appropriate action, and work will resume once the monitor determines there is no longer a threat to the special status species or approval has been obtained from the appropriate wildlife agencies or CPUC. Biologists shall document monitoring observations in a daily logbook.	Verify the monitoring of construction activities	During construction
	MM BR-4: Limit Removal of Native Vegetation Communities and Trees. The removal of native vegetation and trees shall be limited to the minimum practicable area required for construction of the project. Grading, grubbing, graveling, or paving shall only occur where required for construction and operations. The applicant shall use temporary staging areas in a way that facilitates post-construction restoration, and shall restore these areas to as close to pre-construction conditions as possible, or to the conditions agreed upon between the applicant and landowner.	Verify the minimization of native vegetation removal	During construction
	MM BR-5: California gnatcatcher protection measures. In accordance with the MSHCP, removal of Riversidean sage scrub habitat will not occur during the coastal California gnatcatcher breeding season. (February 15 to August 15). Should nesting coastal California gnatcatcher be observed during preconstruction surveys, outside of the breeding season, vegetation removal and other construction-related disturbance shall not commence	Verify the implementation of protection measures	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>within the applicable nest buffer area, as identified in the projects' Nesting Bird Management Plan, until the nest is determined to be inactive.</p> <p>MM BR-6: Oak tree protection measures. This measure applies to oak trees in all project areas. Preventive measures shall be taken during construction activities to minimize impacts in the protected zone of each oak tree. The protected zone commences at a point 5 feet outside the dripline and extends inward to the trunk of the tree. All work conducted in the protected zone of oak trees shall be performed using hand implements and in the presence of a certified arborist. If it is determined that oak tree removal is necessary, the applicant shall relocate oak trees to a place outside of the area of anticipated impacts under the direction of the certified arborist.</p> <p>If the applicant cannot feasibly relocate oak trees that are removed, 1-gallon oak trees shall be planted at a 12:1 ratio within the appropriate habitat to replace removed trees. These replacement trees shall be indigenous coast live oak trees that have been grown in a natural form (no topping or street tree forming).</p> <p>The applicant shall be responsible for monitoring and maintaining the relocated or replacement trees for a minimum of two years (to include at least two complete California rainy seasons, here defined as the period of the year from November – May).</p> <p>In addition, the following minimization measures shall be implemented under the direction of the certified arborist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment, materials, and vehicles shall not be stored, parked, or operated within the protected zone of an oak tree, except on sites approved for this use by a certified arborist. • Removal of the natural leaf mulch within the protected zone of oak trees is prohibited except where absolutely necessary. • All trees not approved for removal shall be fenced or flagged for avoidance and to designate the protected zone. • Any pruning, including removal of dead wood, shall be performed in compliance with the latest American National Standards Institute pruning standards by a certified arborist (or certified tree worker). 	Verify the implementation of protection measures	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any root-pruning required within the protected zone of an oak shall be limited to the minimum amount necessary. All root-pruning shall consist of clean, 90-degree angle cuts utilizing sharp hand tools. Any major roots (2 inches or greater in diameter) encountered shall be preserved to the extent possible and wrapped in moist burlap until the soil is replaced. Soil shall be replaced around preserved roots as soon as possible. <p>To evaluate whether or not this type of mitigation is successful over the long-term, the relocated oak trees and replacement oaks will be revisited by a certified arborist in the fifth, tenth, and fifteenth years after relocation or planting to assess the survival/mortality rate of these oaks, and to evaluate the health of the surviving individuals. The applicant will prepare an initial report on the implementation of this measure after the second year of monitoring and maintenance has been completed. A Final Report will be prepared after the Year-15 assessment has been carried out; the Final Report will be submitted to the CPUC, and copies shall be sent to the USFWS (Palm Springs Fish and Wildlife Office), to the CDFW (Inland/Desert Regional Office), and to the California Native Plant Society's Conservation Program staff.</p>		
	<p>MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements. Pursuant to Project Commitment D, the applicant shall develop a Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan to address ground disturbance in all project areas. In addition to including the provisions set forth in Project Commitment D, the Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan shall detail topsoil segregation and conservation methodology; restoration of special status plant species habitat; vegetation removal and revegetation methods, including seed mixes, rates, and transplants; criteria to monitor and evaluate revegetation success; and alternative restoration and revegetation methods in the event that the revegetation success criteria are not initially reached. The applicant shall implement the Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan until the restoration success criteria are achieved. Appropriate agencies (CPUC, USFWS, and CDFW) shall be consulted during the preparation of the Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan. A copy of the final Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan, along with documentation of agency review and incorporation of comments into the final version, shall be provided to the CPUC, the USFWS, and the CDFW for approval prior to the CPUC issuing a notice to proceed.</p>	Verify the preparation and implementation of habitat restoration and revegetation plan	Prior to, during, and post construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>MM BR-8: Special Status Plant Avoidance and Mitigation Measures. For project areas not covered by the MSHCP, the applicant shall avoid the special status plant populations listed in Appendix G, Table 1. However, where avoidance is not feasible, special status plants in project work areas shall be identified in the field, and the following avoidance measures shall be implemented to minimize the possibility of inadvertent encroachment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A qualified biologist shall flag or otherwise mark special status plants. Construction crews will avoid direct or indirect impacts on these flagged areas. Should impacts on special status plants be unavoidable, the applicant will implement the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A qualified botanist shall determine if transplantation is feasible. If determined feasible, a qualified botanist shall develop and implement a transplantation plan in coordination with appropriate agencies (CDFW, USFWS, RCA). The special status plant transplantation plan shall identify a suitable transplant site, moving the plant material and seed bank to the transplant site, collecting seed material and propagating it in a nursery, and monitoring the transplant sites to document recruitment and survival rates. – If transplantation is infeasible, the applicant shall replace impacted special status plants at a 2:1 ratio within the project area within one year of the end of construction. Measures to restore special status plants shall be implemented in accordance with the Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan (MM BR-7). 	Verify the implementation of protection measures	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>MM BR-9: Invasive Plant Control Measures. The applicant shall develop an Invasive Plant Management Plan outlining measures to prevent the spread of invasive plants such as tamarisk (<i>Tamarix</i> sp.) and giant reed (<i>Arundo donax</i>) during construction of the projects. The Invasive Plant Management Plan shall include, but is not limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All vehicles and equipment shall be cleaned prior to arrival at the work site. • Straw or hay bales used for sediment barrier installations or mulch distribution shall be obtained from weed-free sources. <p>The Invasive Plant Management Plan will be submitted to the CDFW and CPUC for review and comment no more than three months prior to the start of construction. A copy of the final Invasive Plant Management Plan, along with documentation of agency review (CDFW and CPUC) and incorporation of comments into the final version, shall be provided to the CPUC for approval prior to the CPUC issuing a notice to proceed.</p>	Verify the preparation and implementation of invasive plant management plan	Prior to and during construction
	<p>MM BR-10: Prevent Wildlife Entrapment. In all project work areas, the applicant shall install covers, ramps, and/or fencing to avoid trapping wildlife in excavations or trenches. Covers must be weighted at the edges or installed in a way that prevent wildlife from attempting to burrow beneath the cover. Fine-gauge fencing shall be used to prevent small animals from passing through the fence. Ramps with an angle of less than 45 degrees shall be utilized. The applicant's biological monitor will check open trenches and excavations for trapped wildlife each morning prior to the start of work on the trench or excavation. Trenches and excavations that are covered for more than one week will be inspected on a weekly basis. In addition, where retaining walls or another method of slope stabilization are required, the facility shall be sited, designed, and oriented to avoid impacts on the movement of native wildlife species and established wildlife corridors in coordination with the wildlife agencies (USFWS, CDFW, RCA).</p>	Verify the prevention of wildlife entrapment	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>MM BR-11: Migratory Birds and Raptors Impact Reduction Measures. The applicant shall develop a Nesting Bird Management Plan in consultation with the USFWS and CDFW that outlines protective measures and BMPs that shall be employed in all project work areas to prevent disturbance of active nests. The final Plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for approval. The Nesting Bird Management Plan shall include the following components: species-specific buffer distances (including vertical buffers in areas where helicopters will be used) and conditions under which these buffer distances can be reduced, including concurrence by the CDFW, USFWS, and CPUC for special status species; dates of local breeding seasons during which nest surveys shall be conducted; preconstruction nest survey timing, methods, and surveyor qualifications; nest deterrent methods, including vegetation clearing; monitoring and reporting protocols during construction; protocols for determining whether a nest is active; protocols for documenting, reporting, and protecting active nests within construction areas; and avian monitor qualifications. If preconstruction survey protocols exist for a certain species, the Nesting Bird Management Plan shall incorporate these protocols. The survey area shall include the construction area, plus an additional distance large enough to accommodate the protective buffer of bird species likely to occur in proximity to the construction area.</p> <p>The Nesting Bird Management Plan shall further specify that active bird nests shall not be removed during breeding season unless the projects are expressly permitted to do so by the USFWS or CDFW; all project-related nest failures shall be reported to the USFWS and CDFW; and the biological monitor shall halt work if he or she determines that active nests would be disturbed by construction activities. If construction begins during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), the Nesting Bird Management Plan shall be submitted to the USFWS and CDFW for review and comment no less than two months prior to the start of construction, with the intent that the plan will be finalized no less than one months prior to the start of construction. A copy of the final Nesting Bird Management Plan, along with documentation of agency review (CDFW, USFWS, CPUC) and incorporation of comments into the final version, shall be provided to the CPUC for approval prior to the CPUC issuing a notice to proceed during the breeding season.</p>	Verify the preparation and implementation of nesting bird management plan	Prior to and during construction
	MM BR-12: Burrowing Owl Impact Reduction Measures. To reduce impacts on burrowing owls, the applicant shall implement the following	Verify the implementation of protection measures	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>measures in all project work areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys for burrowing owls will be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days of construction during the non-breeding season and within 14 days of construction during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31) to confirm whether burrowing owls occupy the site. Surveys shall be performed throughout the project areas that contain suitable burrowing owl habitat, with a potential to be impacted by construction activities, plus an additional area extending 300 feet from the projects' boundaries. • If an occupied burrow is identified, the applicant shall adhere to buffer distances detailed in the <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i> (CDFG 2012). • The biologist will report all project-related impacts on burrowing owl to the appropriate resource agencies (CDFW and RCA). • If appropriate buffers cannot be maintained, and impacts on burrowing owls or occupied burrows are unavoidable, the applicant shall develop and implement a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP), in compliance with MSHCP Section 6.3.2, and as approved by CDFW and RCA. The DBESP shall describe the compensatory measures that will be undertaken to address the loss of burrowing owl burrows within the project area. The compensatory mitigation shall be determined on a site-specific analysis, but may include restoration of temporarily impacted habitat and acquisition and or enhancement of off-site mitigation lands as determined in consultation with CDFW. If, in consultation with CDFW it is determined that project activities require removal of occupied burrows, eviction and burrow closure may be required to ensure against "take" of owls or nests. However, this will only occur after the preparation of a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan, as approved by CDFW. 		
	MM BR-13: Trash Abatement. The applicant shall keep project areas free of trash and debris. Food-related trash items shall be stored in enclosed containers and regularly removed from site.	Verify trash removal	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>MM BR-14: Protection of Special Status Species on Castle and Cooke Land. The applicant is entering into an agreement with the RCA, with USFWS and CDFW concurrence, to allow for coverage of the Valley-Ivyglen Project's obligations under the MSHCP on Castle and Cooke property, which falls outside MSHCP boundaries and thus is exempt from mitigation under the MSHCP. If this agreement is finalized prior to the start of construction, it shall be in effect for the duration of the projects or until SCE opts out. Should SCE opt out of the MSHCP, or if this agreement with the RCA is not finalized, the applicant shall implement the same or a greater level of species-specific avoidance, mitigation, restoration, and compensation measures as would have been required under the MSHCP. This may include additional consultation with USFWS and CDFW to obtain Incidental Take Authorization pursuant to the Federal California Endangered Species Acts. These additional measures would include MM BR-1, MM BR-4, and MM BR-8.</p> <p>MM BR-18: Implementation of All Project Commitments. The applicant will implement all Project Commitments as stated in this EIR, except in cases where they are superseded or modified by Mitigation Measures. The Project Commitments will be incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Compliance Reporting Program.</p>	Verify the implementation of protection measures	During construction
		Verify the implementation of protection measures	During construction
Impact BR-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.	<p>Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.</p> <p>Project Commitment D: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan.</p> <p>MM BR-1: Limit Construction to Designated Areas and Avoid Riparian, Aquatic, and Wetland Areas.</p> <p>MM BR-2: Preconstruction Surveys.</p> <p>MM BR-3: Biological Monitoring During Construction.</p> <p>MM BR-4: Limit Removal of Native Vegetation Communities and Trees.</p> <p>MM BR-6: Oak tree protection measures.</p>	See above	See above

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements. MM BR-9: Invasive Plant Control Measures.		
Impact BR-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	MM BR-1: Limit Construction to Designated Areas and Avoid Riparian, Aquatic, and Wetland Areas. MM BR-2: Preconstruction Surveys. MM BR-3: Biological Monitoring During Construction. MM BR-15: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). <u>The SWPPP shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) sufficient to acquire authorization under the Construction General Permit and protect waters in the project vicinity from sediment and other pollutants during construction. Per SCE, BMPs from the California Stormwater BMP Handbook that would be included in the SWPPP include but are not limited to WM-1 Material and Delivery Storage, WM-4 Spill Prevention and Control, WM-5 Solid Waste Management, WM-6 Hazardous Waste Management, WM-8 Concrete Waste Management, NS-9 Vehicle and Equipment Fueling, and NS-10 Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance. Verification of Construction General Permit authorization and the associated SWPPP shall be provided to the CPUC at least 15 days prior to start of construction. Updated SWPPPs shall be provided to the CPUC during construction upon request.</u>	See above	See above
Impact BR-4: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan. MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements. MM BR-10: Prevent Wildlife Entrapment. MM BR-11: Migratory Birds and Raptors Impact Reduction Measures. MM BR-12: Burrowing Owl Impact Reduction Measures.	Verify the implementation of protection measures	During construction
Impact BR-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	MM BR-6: Oak tree protection measures. MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements.	See above	See above

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	MM BR-8: Special Status Plant Avoidance and Mitigation Measures. MM BR-11: Migratory Birds and Raptors Impact Reduction Measures. MM BR-12: Burrowing Owl Impact Reduction Measures.		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Cultural Resources			
Impact CR-1: Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource.	Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.	See above	See above
	<p>MM CR-1a: Ensure preconstruction survey coverage of all work areas and staging areas. Prior to construction, the applicant shall compare the limits of the work areas and staging areas to project maps that show where areas have been previously surveyed for cultural resources at the Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory level. The applicant shall verify the proposed work areas and staging areas have been surveyed at the Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory level. An Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory level of survey is defined here as consisting of pedestrian surveys with transects spaced no farther apart than 15 meters except where field conditions such as exceptionally dense vegetation or steep slopes make walking transects difficult. In order to rely upon a prior survey for a work area, all areas that can be reasonably covered by transect surveys within such work area shall have been surveyed.</p> <p>If such a prior survey has been completed in the proposed work area or staging area, work can commence as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If no known resources are located in the work area or staging area, work or staging can proceed in the area. Previously unknown resources that are discovered during work activities shall be subject to MM CR-1b. • If known resources are located in the work area or staging area, they must be handled pursuant to MM CR-1b. Previously unknown resources that are discovered during work activities shall be subject to MM CR-1b. <p>If such a prior survey has not been completed in the proposed work area or staging area, then work may not commence until an Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory has been completed by a CPUC-approved archaeologist or cultural resources specialist and Native American tribal monitor(s) and reviewed and approved by the CPUC. If a resource is found during the survey, the applicant shall adhere to MM CR-1b procedures for unanticipated resources.</p>	Verify completion of survey	Prior to construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>MM CR-1b: Avoid impacts to known and undiscovered historic resources and unique archaeological resources (except for site P33-000714). SCE shall prepare a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan (CRMTP) for known and unknown resources that are eligible or potentially eligible for the California Register or are unique archaeological resources, except P33-000714, which is subject to MM CR-6. The CRMTP shall be reviewed and approved by the CPUC prior to the start of construction. To implement MM CR-1b SCE shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain a qualified archaeologist who shall: prepare the CRMTP; oversee archaeological and Native American monitors; and evaluate discoveries and prepare Evaluation and Data Recovery Plans and subsequent reports. This archaeologist shall, at the minimum, meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology and be approved by the CPUC. • Provide Native American Tribes that have expressed interest in the projects (Soboba and Pechanga) the opportunity to consult with the qualified archaeologist and provide input on the draft CRMTP during its preparation, including the Evaluation Plan and Data Recovery Plan. Upon completion of the draft CRMTP, Native American Tribes shall be given at least 30 days to provide input on the draft CRMTP. Evidence of consultation with the Tribes shall be submitted to the CPUC. • Prepare the CRMTP, which shall include the following. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mapping. The CRMTP shall map all known California Register eligible or potentially eligible resources in and within 100 feet of work areas. Maps shall be updated as necessary to incorporate any new information obtained pursuant to MM CR-1a. - Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) Delineation. The CRMTP should describe how California Register eligible or potentially eligible resources will be delineated and avoided as ESAs during construction. ESAs containing cultural resources shall not be identified on the ground or on maps to be used by anyone other than the qualified archaeologist, 	Verify the preparation and implementation of cultural resources monitoring and treatment plan	Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>Native American monitors, cultural resource monitors, or other cultural resource professionals. They shall be labeled on maps and with signage in the field as “environmentally sensitive areas.” The preferred method of mitigation in the CRMTP for known resources shall be total avoidance of the resource (preservation in place), per CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(A). The preferred method of mitigation in the CRMTP for unanticipated resources shall be total avoidance (preservation in place). If avoidance is determined to be infeasible, the applicant shall prepare a Data Recovery Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unanticipated resource discovery. The CRMTP shall contain a description of procedures to be used if unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during construction. The CRMTP shall require that work shall be temporarily halted within 100 feet of the resource, appropriate temporary protective barriers shall be installed along with signage identifying the area only as an “environmentally sensitive area” and forbidding entry into the area by all but authorized personnel, and the qualified archaeologist and the CPUC shall be notified. No work will resume in the area until the qualified archaeologist and the CPUC agree to an appropriate buffer or until mitigation has been completed. The preferred method of mitigation in the CRMTP shall be total avoidance of the resource (preservation in place), per CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(A). If the resource can be completely avoided, no additional mitigation is necessary. If the resource cannot be completely avoided, the qualified archaeologist shall then follow the procedures delineated for resources where it is not known whether the resource is historical. If an unanticipated resource is avoided, it shall nonetheless be recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms and filed at the Eastern Information Center. - Determination if a resource is an historical resource. The qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the CPUC, shall determine if there is a potential for the resource to be an historical resource. If there is no potential for the resource to 		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>qualify as an historical resource, work shall resume after CPUC concurrence. The CRMTP shall include a framework for evaluating cultural resources. If there is a potential for the resource to be an historic resource, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare an Evaluation Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Plan. The resource-specific Evaluation Plan shall detail the procedures to be used to determine if the discovery is an historical resource. The Evaluation Plan shall include sufficient discussion of background and context to allow the evaluation of the resource against the historic resource criteria. It shall include a description of procedures to be used in the gathering of information to allow the evaluation. These techniques may include (but are not limited to): excavation, written documentation, interviews, and/or photography. For archaeological resource testing, the Evaluation Plan should describe the archaeological testing procedures, including, but not limited to: surface collection (if surface artifacts are discovered), test excavations (including type, number, and location of test pits and/or trenches), analysis methods, and reporting procedure. The Evaluation Plan shall be submitted to CPUC for review. Once approved, the Evaluation Plan shall be implemented in the field. The report resulting from this work shall include evaluation of the discovery, based on the significance criteria set forth in the Evaluation Plan, indicating if it is an historic resource. If the discovery is not found to be an historic resource, and CPUC concurs with that determination, protective barriers may be removed, and work may proceed in the area of the discovery. If the discovery is determined to be an historic resource, SCE shall prepare a Data Recovery Plan. - Data Recovery Plan. Data recovery plans for historic resources that cannot be fully avoided shall be prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(C) and PRC section 21083.2, as applicable. The Data Recovery Plan shall outline how the recovery of data from the resource will mitigate impacts to that resource to below a level of significance. The Data Recovery Plan shall describe the level 		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>of effort, including numbers and kinds of excavation units to be dug, excavation procedures, laboratory methods, samples (e.g., pollen, sediment, as appropriate) to be collected and analyzed, analysis techniques that will yield information relevant to the aspects of the site that make it an historic resource, and reporting procedure. This plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. Once approved, the applicant shall implement the approved plan. Once the data recovery field work is complete, a Data Recovery Field Memo shall be prepared.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data Recovery Field Memo. Following implementation of the Data Recovery Plan, the Data Recovery Field Memo shall be prepared. The Data Recovery Field Memo shall briefly describe the data recovery procedures in the field and summarize (at a field catalog level) the materials recovery. The Data Recovery Field Memo shall also identify the number and kind of samples recovered that are appropriate for special analyses, including radiocarbon dating, obsidian sourcing, pollen analysis, microbotanical analysis, and others, as applicable. The Data Recovery Field Memo shall be submitted to CPUC for review and approval. Once the Data Recovery Field Memo has been approved, protective barriers may be removed, and work may proceed in the area of the discovery. If the Data Recovery Field Memo concerns Native American resources or archaeological or prehistoric resources, the Data Recovery Field Memo shall also be submitted to the Native American Tribe per the procedures outlined in the Data Recovery Plan. A Data Recovery Report shall then be prepared. - Data Recovery Report. Within 90 days of submittal of the Data Recovery Field Memo, a Data Recovery Report shall be prepared. The Data Recovery Report shall present the results of the data recovery program, including a description of field methods, location and size of excavation units, analysis of materials recovered (including results of any special analyses conducted), and conclusions drawn from the work. The Data Recovery Report shall also indicate where artifacts, samples, 		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>and documentation resulting from the data recovery program will be curated. The Data Recovery Report shall specify that the curation facility meets the requirements of 36 CFR 79. The Data Recovery Report shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. Once approved, the Data Recovery Report shall be filed with the Eastern Information Center. All impacted known resources and all unanticipated resources shall be recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms and filed at the Eastern Information Center with the Data Recovery Report. If the Data Recovery Report concerns Native American resources or archaeological or prehistoric resources, the Data Recovery Report shall also be submitted to the Native American Tribe per the procedures outlined in the Data Recovery Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The CRMTP shall include a summary of the California laws regarding the discovery of human remains, including: CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e); PRC sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99; and California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5. In addition, the plan shall include the contact information for the Riverside County Medical Examiner. The CRMTP shall specify that the curation facility, where artifacts, samples, and documentation resulting from the data recovery program shall be curated, meets the requirements of 36 CFR 79. 		
	<p>MM CR-2: Monitor ground disturbing activities (includes Native American monitoring). Archaeological monitoring shall be required for ground disturbing activities in areas with moderate to high archaeological sensitivity. In some areas where previous disturbance has occurred, spot checking may be appropriate and will be defined in the CRMTP. The archaeological monitor(s) shall be approved by CPUC staff prior to the start of construction. If any cultural resources are discovered, the archaeological monitor has the authority to stop ground-disturbing activities in the immediate area of the discovery. The process outlined in the CRMTP required under MM CR-1b shall then be followed.</p> <p>One Native American monitor from each tribe that has requested involvement (the Pechanga Tribe and the Soboba Band) shall be retained, at the Tribes' option, to observe ground-disturbing activities and all work at</p>	Verify monitoring of ground disturbing activities	Monitoring = During construction Native American notification = 30 days prior to the start of construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>P33-00714, subject to the conditions outlined in this mitigation measure. SCE shall consult with Native American tribes that have requested involvement (including Pechanga and Soboba) to determine where additional Native American monitoring is required. SCE shall document consultation efforts that show queries to the NAHC and tribes on the NAHC contact list regarding culturally sensitive sites and shall provide this documentation to the CPUC for review and approval prior to any ground-disturbing activities and prior to work at resource P33-00714. Native American monitoring shall be subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tribes requesting presence at construction or excavation activities shall be given 30 days advance notice prior to the start of construction and shall be provided the opportunity to monitor construction activities as requested in consultation with SCE subject to the terms of this mitigation measure. The applicant shall make a good-faith best effort to schedule construction when a monitor is available. • Attendance by Native American monitors during these activities is ultimately at the discretion of the Tribe and the absence of a Native American monitor shall not delay work if the Native American tribe has been given 30 days advance notice. Documentation of consultation activities shall be included in the monitoring plan. • The Native American monitors shall have the ability to temporarily halt work or redirect grading from the immediate vicinity of a potential unanticipated archaeological find that may require recordation and evaluation. The archaeological monitor shall be notified immediately to determine the procedure to follow per MM CR-1b. 		
	<p>MM CR-6: Avoid impacts to contributing elements of P33-000714. All activities within the site boundaries of P33-000714 shall be in accordance with SHPO's concurrence letter, sent to SCE on October 7, 2014. Access road construction shall occur only as described in SCE's letter to the SHPO for concurrence. No contributing elements of P33-000714 shall be impacted during construction, operation, and maintenance activities. An ESA shall be established around contributing elements during construction to prevent access by construction crews. Archaeological monitoring shall be required</p>	Verify avoidance of cultural resource	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	for construction activities within the boundaries of P33-000714. Archaeological monitoring shall be required for maintenance activities within the boundaries of P33-000714 unless the activities involve only driving on established access roads. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to stop work in the case of an unanticipated resource. In the case of an unanticipated resource, the process outlined in MM CR-1b shall be implemented. In addition, eucalyptus trees shall not be uprooted at site P-33-000714 but shall be removed by a method that minimizes ground disturbance, such as cutting down the tree and grinding the stump to ground level with a stump grinder.		
Impact CR-2: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	<p>MM CR-4: Monitor Paleontologically Sensitive Areas. SCE shall retain a qualified paleontologist to monitor ground-disturbing activities in paleontologically sensitive areas as defined in the Paleontological Resource Monitoring Plan (PRMP). The qualified paleontologist shall be approved in advance by the CPUC. The qualified paleontologist shall prepare a brief Paleontological Resource Monitoring Plan that includes methods of paleontological monitoring and includes construction maps delineating areas of ground disturbance that shall be monitored for paleontological resources. These shall include areas where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity. • There is a potential for fossils to occur at a level shallow enough to be adversely affected by project activities. <p>Areas where fossils would likely occur include but are not limited to the Silverado Formation. Areas where fossils are not reasonably likely to be discovered include areas of igneous substrate, such as the Estelle Mountain volcanic rock. Qualifications for proposed paleontological monitors shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. Only CPUC-approved paleontological monitors shall serve on this project. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt construction in the vicinity of any potential finds in order to begin implementation of MM CR-5. A reduction in monitoring activities will be determined based on field observations and in coordination with SCE and CPUC.</p>	Verify monitoring of ground disturbing activities	During construction
	MM CR-5: Follow Paleontological Resource Discovery Protocol. In the case that a previously unknown paleontological resource is discovered during construction activities, all work within 15 meters of the resource shall	Verify implementation of resource discovery protocol	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>be stopped, and the CPUC-approved paleontologist shall determine whether the resource can be avoided. If the resource cannot be avoided, the paleontologist shall determine whether the resource is unique under Part V of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. A paleontological resource shall be considered unique if it meets the definition of a significant paleontological resource under the 2010 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology <i>Standard Procedures for the Assessment of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources</i> definition:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Significant paleontological resources are fossils and fossiliferous deposits, here defined as consisting of identifiable vertebrate fossils, large or small, uncommon invertebrate, plant, and trace fossils, and other data that provide taphonomic, taxonomic, phylogenetic, paleoecologic, stratigraphic, and/or biochronologic information. Paleontological resources are considered to be older than recorded human history and/or older than middle Holocene (i.e., older than about 5,000 radiocarbon years) (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010).</p> <p>Substantiation of the uniqueness conclusion shall be provided to the CPUC for review and approval. Work shall be allowed to continue if the resource is not unique.</p> <p>If the resource is unique, then work shall remain stopped until the approved paleontologist has consulted with SCE and the CPUC and a feasible approach, approved by the CPUC, has been developed that will prevent destruction of the resource by site protection or recovery. Methods of recovery, testing, and evaluation shall adhere to current professional standards for recovery, preparation, identification, analysis, and curation, such as the 2010 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology <i>Standard Procedures for the Assessment of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources</i>. Work can commence following recovery and CPUC approval.</p>		
Impact CR-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	MM-CR-7: Follow Necessary Procedures for Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains. The CRMTP (MM CR-1b) shall include a summary of the applicable laws concerning human remains, including: CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e); PRC sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99; and California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5. These laws require Native American consultation for Native American burial sites. The CPUC shall be	Verify implementation of resource discovery protocol	During construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	notified immediately after the legally-mandated notification of the county medical examiner if any human remains are encountered during construction. Workers shall be trained in procedures to follow in case of unanticipated discovery of human remains as part of the Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.		
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources			
Impact GE-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction; or landslides.	Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan. Project Commitment D: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan. Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards.	Verify completion of study and implementation of recommendations	Prior to and during construction
Impact GE-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	Project Commitment D: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan. MM BR-15: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Best Management Practices (BMPs).	See above	See above
	Project Commitment E: Grading Plan.	Verify preparation and implementation of grading plan	Prior to and during construction
Impact GE-3: Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.	Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards.	See above	See above
Impact GE-4: Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.	Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards.	See above	See above
Impact GE-5: Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.		See above	See above
Greenhouse Gases			
No measures apply.			

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Impact HZ-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan. Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards. MM BR-15: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). MM WQ-1: Blasting Plan and Best Management Practices.	See above	See above
		Verify preparation and implementation of hazard materials management plan	Prior to and during construction
	MM HZ-2: Contaminated Soil/Groundwater Contingency Plan. Prior to the start of construction, to the extent not otherwise included within plans required by the Riverside County Hazardous Materials Management Division, the applicant shall develop a Contaminated Soil/Groundwater Contingency Plan to address the unearthing or exposure of buried hazardous materials or contamination or contaminated groundwater during construction of the projects. The Plan shall detail steps that the applicant or its contractor will take to prevent the spread of contamination, the sampling necessary if contamination is discovered, and remedial action to be taken. The Plan, at minimum, shall include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contact information for federal, regional, and local agencies, the applicant's environmental coordinator(s) responsible for the cleanup of contaminated soil or groundwater, and licensed disposal facilities and haulers. 2. Procedures to minimize environmental impacts in the event that hazardous soils, contaminated groundwater, or other hazardous materials are encountered during construction including stopping work; securing and marking the contaminated area; preventing the spread of contamination; testing; primary, secondary, and final cleanup procedures; and proper disposal in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. 3. Training requirements for construction workers performing excavation activities including training on types of contamination including common contaminants (e.g., petroleum hydrocarbons, lead, mercury, and metals, asbestos, acetone, nitrate, semi-volatile organic compounds and volatile organic compounds (benzene), polychlorinated biphenyls, sanitary waste, and pesticides) and <i>hazardous materials</i> (as defined by the California 	Verify preparation and implementation of contaminated soil/groundwater contingency plan	Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>Health and Safety Code) and identifying potentially hazardous contamination (e.g., stained or discolored soil and odor).</p> <p>4. Dewatering procedures including storage, testing, treatment, and disposal requirements and dewatering BMPs set forth in the applicant's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.</p> <p>The applicant shall submit the plan to CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction. The applicant shall implement the plan during construction of the projects.</p>		
Impact HZ-2: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	MM HZ-3: Contacting Affected Landowners Regarding Underground Facilities. Prior to construction the applicant shall contact affected private landowners to determine if septic systems and associated leach fields as well as other underground facilities may be impacted by construction of the projects. Final engineering plans for the projects shall be designed to avoid damage to underground facilities, both public and private. The applicant shall immediately notify by telephone the owner of underground facilities that may have been damaged or dislocated during construction of the projects.	Verify utilization of digalert	During construction
Impact HZ-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school.	Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan. Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards. MM BR-15: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). MM HZ-2: Contaminated Soil/Groundwater Contingency Plan. MM WQ-1: Blasting Plan and Best Management Practices.	See above	See above
Impact HZ-4: Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	MM HZ-2: Contaminated Soil/Groundwater Contingency Plan.	See above	See above

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Impact HZ-8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	<p>MM HZ-4: Fire Control and Emergency Response. The applicant, in consultation with its contractors, shall develop and implement site-specific fire control and emergency response plans to address the risk of fire or other emergencies (e.g., flooding) during construction, operation, and maintenance of the projects. The plans and a record of contact and coordination with the fire departments with jurisdiction over each worksite shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to start of construction. The plans shall describe fire prevention and response practices that the applicant and its contractors will implement to minimize the risk of fire, and in the event of fire or other emergencies, provide for immediate response.</p> <p>The site-specific plans shall specify that the applicant or its contractors will furnish supervision, labor, tools, equipment, and materials for the prevention of fire and extinguishing and controlling the spread of fires started as a result of project activities.</p> <p>During Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant or its designee shall designate a full time Fire Risk Manager who will be present during construction activities, whose sole responsibility will be to monitor the contractor's fire-prevention activities, and who will have full authority to stop construction as needed to prevent fire hazards. The Fire Risk Managers shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Serve as liaisons to fire departments and act as a point of contact for fire departments in the event of fire or other emergency; - Manage the prevention, detection, control, and extinguishing of fires set accidentally as a result of construction activity; - Review site-specific fire control and emergency response plans prior to starting work; - Ensure that all construction personnel are trained in fire safety measures relevant to their responsibilities. At minimum, construction personnel shall be trained in fire and emergency reporting and incipient-stage fire prevention, control, and extinguishing (i.e., the fire can be controlled or extinguished by portable fire extinguishers, small hose systems, or portable 	Verify preparation and implementation of fire control and emergency response plan	Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>water supplies without the need for protective clothing or breathing apparatus). Each member of the construction workforce shall be trained and equipped to extinguish small fires;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be equipped with radio and cellular telephone access for the duration of each work day; - Ensure that all construction personnel are provided with operational radio and cellular telephone access at each worksite to allow for immediate reporting of fires or other emergencies and ensure that communication pathways and equipment are tested and confirmed operational each day prior to initiating construction activities at each worksite; and - Maintain an updated key personnel and emergency services contact (telephone and email) list onsite and available to construction personnel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction workers shall immediately report all fires to the nearest Fire Risk Manager. <p>During All Project Phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment installed and maintained as part of the project shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spark arresters that are in good working order and meet applicable regulatory standards for all internal combustion engines (both stationary and mobile); - Fire suppression equipment on all motorized vehicles that includes, at minimum, one shovel and one pressurized chemical fire extinguisher; - A fire extinguisher capable of extinguishing any equipment-caused fire on all heavy construction equipment; and - Portable communication devices (e.g., radios or cellular telephones) and communication protocols for project workers to coordinate with local agencies and emergency personnel in 		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>the event of fire or other emergencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures to be undertaken by the applicant or its contractors shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prohibiting smoking during the operation of light or heavy construction equipment; in wildland areas; and within 30 feet of any area where combustible materials (e.g., fuels, gases, and solvents) are stored; - Limiting smoking to paved areas or areas cleared of all vegetation; - Posting no-smoking signs and fire rules on project bulletin boards, at contractor field offices, and in other areas visible to workers during fire season; - Maintaining all worksites in an orderly, safe, and clean manner. Maintaining staging areas and parking areas free of extraneous flammable materials. Removing all oily rags and used oil filters from worksites; - Confining hot-work activities (e.g., welding, brazing, soldering, grinding, and arc cutting) to cleared areas with a minimum 10-foot clearance radius measured from place of hot-work activity; - Ensuring an appropriate fire extinguisher is present before initiating each hot-work activity; - Preventing vehicles with hot exhaust manifolds from idling on roads with combustible vegetation under the vehicles; - Ensuring all Blasting Plan (MM WQ-1) BMPs are followed, e.g., pre-blast and post-blast inspections; - Notifying the fire department with jurisdiction over the worksite in advance of all planned burning activities (e.g., to clear vegetation). Special care shall be taken to prevent damage to adjacent structures, trees, and vegetation during planned burning activities; and - Any additional fire prevention and detection measures to 		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>lower the risk of wildland fires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to be undertaken by the applicant or its contractors for days when the National Weather Service issues a Red Flag Warning for a project area shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abiding by all restrictions and requirements that may be imposed by fire departments during Red Flag Warning periods (e.g., parking restrictions; road closures; and work activity and equipment use restrictions and requirements); and Prohibiting smoking at all worksites. 		
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact WQ-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	<p>Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan. Project Commitment D: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Project Commitment E: Grading Plan. Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards. MM BR-15: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements.</p> <p>MM WQ-1: Blasting Plan and Best Management Practices.. The applicant or its contractors shall prepare and implement a detailed Blasting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project. This plan shall identify the scope of blasting, all blasting locations, the proximity of facilities to each blasting location, and the types and estimated amounts of blasting agent required for each blasting location. The plan shall be submitted to and approved by the CPUC prior to start of blasting and the plan shall be resubmitted for approval if changes are required. The intent of the plan is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the potential for increased turbidity in groundwater and surface water; Prevent debris from entering drainages, waters of the state, and waters of the United States; and Avoid mishandling of hazardous materials associated with blasting. <p>BMPs shall include, but are not limited to:</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>Verify preparation and implementation of blasting plan</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>Prior to and during construction</p>

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct pre-blast surveys and inspections and conduct post-blast surveys and inspections for blast performance and fire hazards (e.g., undetonated explosive agent or smoldering materials); • Remove and manage muck piles (blast debris) to prevent water contamination; • Place matting or padding to contain flyrock and add an appropriate blasting agent to reduce flyrock near sensitive biological and cultural resources; • Select an explosive with appropriate water resistance for the blast site to reduce impacts on groundwater; • Clean loading equipment in an area where waste can be contained and kept away from drainages and other surface water; • Manage muck piles to avoid contact with stormwater and remove them from the project area as soon as reasonably feasible; and • Handle hazardous materials located during blasting in accordance with MM HZ-2. 		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>MM WQ-2: Drainage crossing procedures and practices. Within two weeks following a significant precipitation event (e.g., >0.6 inches within a 24-hour period) and prior to construction-related drainage crossing, a qualified aquatic monitor shall inspect any drainages that must be crossed. The inspector shall determine whether the drainage may be crossed without a bridge, crossed with a bridge, or avoided until conditions become more suitable for crossing. If a temporary or permanent bridge is required in order to avoid impacts, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any temporary or permanent bridges shall be installed to avoid placement below the Ordinary High Water Mark of the drainage as feasible. Prior to construction, the applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the USACE, Santa Ana RWQCB, and CDFW. 	Verify implementation drainage crossing procedures	During construction
	<p>MM WQ-3: Design of access roads with erosion control measures. Access roads shall be designed and built to minimize adverse erosion and siltation impacts. Measures to be incorporated into unpaved roadway design and construction shall include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design road with insloping, outsloping, or crowning; Incorporate rolling dips; Incorporate water bars; Avoid overgrading; and Build ditches. 	Verify erosion minimization measures	Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>MM WQ-4: Disposal of groundwater from dewatering excavations. Groundwater extracted as a result of dewatering during construction shall not be discharged to waters of the state without written authorization from the Santa Ana RWQCB. Extracted groundwater shall be disposed of on-site in one of the following manners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discharged to an upland area where it will not enter waters of the state but would instead evaporate or infiltrate; • Used for dust control; • Used for irrigation water; • Used for other construction needs; or • Disposed of at a licensed facility if water is suspected of being contaminated or degraded. 	Verify disposal of dewatered groundwater	During construction
Impact WQ-3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	<p>Project Commitment D: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan</p> <p>Project Commitment E: Grading Plan. The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall be consulted regarding grading plans for construction and operation of the proposed projects.</p> <p>MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements.</p> <p>MM WQ-2: Drainage crossing procedures and practices.</p> <p>MM WQ-3: Design of access roads with erosion control measures.</p>	See above	See above
		Verify design adequacy of detention basin	Prior to construction
Impact WQ-4: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.	<p>MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements.</p> <p>MM WQ-3: Design of access roads with erosion control measures.</p>	See above	See above

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	MM WQ-5: Maintain capacity and connectivity of drainages. SCE shall design and construct access roads to maintain the capacity and connection of drainages that are adjacent to and crossed by access roads for the proposed projects. Methods to maintain drainage characteristics include installation of culverts or designing low water crossings. Prior to any alteration of a drainage, including grading or the placement of fill material or culverts in a drainage, SCE shall obtain any permits required by the USACE, Santa Ana RWQCB, and CDFW.	Verify implementation of drainage protection measures	During construction
	MM WQ-6: Avoid impeding MDP implementation and function. Prior to construction, SCE shall consult with the RCFCWCD for project elements located within MDP areas. Construction within MDP areas shall not be allowed to proceed until SCE consults with the RCFCWCD about whether project elements located in these areas would not impede the function of flood control facilities and would not prevent implementation of the MDP.	Verify avoidance of MDP areas	During construction
Impact WQ-5: Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.		See above	See above
Impact WQ-7: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.	MM WQ-5: Maintain capacity and connectivity of drainages.	See above	See above
Impact WQ-8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	MM HZ-4: Fire Control and Emergency Response.	See above	See above
Impact WQ-9: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards.	See above	See above

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Land Use and Planning			
Impact LU-2: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	MM BR-6: Oak tree protection measures. MM BR-7: Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan Requirements. MM BR-8: Special Status Plant Avoidance and Mitigation Measures. MM BR-11: Migratory Birds and Raptors Impact Reduction Measures. MM BR-12: Burrowing Owl Impact Reduction Measures.	See above	See above
Noise			
Impact NV-1 : Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies	Project Commitment H: Noise Control. MM NV-1 Construction Noise Reduction Measures. Prior the start of construction, the applicant shall prepare and submit to the CPUC a Noise Control Plan, which shall detail the frequency, location, and methodology for noise monitoring prior to and during the proposed construction activities, such as for activities within the Cities of Lake Elsinore and Perris. The Noise Control Plan will shall also detail the actions and procedures that the applicant will implement to avoid significant impacts from temporary ambient noise increases. Measures in the Noise Control Plan shall include, but not be limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the number of pieces of equipment concurrently operating near sensitive receptors, as feasible. Where feasible and available, using construction equipment specifically designed for low noise emissions (i.e., equipment that is powered by electric or natural gas engines instead of diesel or gasoline reciprocating engines). Electric engines have been reported to have lower noise levels than internal combustion engines. Compensating residents for temporary relocation during high-noise activities that cannot be reduced to less than 90 dBA. The applicant shall monitor construction and maintenance noise 	Verify implementation Verify preparation and implementation of noise monitoring plan	During construction Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>levels in hourly equivalent averages Leq(h) before and during construction activities planned within 20 feet of noise sensitive receptors. During the project construction period, noise measurements shall be taken on a daily basis and reported to the CPUC on a monthly basis, within 15 days of the end of the monitoring period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where applicable, the hours of construction may be altered from Project Commitment H to include a 12-hour day in accordance with a local jurisdiction. Within the City of Wildomar, for instance, construction may occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. instead of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. <p>The applicant shall submit the Noise Control Plan to the CPUC for review and approval at least 30 days prior to the start of project construction. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the approved Noise Control Plan whenever it applies during construction and maintenance activities for the projects.</p>		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Impact NV-2: Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	<p>Project Commitment H: Noise Control.</p> <p>MM VIG NV-2: Blasting Vibration Control Measures. During final project design, if blasting is proposed, the applicant shall develop a blasting mitigation and monitoring plan to be implemented during blasting activities for the Valley-Ivyglen project. The plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval at least 30 days prior to the start of project construction. During plan development, applicant must assess distances to sensitive receptors and include blasting procedures in the plan that ensure blasting operations will be engineered safely and effectively. The plan shall include the following requirements for blasting activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using blasting methods designed to reduce vibration and air overpressure; • Using pre-blast warning signals prior to detonating the blast and after detonation, conducting post-blast safety inspections; • Conducting blast monitoring for all blasting operations. A daily log shall be maintained by the blasting contractor for each blast detonated on each working day, including monitoring of ground motions, peak particle velocity, and air blast levels; • Implementing modifications to blasting procedures -- such as using different delay patterns, reducing the size of individual blasts, using shorter and/or smaller diameter blast holes, closer spacing of blast holes, reducing volume of explosives used, using protective measures (e.g., gravel or blasts mats) -- as necessary to control rock and debris that may be expelled from the blast sites and sound walls or a combination of measures in the case that blasting would result in vibration or blast levels with a PPV in excess of 2.0 inches/second or 80 VdB as measured at the closest residential receptors property line; • Limiting hours of blasting to daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday; • Implementing a public outreach program to provide alerts the affected public to the potential for vibrations and noise associated with blasting not less than three and not more than ten days prior to the commencement of blast activities; and 	See above Verify preparation and implementation of blasting mitigation and monitoring plan	See above Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to and investigating complaints. 		
Impact NV-4: Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project	Project Commitment H: Noise Control. MM NV-1 Construction and Maintenance Noise Reduction Measures. MM NV-2 Blasting Vibration Control Measures.	See above	See above
Population and Housing			
No measures apply			
Public Services and Utilities			
Impact PS-1: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts on governmental facilities or from the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following: (1) fire protection, (2) police protection, (3) schools, (4) parks, or (5) other public facilities.	MM HZ-4: Fire Control and Emergency Response.	See above	See above
Impact PS-3: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of	Project Commitment E: Grading Plan. The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District shall be consulted regarding	See above	See above

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
existing facilities.	grading plans for construction and operation of the proposed projects. Project Commitment F: Geotechnical Study, Soil Testing, and Seismic Design Standards. MM BR-1: Limit Construction to Designated Areas and Avoid Riparian, Aquatic, and Wetland Areas.		
Recreation			
No measures apply			
Transportation and Traffic			
Impact TT-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.	Project Commitment H: Noise Control MM TT-1: Traffic Management and Control Plan. As part of the encroachment permit, the applicant shall prepare a Traffic Management and Control Plan that may include measures to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic flow, bicycle access, and pedestrian access is not completely restricted on any roadway for longer than 15 minutes, or a detour is provided; • Emergency access is maintained at all times; and • Lane closures do not create safety hazards. In addition to measures required by agencies with jurisdictions over the project, this plan also may provide for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a discussion of work hours, haul routes, work area delineation, traffic control, and flagging; • Identify all access and parking restriction and signage requirements; • Require workers to park personal vehicles at the approved staging area and take only necessary project vehicles to the work sites; • Lay out plans for pre-construction notifications to and a process for communication with affected residents and landowners. Advance public notification shall include posting of notices and appropriate signage regarding construction activities. The written notification shall include the construction schedule, the exact location and 	See above Verify the preparation and implementation of Traffic Management and Control Plan	See above Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<p>duration of activities within each street (i.e., which roads/lanes and access point/driveways/parking areas would be blocked on which days and for how long), and a toll-free telephone number for receiving questions or complaints;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require posting of warning signs so that motorists are prepared for slow trucks; • Require notification of emergency service providers regarding the timing, location, and duration of construction activities. • Require all roads to remain passable to emergency service vehicles at all times; • Identify all roadway locations where special construction techniques (e.g., night construction) would be used to minimize impacts to traffic flow; • Require emergency vehicle access to be maintained at all times; • Encourage full use of the full roadway width that existed prior to construction during non-working hours, if possible; • Restrict deliveries of large equipment during peak traffic hours to the extent feasible in accordance with applicable local ordinances; • Ensure that traffic control is performed in accordance with final engineering plans and approved drawings attached to any permit issued; • When required, such as during egress of slow traffic onto public roadways, traffic shall be controlled by flaggers who shall be in constant communication with each other during flagging operations; • Require removal of all dirt from the roadway each day before the completion of work; and • Require streets to be maintained in drivable condition at all times. <p>The Traffic Management and Control Plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to submittal of the permit application to Caltrans. The plan will account for Caltrans standards and guidelines. .</p>		

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
Impact TT-2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways	<p>MM TT-2: Heavy Vehicle Traffic Restrictions. The applicant shall minimize heavy vehicle traffic for the project at the Lake Street and I-15 northbound ramp during the AM peak hour (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM) for the duration of project construction. Heavy vehicles traveling to project sites during the AM peak hour shall be diverted to the Indian Truck Trail and I-15 northbound ramp. Prior to the start of construction, the applicant shall alert truck drivers associated with the project.</p> <p>The applicant shall also minimize construction traffic for the project at the Menifee Road and SR-74 intersection during the PM peak hour (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM). The applicant may require construction traffic to exit Staging Area ASP7 and Staging Area VIG2 prior to 4:00 PM or after 6:00 PM. Alternatively, the applicant may provide an alternative access route.</p>	Verify the restriction of heavy vehicles	During construction
	<p>MM TT-3: Highway Closure Plan. The applicant shall prepare and submit to Caltrans a Highway Closure Plan as part of its Caltrans encroachment permit application. The plan shall ensure that closure or partial closure of I-15 and SR-74 are planned so as to minimize traffic disruption and other hazards to highway users. The plan may include measures to limit construction to off-peak, non-daytime hours, from 10 p.m. to 5 a.m., and to include signage posted prior to the closure to alert drivers of the closure in accordance with Caltrans requirements. The plan will be reviewed and approved by Caltrans to minimize delay to I-15 and SR-74 traffic. If needed, the plan shall also outline suggested detours for I-15 and SR-74 traffic, including routes and signage. At least 15 days prior to initiating installation of the crossings, the applicant shall provide to the CPUC evidence of Caltrans granting the encroachment permit.</p>	Verify preparation and implementation of highway closure plan	Prior to and during construction
Impact TT-3: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks	<p>Project Commitment G: Aircraft Flight Path Safety Provisions and Consultations.</p>	Verify consultation with FAA	Prior to construction
	<p>MM TT-4: Helicopter Lift Plan. SCE's helicopter contractor shall coordinate with the FAA and obtain FAA-required approvals for helicopter operations. The applicant contractor's submittal to the FAA shall include a Helicopter Lift Plan for operations within 500 feet of a congested area or within 500 feet of residences in compliance with 14 CFR 133.33, which requires that flights be conducted so emergency landings and release of external load can be accomplished without safety risks to people or property when operating over congested areas. The Helicopter Lift Plan shall include the following measures, to the extent feasible:</p>	Verify preparation and implementation of helicopter lift plan	Prior to and during construction

Table 9-1 Draft Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan for the Valley-Ivyglen Project

Impact	Valley-Ivyglen Project Project Commitments and Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Requirements	Timing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of a responsible party for equipment inspections; • Communication procedures; • Identification of exclusion zones where pedestrians will not be allowed; and • Training of personnel in safety requirements and procedures. <p>The Helicopter Lift Plan and evidence of FAA approval of the plan shall be provided to the CPUC prior to commencing helicopter operations.</p>		
	<p>MM TT-5. FAA No-Hazard Determination. SCE shall obtain a determination of no hazard from the FAA when notification under 14 CFR 77 is required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of construction equipment, such as cranes; or • Installation of structures, such as lattice steel towers. <p>SCE shall provide documentation of the FAA finding to the CPUC prior to the use of equipment or installation of structures that require notification under 14 CFR 77.</p>	Verify determinations from FAA	Prior to construction
Impact TT-4: Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	<p>MM TT-1: Traffic Management and Control Plan.</p> <p>MM TT-6: Road Damage Repair. SCE shall restore and repair to pre-project conditions any private roads damaged by project vehicle traffic. SCE shall document roadway conditions with photographs prior to the project along roads identified for heavy vehicle use in the project's Traffic Impact Analysis. SCE shall also take photographs after the project and after completion of any repairs to document restoration of pre-project pavement conditions</p>	See above	See above
Impact TT-5: Result in inadequate emergency access	<p>MM TT-7: Emergency Service Provider Notification. SCE shall notify local emergency service providers (i.e., police departments, ambulance services, and fire departments) of road closures at least one week prior to the closure. SCE shall notify the provider of the location, date, time, and duration of closure. SCE shall also coordinate with local emergency service providers to ensure emergency vehicle access at all times during construction by, for example, keeping metal plates available to cover open trenches.</p>	Verify notification of emergency service providers	Prior to and during construction
Impact TT-6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities	<p>MM TT-1: Traffic Management and Control Plan</p>	See above	See above

1

(End of Appendix A)