STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRAY DAVIS, *Governor*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E'S) APPLICATION NO. A. 01-07-004, ATLANTIC-DEL MAR REINFORCEMENT PROJECT

Introduction

Pursuant to the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) General Order 131-D, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has filed an application with the Commission for a Permit to Construct power lines and associated substation modifications known as the Atlantic-Del Mar Reinforcement Project (A. 01-07-004). The Application was filed on July 9, 2001 and includes the Proponents Environmental Assessment (PG&E, 2001) prepared by PG&E pursuant to Rules 17.1 and 17.3 of CPUC's Rules of Practice and Procedure. PG&E requests authority to: 1) construct approximately 4 miles of 60-kilovolt (kV) single-circuit electric power line; and 2) install a new 60 kV breaker at the existing Atlantic Substation, and installing a new switch at the existing Del Mar Substation. Under the Commission's General Order 131-D, approval of this project must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Pursuant to CEQA, the CPUC must prepare an "Initial Study" for discretionary projects such as the proposed project to determine whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. If an Initial Study prepared for a project indicates that such an impact could occur, the CPUC would be required to prepare and Environmental Impact Report (EIR). If the Initial Study does not reveal substantial evidence of such an effect, or if the potential effect can be reduced to a level of insignificance through project revisions, a Negative Declaration can be adopted (Section 21080; CEQA Public Resources Code).

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is the third type of document that could be prepared based on an Initial Study. The statute provides that MNDs are used "when the initial study has identified potentially significant effects on the environment, but (1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by, the applicant before the proposed negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, and (2) there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment" (Section 21064.5; CEQA Public Resources Code).

Based on the assessment of the Revised Draft MND/Initial Study (MND/IS) prepared for the Atlantic-Del Mar Reinforcement Project, this Final MND has been prepared. It should be noted that the Final MND/IS includes the Revised Draft MND/IS along with the modifications that were made to the Revised Draft MND/IS in response to comments received on the document (see Section C).

Project Description

The following is a summary of the project that PG&E has proposed; Section 8 of the Revised MND/IS presents more detail on the proposed project.

Power Line. The power line portion of the proposed project involves installing approximately four miles (21,000 feet) of a new 60 kV line on tubular steel poles (poles). The proposed project would provide a second 60 kV line to serve the Rocklin-south Placer County area. It would be built to 115 kV standards so that, at some future date, PG&E could convert the line to a 115 kV line without replacing the poles and conductors. PG&E does not have present plans to convert the line to 115 kV.

The new power line would begin at Atlantic Substation and proceed north adjacent to Harding Boulevard, following the existing Atlantic-Del Mar 60 kV line, for approximately 900 feet. The line would then turn east, continuing to follow the existing line, and proceed approximately 2,000 feet, crossing Antelope Creek before reaching the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks. At the railroad tracks, the proposed route turns northeast (the existing power line crosses the railroad and goes east at this point), and continues parallel to the west side of the tracks, crossing State Route 65 (SR 65) and Sunset Boulevard. The line would cross the railroad tracks south of Farron Street and continue northeast again on the east side of the railroad tracks for approximately 1.1 miles. At this point, the route follows the south spur of the railroad tracks for approximately 0.4 miles. The line would then turn east, crossing Pacific Street where it would meet the existing 60 kV power line. The existing line would be reconstructed to accommodate the new proposed line on a single set of double circuit poles along Sierra Meadows Drive to the Del Mar Substation.

Based on analysis of visual impacts of PG&E's proposed project, an approximately 1.3-mile segment of underground power line is recommended in **Mitigation Measure V-1**. This underground power line segment would begin immediately south of Sunset Boulevard and extend to a point at least 120 feet north of Midas Avenue (see Section D for a detailed description of Mitigation Measure V-1).

Atlantic Substation. A new 60 kV breaker and bay would be installed within the fenced area at the existing Atlantic Substation. The new line would be placed on three new double-circuit poles within the Atlantic Substation property, along with the existing Atlantic-Del Mar 60 kV circuit, and routed toward the Del Mar Substation. The new 60 kV bay would be added to the end of the 60 kV bus.

Del Mar Substation. East of Pacific Street, along Sierra Meadows Drive, both the new 60 kV line and the existing 60 kV circuit from the Atlantic Substation would be placed on two new, double-circuit poles and routed from the Del Mar Substation toward the Atlantic Substation. The wood poles currently carrying the existing Atlantic-Del Mar 60 kV circuit and a distribution circuit in this area would be topped off (i.e., the top third of the poles would be cut off leaving the existing distribution circuit attached) after the 60 kV circuit has been moved to the new poles. In order to permit a possible future voltage upgrade, the clearances and equipment at this substation are rated 115 kV, although the operating voltage is proposed to remain 60 kV. New equipment and clearances would also be rated 115 kV.

Alternatives

CEQA does not require that MNDs include an alternatives analysis because the Initial Study concludes that, with mitigation, there are no significant impacts resulting from the proposed project. However, pursuant to Section IX.B.1.c of CPUC's General Order 131-D, PG&E's Application did consider alternative power line routes and presented an explanation of the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative. Nine route alternatives were considered by PG&E during the scoping phase of the project. The nine power line routes are approximately bounded by the existing Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks to the west, Atlantic Boulevard to the south, I-80 to the east, and Sierra Meadows Drive to the north. Of the nine route alternatives, four were considered feasible and capable of meeting the project

objectives. The other five routes were rejected because PG&E believed that they would cause significant environmental impacts that could not be mitigated, or would result in substantial impacts to system reliability, operation, and/or costs. The four routes that PG&E considered feasible included: a route along the existing Atlantic-Del Mar 60 kV line that would create a double circuit; a route that would parallel Interstate 80 for approximately 2.5 miles; the preferred project route as described in this MND/IS; and a route that includes approximately 1 mile of underground power line along Pacific Street. The preferred route was selected because PG&E believed that it would have no significant adverse environmental impacts and the greatest line integrity and service reliability of all the alternative routes. Refer to Appendix A of the Revised Draft MND/IS for more detailed descriptions and evaluations of the four alternative routes described above.

Purpose and Need for the Project

The Atlantic-Del Mar Reinforcement Project would serve the City of Rocklin and south Placer County. The project is located within the cities of Roseville and Rocklin, approximately 15 miles northeast of Sacramento.

PG&E has experienced a significant and constant increase in electric demand in the project area due to dramatic growth in population, resulting in construction of new homes and businesses. The population of the City of Rocklin has increased from 19,033 in 1990 to 36,330 in 2000 (see Section XII, Population and Housing of the Revised Draft MND/IS). PG&E's electric load studies show that, without immediate action, loads within the project area could exceed existing power line and substation capacity by the summer of 2002. The proposed project would address this urgent need to upgrade the system. Furthermore, since the existing Atlantic-Del Mar 60 kV line is the single source for the area, there is currently no emergency capacity. The proposed project would increase the normal capacity of this area from 65 MW to over 117 MW. In addition, the project would provide an emergency capacity of 77 MW (PG&E, 2001). This line is needed to supplement the one line currently serving the area to provide emergency capacity in the event of an outage. Each power line serving the area (the existing and proposed lines) would by itself have approximately 65 MW of normal operating capacity. However, power lines can handle slightly more than normal operating capacity from time to time. This higher capacity is referred to as the "emergency rating" of a power line. 77 MW is the emergency rating on these lines, so when one line goes out, the other can handle up to 77 MW for the short term in an emergency.

Environmental Determination

The Initial Study (Section B of the Revised Draft MND/IS) was prepared to identify the potential effects on the environment from the construction and operation of the proposed project and to evaluate the significance of these effects. The Initial Study was based on information presented in PG&E's PEA filed on July 9, 2001, site inspections by the CPUC environmental team, and other environmental analyses of the project. Within the PEA, measures addressing potentially significant impacts were proposed by the Applicant (Applicant Proposed Measures), and have been incorporated into the project description. Additional Mitigation Measures are recommended as a result of the Initial Study's analysis, and PG&E has agreed to implement these measures as well. Where Applicant Proposed Measures and Mitigation Measures are similar in intent, the more stringent measure is to be implemented.

Based on the Initial Study, the project as proposed by PG&E would be mitigable to less than significant effects or no impacts in the areas of aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards & hazardous materials, hydrology & water quality, land use planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, recreation, transportation & traffic, and utilities and service systems. Implementation of these mitigation measures would avoid all potential impacts or reduce them to less than significant levels.

A Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan (Section D) has been prepared to ensure that the Applicant Proposed Measures and the Mitigation Measures are properly implemented. The plan describes specific actions required to implement each measure, including information on the timing of implementation and monitoring requirements.

_____ _____

Rob Feraru, Program Manager
Engineering, Environmental Studies and
Customer Services Branch
Energy Division
California Public Utilities Commission

Date

B.1 Introduction

The CPUC released for public review a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Draft Initial Study (MND/IS) for the proposed Atlantic–Del Mar Reinforcement Project on October 17, 2001. In response to numerous comments on the potential visual impacts of the project, the CPUC revised the MND/IS and PG&E agreed to install a portion of the power line underground. The Revised Draft MND/IS was released on October 15, 2002 and was circulated for an additional 30-day public review period. It included a revised Aesthetics section and incorporated revisions to the other environmental issue areas, where appropriate.

This section presents responses to comments received on both the initial Draft MND/IS (October 2001) and the Revised Draft MND/IS (October 2002). Section B.2 presents the responses to comments received on the initial Draft MND/IS and Section B.3 presents the responses to comments received on the Revised Draft MND/IS. See the Appendix for copies of the comment letters.

B.2 Responses to Initial Draft MND/IS Comment Letters

Table B-1 lists all comments received on the initial Draft MND/IS and shows the comment set identification number for each letter. The responses are presented in the order shown in Table B-1. To find the response to a particular comment letter, note its comment set number from Table B-1. Responses to agency comment letters are presented first, followed by responses to comments from the general public. Section B.2.1 presents detailed responses to general comments that were made by many commenters; these responses are referenced in responses to many individual comments in Sections B.2.2 and B.2.3. Section B.2.2 includes responses to written comments from agencies and Section B.2.3 presents responses to written public comments. See Part I of the Appendix for copies of comment letters on the Initial Draft MND/IS.

Table B-1. Commenters And Comment Set Numbers - Initial Draft MND/IS

Commenter	Comment Set
LETTERS FROM PUBLIC AGENCIES	
City of Rocklin	A
City of Roseville	B
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	C
Placer County Public Works Department	D
LETTERS FROM PRIVATE PARTIES	
Concerned Citizens Form Letter (David Martin, Roberta M. Fisser, Donald Reeves, Laura Duncanson, Ingrid Phippen, Carl and Nancy Allen, Lisa Flowers, Rebecca Saggau-Russo, Cynthia Hernandez, Nadine Neis, Garland Welch, Leonard Russo, E. Sunny Sinz, Brent Nysfrom, Jeff and Tricia Duypers, Carol Stambuk, Paul Meyers, Deirdra Piazza, Betsy Reark, Mr. and Mrs. Gene Morgan, Dorthy and Robert Moss, John King Jr., William Burgus, Verde Richardson, Patricia Bewley, John B. Nichol, Charles Bewley, Victor Macchietto, Carol Hughs, Virginia Meier, Beverly Wilson, Karen M. Hall, Lorett Stanley, Charlene Harlow, Mike Caminada, Ronald Talmage, Joyce Ray, Douglas Rollins, Mary Rollins, Judy Lacefield,Barbara L Craigo, Janet Ray, Luicille D. Batt, Dale Brimley, Hope and Dorcey French, Steve and Tony Jagerhorn, Ingeborg Sceals, Raymond G. K., Rui and Gloria J. Cunha, Nola Palo, Mike Phillips, Tammy Millone, William William, James Epp, Ruth Hemingsen, Carmen VanZandt, Roger Jackson, Pamela Garnett, Elsie Arellanes, Erica Rogers, Mary Lou Michael, Leslie A. Kokx, Virginia Rubio, David Donnelly, Gaela Ash, Charles W. Miller, M. Eel, Laura Sanders, Julia Brown, Lyn C. Beck, Ronda Gerke, V. Zych, S.R. McAllister, Sonja Bower, Peggy E. Snyder, Frank Gonzales, Bayinder Kaur, Norman Moore, Michelle Kramer, Donne M. Tidwell, Sue H. Havery, Janis P. Barinsky, Dennis Macleod, Marie Taylor, Will, Margaret Allwein, Caryn Mclaughlin, Janelle K. Dershaw, Mildred Shaw, Craig Christensen, Darci Orwtt, Erna Nelson, Patricia Hamilton, G.A. Michaels, Francine Radoff, Peggy Cozza, Carol S., Randy G., V. Lopez, Kathy Lacke, Eleanor Henderson, Mary Wlasiuk, Mike Denlop, Salina Eversole, Charlotte Gibson, Nicole Adams, Balwant S. Dhaliwah, Florence Challis, Dorthy M., Roy Brison, Sue Miller, Kara Spates, Ethel R. Wood, James Moore, Jacqueline Carr, Eugene Basco, Ann Sawhead, Joan M., Paula MacCullen, Sharon Gordon-Link, Anne Marie Pimentel, Mandy Sanderson, James Uyeda, Ross and Lynda Green, Eirk Winblad, Gene and Jackie Gieck, Kadira Sinanovic, James Chimera, Constance Koberlein, Bob Mitchell, H.J. Adams, A. Neis, Gene Frechette, Edward Galante, Sandy Damiano, Linda Adams, G.M. Bressie, Joe Drab, Larry Frank, Martelda Forry, Paul and Laura Rapp, Charles & Sally Bradshaw, Mike Judith Sauer, Lucretia Lovisa, Anna Balcom, Byron Day, Maureen and Richard Perez, Frank Crowe, G.H. Toulson, Robert Sypniewski, Alex Sondoval, Al Renner, Marvin Goff, Catherine Hoyt, Kenneth Broadway, All Muffler Service, Park Roseville, Alice Cocke, Denise Miller, Casandra Elliott, Keith and Amparo Mifone, Lisa Adler, Thelma Birkhead, Timothy T. and Karen M. Lester, and Natalie A. Ballard)	1
Attorney Representing Gensiro Kawamoto	2

Table B-1. Commenters And Comment Set Numbers - Initial Draft MND/IS

Commenter	Comment Set
Kent Dazey	3
Anne Johnson Dazey	4
Joshua and Erika Redding*	5
Martha Totaro	6
Michael Totaro	7
Alan Hans	8
Barkhurst Family*	9
Michael A. Powell & Lisa A. Dahl*	10
Dan Peters*	11
Beverly Humphrey	12
Allegra Hakim	13
Larry and Kathy Flure	14
Kim Nelson	15
John and Carol Peterson	16
Beverly Hughes	17
Ronald Talmage	18
Kevin R. George	19
Roger Barkhurst Sr.	20
Wayne R. Roth	21
Karen Clark	22
Ron and Donna Palmer	23
Mike and Elaine Speer	24
Douglas and Beth Schell	25
Shelley Hiatt	26
Sue H. Havery	27
Robin Leporati	28
Joanne Troy	29
George R. Kellogg	30
Sandrine Tournier*	31
Dr. and Mrs. Michael Balch	32
Michelle Leonard	33
Erik Winblad	34
Ken Jeffries	35
Chad Stout*	36
Jessica Peters	37
Mr. and Mrs. Davis*	38
Gayla and Mark Heggen	39
Richard Foster	40
Gayla Heggen*	41
John and Sharon Yowell*	42
Michael and Dana Myers and family	43
Traecy Berryman	44
Dick and Carole Hazeltine	45
Fred W. Haynes	46
Matt and Jana Ogt	47
Brian McKenzie and Karen McKenzie	48
G.H. Toulson	49
Brent Nystrom	50

*Letter not available for reproduction.

Table B-1. Commenters And Comment Set Numbers - Initial Draft MND/IS

Commenter	Comment Set
Ann McNellis	51
Mr. and Mrs. Byron Day	52
Ken Morgan	53
Annie Woods	54
Erik Winblad	55
E. Ribeiro Pizante and Laura & Ribeiro	56
Alvin Nielsen	57
Sophia Perrone Epp	58
Lynda Nelson	59
Cecil C. McLaughlin	60
Ken F. Hisey Sr.	61
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Sypniewski	62
Roice E. Simkins*	63
Peggy Palmertree*	64
Susan Dougherty	65
Nancy and Roger Johnson*	66
Lois Rafferty	67
Dan Burns	68

*Letter not available for reproduction.

B.2.1 General Responses to Frequently Made Comments

The following topics address issues that were raised by many commenters that require detailed responses. General Responses address the following topics:

- GR-1, Visual impacts associated with overhead pole structures
- GR-2, Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) health impacts
- GR-3, Impacts on property values
- GR-4, Concern that the project would serve one community while affecting others
- GR-5, Potential public health hazards associated with the Project and the existing petroleum product tanks.

GR-1 Visual Impacts

In response to numerous comments about potential visual impacts of the proposed power line through the historic district of Rocklin, the CPUC released a Revised Draft MND/IS with an expanded Aesthetics section that presented new visual simulations of the proposed project. Six new Key Viewpoints were selected for the new visual simulation locations along the proposed project route. At each of the six locations, the existing landscape and viewing characteristics were characterized and existing view photographs were presented. Subsequently, an assessment of visual change and impact significance was conducted based on field observations and analysis of the project simulations.

Upon completion of the new visual simulations, it became apparent that potentially significant impacts to visual resources within Rocklin's historic district would occur from the project as proposed. Less than significant impacts to visual resources along the proposed project route were identified south of Sunset Boulevard and north of Midas Avenue. To eliminate the potential for significant impacts within Rocklin's historic district, the revised Aesthetics section of the MND/IS recommended mitigation (Mitigation Measure V-1) that requires the proposed project to be installed underground from a location just south of Sunset Boulevard to a location at least 120 feet north of Midas Avenue. PG&E has agreed to

implement Mitigation Measure V-1, and as a result, the potentially significant visual impacts in Rocklin's historic district would be less than significant. Refer to Section I (Aesthetics) of the Revised Draft MND/IS for the complete revised visual resources analysis.

GR-2 EMF Health Impacts

A number of comments stated a concern about electric and magnetic fields (EMF) as a potential health hazard. Commenters expressed concern that there remains uncertainty in the scientific community as to the health effects of EMF, and that the proposed project would result in public exposure to EMF in the vicinity of the power lines. This issue was addressed in the initial Draft MND/IS in Section VII (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), page B-70. The discussion of EMF was expanded substantially in the Revised Draft MND/IS:

- A description of PG&E's required "no cost" and "low cost" magnetic field reduction steps for the proposed project has been added to Section VII(e).
- More information about potential health issues pertaining to EMF associated with power and transmission lines has been added to the Project Description (pages B-10 through B-16) of the Revised Draft MND/IS.

GR-3 Property Values

Many commenters expressed concern about potential adverse property value impacts of the proposed project. As cited in CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, economic or social effects of a project *per se* are not considered as significant effects on the environment. However, such issues can be considered by the CPUC in its General Proceeding.

A great deal of research has been conducted on property value impacts of industrial uses and power lines. Although there is evidence that power lines have affected property values in some cases, the effects are generally smaller than anticipated and primarily affect property located within 400 feet of the power line. Impacts on property values generally result from visual impacts, or concerns associated with health and safety. As discussed in GR-1 and GR-2 above, these issues and potential impacts are analyzed extensively in the Revised Draft MND/IS Section I (Aesthetics) and Section VII (Hazards and Hazardous Materials). Where potential visual impacts were deemed significant, a mitigation measure was suggested to reduce them to less than significant levels. Because visual impacts and impacts associated with hazards are determined to be less than significant, property value impacts are also unlikely to be significant.

GR-4 Concern That the Project Would Serve One Community While Affecting Others

Several commenters expressed concern that a particular portion of the proposed project would serve only one community and therefore, that community should bear the impacts of the new project. In fact, the new power line will benefit the entire area not just one development. To ensure reliability, power lines are generally constructed to be part of a "loop" so that in the event of an outage, an area can always be served from another source. The Placer County area is part of an interconnected regional network of power and distribution lines, and no area can (or should) be isolated, providing power only for itself.

GR-5 Potential Public Health Hazards Associated with the Project and Existing Petroleum Products Tanks

Several commenters expressed concern regarding the potential danger of placing the proposed power poles near the existing Kinder Morgan petroleum tanks adjacent to the west side of the Union Pacific Railroad, south of Sunset Boulevard, and the potential for fallen poles and conductors to start a fire or cause an

explosion. The following text, which includes a mitigation measure designed to eliminate the potential of siting power poles within striking distance of any of the petroleum tanks, has been added to the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section of the Revised Draft MND/IS (Section VII) to address these concerns:

> …there is a remote possibility that the proposed project could indirectly cause an accidental release of hazardous materials contained at the Kinder Morgan tank farm located adjacent to the project route, south of Sunset Boulevard. The existing tanks contain refined petroleum products that are extremely flammable and explosive. The Lead Operator of the tank farm has indicated that if poles or conductors associated with the proposed project were sited within striking distance of any of the tanks located on the Kinder Morgan property, there would be a concern of potential system upset in the event a power pole or associated conductor were damaged and fell onto one of the tanks (Kinder Morgan, 2001).
>
> Therefore, the following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce the potential indirect impact to a less than significant level:
>
> **HM-1** PG&E shall site all power poles and/or underground transition structures at least 200 feet away from the nearest petroleum products storage tank at the Kinder Morgan tank farm.
>
> It should be noted that overhead high voltage power line system would include a system protection designed to safeguard the public and line equipment, so in the event the electrical conductor is severed or in any other way compromised, the electric power would be shut off. These protection systems consist of power line relays and circuit breakers that are designed to rapidly detect faults and cut-off power flow to avoid shock and fire hazards. This equipment is typically set to operate in 2 to 3 cycles, representing a time interval range from 2/60 of a second to 3/60 of a second. Therefore, the risk associated with electrical arcing from a downed power line to one of the high-pressure petroleum tanks is extremely small.

With regard to the potential for a pole to fall on a person or house, CPUC General Order 95 sets safety standards for power lines and establishes minimum clearance distance for both poles and conductors. As a result, these types of hazard impacts are considered to be extremely unlikely.

B.2.2 Responses to Comments from Agencies

COMMENT SET A: CITY OF ROCKLIN

A-1 The power line portion of the proposed project, as presented in PG&E's Application for a Permit to Construct (PTC), is to install approximately 4 miles of new 60 kV line on tubular steel poles. A 115 kV project has not been proposed and is not being approved at this time. The Draft MND/IS does not analyze impacts associated with a 115 kV line because the Application for a PTC is specifically for construction of a 60 kV system.

The project does include tubular steel poles and insulators that would be compatible with a 115 kV line system, so at some future date PG&E could convert the line to a 115 kV line without replacing the poles and conductors. PG&E does not have present plans to convert the line to 115 kV. However, had the Application for a PTC considered a 115 kV line, there would be no difference in impact because the two projects (115 vs. 60 kV) would look exactly the same and construction impacts would be the same.

The Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) Management Plan will be prepared for the 60 kV project. The only difference between a 60 kV and 115 kV project in this case is the amount of voltage carried by the conductor, and voltage does not determine magnetic field levels, which typically is the focus of health issues surrounding EMF. The amount of current determines magnetic field levels surrounding a power line. Therefore, the same load passing through a 115 kV line rather than a 60 kV line will result in decreased magnetic field levels.

The information presented above has been added to the description of the proposed project of the Revised Draft MND/IS (see pages B-4 and B-5).

A-2 See General Response GR-1.

A-3 Descriptions of the City of Rocklin Front Street Historical District Plan, the City of Rocklin Downtown Revitalization Plan, and the City of Rocklin Redevelopment Plan, including reference to Ordinance Numbers 480 and 485, have been added to the Existing Conditions portion of Section IX (Land Use and Planning) of the Revised Draft MND/IS.

In addition, the following statement has been added to the Land Use section IX(b), Conflict with Adopted Land Use Plan or Policy of the Initial Study:

> ...based on the recommendation of the revised visual analysis conducted for the project, PG&E has agreed to place the proposed power line underground from south of Sunset Boulevard to north of Midas Avenue to avoid significant visual impacts in Rocklin's Historic District.

A-4 See General Response GR-1.

A-5 See General Response GR-1.

A-6 See General Response GR-1.

A-7 See General Response GR-5.

A-8 The CPUC believes that with implementation of the mitigation measures presented in the Initial Study, including Mitigation Measure V-1 (underground the power line from south of Sunset Boulevard to north of Midas Avenue), potentially significant visual impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and an accompanying Alternatives Analysis is not warranted for this project.

The following paragraphs have been added to Section A (Mitigated Negative Declaration) of the Revised Draft MND/IS to clarify the requirements associated with the types of environmental documents for CEQA compliance:

> Pursuant to CEQA, the CPUC must prepare an "Initial Study" for discretionary projects such as the proposed project to determine whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. If an Initial Study prepared for a project indicates that such an impact could occur, the CPUC would be required to prepare and Environmental Impact Report (EIR). If the Initial Study does not reveal substantial evidence for such an effect, or if the potential effect can be reduced to a level of insignificance through project revisions, a Negative Declaration can be adopted (Section 21080).

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is the third type of document that could be prepared based on an Initial Study. The statute provides that MNDs are used "when the initial study has identified potentially significant effects on the environment, but (1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by, the applicant before the proposed negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, and (2) there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment" (Section 21064.5; OPR, 2001).

CEQA does not require that MNDs include an alternatives analysis because the Initial Study concludes that, with mitigation, there are no significant impacts resulting from the proposed project. However, pursuant to Section IX.B.1.c of CPUC's General Order 131-D, PG&E's Application did consider alternative power line routes and presented an explanation of the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative. Nine route alternatives were considered by PG&E during the scoping phase of the project. The nine power line routes are approximately bounded by the existing Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks to the west, Atlantic Boulevard to the south, I-80 to the east, and Sierra Meadows Drive to the north. Of the nine route alternatives, four were considered feasible and capable of meeting the project objectives. The other five routes were rejected because PG&E believed that they would cause significant environmental impacts that could not be mitigated, or would result in substantial impacts to system reliability, operation, and/or costs. The four routes that PG&E considered feasible included: a route along the existing Atlantic–Del Mar 60 kV line that would create a double circuit; a route that would parallel Interstate 80 for approximately 2.5 miles; the preferred project route as described in this MND/IS; and a route that includes approximately 1 mile of underground power line along Pacific Street. The preferred route was selected because PG&E believed that it would have no significant adverse environmental impacts and the greatest line integrity and service reliability of all the alternative routes. Refer to Appendix A for more detailed descriptions and evaluations of the four alternative routes described above.

A-9 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET B: CITY OF ROSEVILLE

B-1 If the proposed project was located within a City of Roseville designated floodway or flood fringe, PG&E would have to comply with the associated permitting requirements.

B-2 Section I (c) of the revised Aesthetics section includes a visual simulation (see Figure I-2b) and associated visual analysis of the proposed State Route 65 crossing. Visual impacts associated with this crossing were found to be less than significant. Therefore, further mitigation and/or an alternatives analysis are not warranted. Also see General Response GR-1 and Response to Comment A-8.

The CPUC expects that PG&E will implement Applicant Proposed Measure APM 5-1 (Landscaping and Reflection and Contrast Reduction) on all portions of the proposed power line and poles, including portions within the City of Roseville.

B-3 As described in Section 8 of the Initial Study under "Del Mar Substation," the wood poles currently carrying the existing Atlantic–Del Mar 60 kV circuit and a distribution circuit along Sierra Meadows Drive would be topped off (reduced in height) after the 60 kV circuit has been moved to the new poles, leaving only the existing distribution circuit attached the wooden poles.

Figure I-5 does not accurately simulate the proposed project along Sierra Meadows Drive because the existing pole in the foreground has been removed, when it should be visible as topped with only distribution. The Aesthetics section of the Draft MND/IS has been revised. Please also refer to General Response GR-1.

B-4 The data shown in Table III-2 is for Placer County. Table III-2 of the Revised MND/IS has been modified to clarify this.

B-5 American badgers were not included in Table IV-2 because they have a low potential to occur within the project area based on available suitable habitat. Burrowing owls were not specifically addressed in Mitigation Measure B-4, as identified by the commenter. Mitigation Measure B-4 was not intended to be specific to the American badger, but rather to all special status mammals that den or burrow, and have any potential to occur within the project area. The following sentences of Mitigation Measure B-4 have been updated as follows. (The full text of the measure is presented in Section D, Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan.)

> A buffer of at least 300 feet (or as otherwise specified by the appropriate resource agency) shall be maintained around known dens or burrows of special status mammals during the breeding season (March through September) ~~of the American badger during the breeding season (March through September)~~ to avoid the direct loss of individuals or den abandonment. PG&E shall notify the CPUC and confer with USFWS to mitigate potentially significant impacts prior to construction, if construction is unavoidable within ~~this~~ the buffer zone.

B-6 In order to make Mitigation Measures B-2 and B-3 consistent with each other, the text of both measures has been modified. The full text is presented in Section D. Mitigation Measure B-2 has been changed as follows:

> Construction during the avian breeding seasons (February 15 through November 1 ~~September~~) should be avoided if practicable. If construction commences between February 15 and November 1 ~~August 15~~, the following measures shall ~~will~~ apply to reduce the likelihood of impacting sensitive habitat or directly impacting birds that could be nesting:
>
> - A qualified biologist, approved by the CPUC, shall perform a survey of the construction area for nesting special status raptors within 30 days prior to construction.
> - Power line poles, access roads, and equipment staging areas shall be sited to avoid the vicinity of ~~existing~~ active raptor nest trees to the greatest extent practicable…

Mitigation Measure B-3 has been changed as follows:

> If possible, ~~All~~ tree removal or trimming shall occur between November 1 ~~September 15~~ and February 15 ~~March 15~~ to avoid the breeding season of birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which includes the special status avian species listed in Table IV-3, and to discourage hawks from nesting in the vicinity of the proposed power line ROW. If tree removal or trimming must occur outside of this narrow wind period, ~~Prior to the beginning of construction (between March 15~~

~~and September 15),~~ all trees within 250 feet of any construction activity shall be surveyed for active raptor nests by a qualified biologist approved by the CPUC. If active raptor nests are found within the tree to be removed or trimmed, removal or trimming shall be delayed until all juvenile birds have fledged. If active raptor nests are otherwise found within 250 feet of tree removal or trimming…

Table IV-3 has been modified to more accurately define the nesting season of the white-tailed kite. The breeding season of this species has been changed as follows: "February ~~1~~ 15 to October 31" (CDFG, 1990).

B-7 The first paragraph of the discussion of the effect of the proposed project on riparian habitat (see Section IV(b)) has been updated as follows (it should be noted that Section IV(b) was incorrectly labeled as Section IV(a) in the Revised MND/IS):

Efforts to preserve r~~R~~iparian habitat within the project area would be made ~~avoided~~ by adhering to pre-construction measures outlined in APMs 7-1 and 7-2 (refer to Table B-7) and Mitigation Measures **B-1, B-5, B-6, and B-6a** which include the presence of biological monitors with the authority to stop construction activities, and flagging and documentation of potential wetland and riparian habitat, and disturbance-free buffer zones, as well as construction measures restricting construction equipment use within the vicinity of riparian habitats and the relocation of the underground segment away from sensitive areas. Plant surveys were conducted in February, March, April and late May of 2000. Although no special status plant species were identified along the project route during these surveys, pre-field research identified 25 special status plant species and 5 sensitive natural communities as having potential for occurrence in the project area (PG&E, 2001). Table IV-1 lists ten special-status plants that were identified as having the highest potential for occurrence in the project area. The remaining ~~15~~ 16 special status species were not included in Table IV-1 because their low potential for occurrence in the project area.

In addition, the following paragraph has been added to Section IV(b):

Initially, PG&E estimated that approximately 21 native or heritage trees would be removed during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures V-1 and B-6a would decrease the number of trees removed since the underground route would avoid many of the trees identified in the proposed project right-of-way. In addition, APMs 7-3 and 7-17 require a complete tree survey to be conducted when construction designs are finalized. The survey would include a list of all trees that would be removed and trimmed in accordance with the minimum requirements outlined in the Cities of Roseville and Rocklin's tree ordinances and required tree-removal permit applications. Compliance with the measures required in both the Roseville and Rocklin Tree Preservation ordinances would ensure that impacts Valley Mixed Riparian Woodland would be reduced to a less than significant level, either through avoidance, reduction, or replacement.

B-8 As described under "Local Regulations" of the Noise section of the MND/IS (Section XI), the provisions of the City's Noise Ordinances are not explicitly related to construction noise or vibration. The City of Roseville and the City of Rocklin do not set decibel limits for construction noise. Therefore, impact significance associated with construction noise was found to be less

than significant based on the determination that noise levels would be reduced to the lowest level possible through implementation of Applicant Proposed Measure APM 12-1. To further reduce adverse construction noise impacts, the CPUC has required Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-2 to ensure that neighboring receptors would be provided advanced notice of the construction activities and would provide means for PG&E to respond to noise concerns of those receptors (see Section XI(a)).

B-9 See Response B-8.

COMMENT SET C: U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

C-1 The species list provided by USFWS includes all species that may occur within the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quads for Rocklin and Roseville. In addition, USFWS provided guidelines for conducting botanical surveys and listed permits that may be required if specific habitats are impacted by the proposed project. The methodology for collecting biological resource information for this project included (PG&E, 2001):

- Literature searches referring to a 5-mile radius of the project area;
- A search in the California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base for the counties of Placers and Sacramento and USGS 7.5-minute quads for Rocklin, Roseville, Pleasant Grove, Folsom, Citrus Heights, and Lincoln;
- A search in the California Native Plant Society Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered vascular Plants of California;
- Review of other environmental documents prepared for other public and private projects within proximity to the proposed project;
- Floristic survey of the project area conducted on February 4, March 31, April 13-14, and May 18-19, 2000;
- Aquatic habitat assessments conducted from march through April, 2000 and informal surveys for special status aquatic species were conducted where suitable habitat was present; and
- Review of aerial photography of the project area.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures B-1 through B-7c (see Section IV of the Revised Draft MND/IS), in conjunction with PG&E's APMs 7-1 through 7-17 (see Table B-7), would ensure less than significant impacts to sensitive biological resources in the project area. PG&E would conduct all necessary pre-construction surveys, use biological monitors, consult with all applicable agencies, and obtain all required permits as outlined in the mitigation measures.

COMMENT SET D: PLACER COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

D-1 The Placer County Public Works Department does not have any comments or questions about the proposed project.

B.2.3 Responses to Comments from Individuals or Private Organizations

COMMENT SET 1: CONCERNED CITIZEN FORM LETTER

1-1 See General Response GR-1.

1-2 For discussion of potential impacts associated with audible power line noise, see Section XI(c) of the MND/IS.

1-3 See General Response GR-2.

1-4 See General Response GR-5.

1-5 See General Response GR-3.

1-6 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 2: EDWARD J. QUINN, JR. (REPRESENTING GENSIRO KAWAMOTO)

2-1 See General Response GR-1.

2-2 There is no evidence before the CPUC to find that EMF exposure to nearby residents associated with the proposed 60 kV power line would result in potentially significant health impacts to the nearby residents. Pursuant to CEQA, an alternatives analysis is only required when impacts associated with the proposed project are found to be potentially significant, and unmitigable, and for this project all impacts are reduced to less than significant levels. Also see General Response GR-2 and Response A-8.

2-3 Potential operational noise impacts associated with corona noise from the proposed power line are anticipated to be less than significant and are discussed in Section XI(c) of the MND/IS. Pursuant to CEQA, an alternatives analysis is only required when impacts associated with the proposed project are found to be potentially significant and unmitigable.

2-4 See General Response GR-1.

2-5 All potential air quality, biological resources, and hazardous materials impacts identified within the MND/IS were found to be mitigable to levels that are less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures that PG&E agreed to implement. See Sections III, IV, and VII of the MND/IS for discussions about potential impacts associated with Air Quality, Biological Resources, and Hazards & Hazardous Materials, respectively.

2-6 Pursuant to CPUC Rule 17.1, the CPUC provided a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Atlantic–Del Mar Reinforcement Project to property owners within 300 feet of the existing Atlantic and Del Mar Substations and the proposed power line route by direct mail on October 17, 2001 and October 15, 2002. The following name and address is on the NOI direct mailing list:

> Gensiro Kawamoto and the Optima Group, Inc.
> 6630 Goldenwood Circle
> Sacramento, CA 95841

COMMENT SET 3: KENT DAZEY

3-1 The commenter's concerns relate to the distribution and notification of the initial Draft MND/IS. In accordance with CEQA and the CPUC's requirements, a good faith effort was made during the preparation of the MND/IS to contact all affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in the Atlantic–Del Mar Reinforcement Project. The Draft MND/IS was sent to all affected public agencies, organizations, and individuals who had requested a copy on October 17 (see Appendix A for the distribution list of the Draft MND/IS). The CPUC provided a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (NOI) to property owners within 300 feet of the Atlantic Substation, Del Mar Substation, and the proposed route and published the notice

twice in two local newspapers (Roseville Press Tribune and Placer Herald) on October 17 and October 24, 2001, in accordance with CPUC Rule 17.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedures.

The NOI provided information about where the documents could be reviewed including an e-mail address for electronic access to the Mitigated Negative Declaration, instructions about the public review period, and information about the CPUC's public informational meeting. The 30-day review and comment period from October 17, 2001, to November 16, 2001, was established in accordance with Section 15105(b) of the CEQA guidelines.

3-2 At Del Mar Substation, the total distribution capacity is approximately 49.5 MVA. PG&E has one 16 MVA bank (good for about 18 MVA) and one 30 MVA bank (good for about 31.5 MVA). However, for this area, the power line is the limiting factor, not the capacity at Del Mar Substation. Because the existing 60 kV line has limited capacity, currently PG&E cannot use all of the existing distribution capacity at Del Mar Substation. If the proposed new power line is built, PG&E would be able to use its full distribution capacity at both Del Mar and Rocklin Substations.

No new distribution lines are planned as part of the proposed project. The distribution lines currently in place have sufficient capacity to match the capacity of the existing distribution banks. After the transmission capacity is increased, PG&E would be able to use the full existing capacity of the distribution banks and lines without adding new feeders. If at some point in the future a new distribution bank were added to Del Mar Substation, then new distribution lines would also be added. These might be overhead or underground depending upon the lines these extensions are added to and how the City of Rocklin has applied its Rule 20A funds (PG&E, 2002).

3-3 The statement of the fourth paragraph on page A-3 of the initial Draft MND/IS reads:

> Based on the analysis of the Initial Study and the mitigation measures identified therein and incorporated into the project, the Commission finds that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment

The statement did not imply that the proposed project had already been approved. The intent of the statement was to convey that based on the findings of the Draft MND/IS, the CPUC finds that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment and that the CPUC intends to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project. However, to clarify the Environmental Determination portion of Section A (Mitigated Negative Declaration), the subject paragraph has been removed and was not presented in the Revised Draft MND/IS.

3-4 The CPUC believes that Table B-1, "Project Area Land Use Designations and Existing Land Use," is presented in a way that allows residents to determine whether the information provided is complete.

3-5 Milepost locations designations along the proposed route have been added to Figure B-2.

3-6 The land use descriptions of "Power Line, Overpass, and Open Space" in Table B-1 are the existing land uses along the proposed power line route. A complete description of the power line route is provided on pages B-4 through B-7 of Revised Draft MND/IS. The proposed power line route is not adjacent to Creekside Ridge Drive.

3-7 The MND/IS document does not contain a Figure B-4. However, the CPUC recognizes that base street maps used in the initial Draft MND/IS were out of date. Base maps that more accurately represent the existing project area were used for the figures of the Revised Draft MND/IS. It should be noted that the base maps were not used to determine impact significance, but were used

solely for the purpose of providing a geographic reference for the other information illustrated on the figures.

3-8 Pursuant to Mitigation Measure V-1, the overhead line shall cross from the west side to the east side of the railroad in the vicinity of the tank farm. However, pursuant to Mitigation Measure HM-1, the poles shall be sited at least 200 feet from the nearest petroleum products storage tank. See Section D (Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan) for the complete text of Mitigation Measures V-1 and HM-1.

3-9 For clarification, a reference to Applicant Proposed Measure APM 15-2, "Routine Measures to Protect Existing Utilities and the Railroad," has been added to the General Construction Methods portion of the Project Description in the Revised Draft MND/IS.

PG&E and Union Pacific Railroad exchanged letters on at least two occasions about the proposed project (June 13, 2000 and August 4, 2000; see Appendix B). PG&E did not consult with Kinder Morgan Energy Partners or the Department of Defense about the proposed project. However, the listed legal owner of the petroleum tank farm land (Gailbreath Petroleum Corp & Others) was noticed about the project and the CEQA process.

Also refer to the response to comment 3-1.

3-10 The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) has not yet set a schedule to make a decision on the proposed project. Once the ALJ has made a decision about the proposed project, the parties to the proceeding have 30 days to protest the decision. If the proposed project schedule is delayed due to the CPUC's decision making process, PG&E is still required to comply with all aspects of the project, including their Applicant Proposed Measures and the CPUC recommended Mitigation Measures, which PG&E has agreed to implement.

3-11 See General Response GR-2.

3-12 See General Response GR-1.

3-13 The overhead high voltage power line system would include a system protection designed to safeguard the public and line equipment in the event the electrical conductor is severed or in any other way compromised. The protection system consists of power line relays and circuit breakers that are designed to rapidly detect faults and cut-off power flow to avoid shock and fire hazards. This equipment is typically set to de-energize the conductor within one twentieth of a second. The risk associated with electrical arcing from a downed power line causing chemical reactions with hazardous materials on the ground is extremely small. Therefore, such impacts are not addressed in this MND/IS.

3-14 Please refer to Section D (Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan) for all issues regarding mitigation monitoring implementation and compliance.

There have been recent situations during construction of CPUC-approved projects that required the CPUC to shut down construction due to potential harm to biological resources. For example, during construction of the Level 3 Communications Infrastructure Project (Decision No. 98-03-028), the CPUC ordered a shutdown when construction crews continued to release boring fluid (bentonite) in a sensitive resource area.

3-15 A disturbance-free zone of 250 feet from the edge of all identified potential wetland habitats and a disturbance-free zone of 200 feet from the edge of all identified aquatic and wetland habitat

would be adhered to during construction, as stated in APM 7-2 (refer to Table B-7). Pole locations have not been finalized; however, in the event construction in the disturbance-free zone is unavoidable, implementation of Mitigation Measure B-7 would mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level. It should be noted that the following modification has been made to Mitigation Measure B-7 regarding the 250-foot disturbance-free zone. (See Section D for the full text of the mitigation measure.)

> If the 200-foot and 250-foot disturbance-free zones described in APM 7-2 cannot be adhered to and construction will occur in jurisdictional wetlands, ...

Areas formally designated as wetlands fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). Any construction within these areas would require proper permitting and consultation by PG&E with the Corps.

3-16 Mitigation Measure B-2 presents a step-by-step approach for reducing impacts to nesting birds (see Section D, Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan, for the complete text of Mitigation Measure B-2). The preferred method for reducing impacts is avoidance of construction during the sensitive time period entirely (i.e., no construction during February 1 through November 1, see updated measure text in Response B-6 above). However, if this would impede construction of the line, other measures are presented to reduce impacts to birds that may be nesting nearby. The steps would be implemented in the order listed in Mitigation Measure B-2, and the CPUC's Environmental Monitor would ensure that each step is implemented as much as possible before moving to the next step.

Pole locations and siting of the underground power line route (see Mitigation Measures V-1 and B-6a) would be finalized prior to the start of construction after completion of biological surveys and other pre-construction requirements. After plans are approved by the CPUC, poles and the underground route could be moved only if an unforeseen site condition prohibited construction at a particular site.

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is the State agency responsible for management of California's diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats upon which they depend, for their ecological values and for their use and enjoyment by the public.

3-17 At the time PG&E submitted its application for the project, its was anticipated that construction would begin in February 2002. However, this date has already passed. A revised construction schedule will be developed after the completion of the environmental review process and project approval.

See Response B-6 for the revised text of Mitigation Measure B-3.

3-18 The two elderberry shrubs are located near proposed pole 9 and between poles 11 and 12. The shrub near the location of proposed pole 10 is over 50 feet west of the proposed right-of-way. The second shrub between the locations of proposed poles 11 and 12 is within 50 feet east of the project right-of-way; however, the nearest tower to this shrub would be approximately 220 feet away.

3-19 Potential significant impacts to the seasonal pools just north of Sunset Boulevard would be avoided with implementation of Mitigation Measures B-6a and B-6b (refer to Section IV-2 of the Revised Draft MND/IS).

3-20 The City of Rocklin has not indicated that the proposed project would conflict with its plans to widen Sunset Boulevard. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure V-1, there would be no power poles between Sunset Boulevard and Midas Avenue. See General Response GR-1.

3-21 See General Response GR-5.

3-22 The CPUC cannot require PG&E to mitigate impacts associated with potential leaks at the tank farm or the associated pipelines, which are not under PG&E's jurisdiction.

Also see General Response GR-5.

3-23 A row has been added to Table B-5 (Agencies other than CPUC Whose Approval May Be Required) of the Revised Draft MND/IS, indicating that PG&E would be required to obtain an Encroachment and/or Crossing Permit from Union Pacific Railroad. Approval from the Department of Defense is not required for this project.

3-24 The intent of the referenced statement is to convey that based on the findings of the Draft IS, the CPUC finds that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment and that the CPUC intends to adopt a MND for the project.

3-25 See General Response GR-1 and Response 3-7.

3-26 See General Response GR-1 and Response A-3.

3-27 A paragraph has been added to the Cultural Resources Existing Conditions (Section V) of the Revised Draft MND/IS that acknowledges the old Lincoln Highway route. Although the proposed overhead power line would cross Pacific Street near Sierra Meadows Drive, the original Lincoln Highway has not been preserved in the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the historical value of the old Lincoln Highway route.

3-28 See General Response GR-1.

3-29 See General Response GR-3.

3-30 The concerns of the commenter that the proposed power line would physically and morally divide Rocklin are noted. However, the CPUC believes that the proposed power line would not physically divide the city because the power line would not permanently inhibit traffic routes or create a physical barrier. In addition, the project has been modified to incorporate an underground segment in historic Rocklin.

3-31 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 4: ANNE JOHNSON DAZEY

4-1 See General Response GR-1.

4-2 See General Response GR-5.

It should be noted that as long as proper line clearance is maintained in accordance with CPUC General Order 95, it is very unlikely that a spark generated from an operating power line would reach ground level, approximately 80 feet below.

4-3 See Response A-3.

4-4 See General Response GR-4.

4-5 Cost and rate issues and disclosures associated with projects are not addressed in CEQA Mitigated Negative Declarations/Initial Studies. However, the Administrative Law Judge for the project will consider these issues prior to approval of the project.

4-6 See General Response GR-5.

The poles or conductors associated with the proposed project would not limit firefighter response time if a fire were to occur in the vicinity of the proposed project. There is a chance of smoke from a fire taking a power line out of service by "flashover." A "flashover" occurs when the air between the conductors or between a conductor and a tower is contaminated with something like smoke from a grass fire. The smoke acts as a conductor for electrons to flow through the contaminated air from one conductor to another, or from a conductor to a tower. Once this occurs, the line protection systems sense the abnormality and power flow is cut off.

4-7 See General Response GR-3.

4-8 See Response 3-2.

4-9 The Mandatory Findings of Significance presented on page B-103 of the initial Draft MND/IS and page B-138 of the Revised Draft MND/IS are based on the analyses presented in the Initial Study (the analysis contained in Section B of these documents).

Also see General Responses GR-1, GR-5, GR-3, and Response 4-6.

4-10 See General Response GR-2.

4-11 See Response 2-3.

4-12 The commenter's position that the CEQA process should be modified is noted. Also see Responses 3-1 and 4-5.

4-13 See Response A-8.

COMMENT SET 5: JOSHUA AND ERIKA REDDING

5-1 See General Response GR-3.

5-2 See General Response GR-3.

5-3 See Response 3-8.

5-4 See General Response GR-1.

5-5 See General Response GR-2.

5-6 See General Response GR-3.

COMMENT SET 6: MARTHA TOTARO

6-1 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-3.

6-2 See General Response GR-5.

6-3 See General Responses GR-1, GR-3, GR-5, and A-3.

COMMENT SET 7: MICHAEL TOTARO

7-1 See General Response GR-1.

7-2 See General Response GR-5.

7-3 See General Response GR-3 and Response A-3.

COMMENT SET 8: ALAN HANS

8-1 The proposed power line would not cause or contribute to the increase in likelihood of a train derailment in the vicinity of the project area.

8-2 See General Response GR-3.

8-3 See Response 4-5.

8-4 The National Transportation Safety Board does not have discretionary jurisdiction over the proposed project. Also see Response 3-9.

8-5 See Response A-8.

8-6 The commenter's position that CEQA should not allow PG&E to pursue a project without public input is noted. However, the review of this project has presented numerous opportunities for public participation and comment.

COMMENT SET 9: BARKHURST FAMILY

9-1 See General Responses GR-3 and GR-5.

9-2 See General Response GR-5.

9-3 See Section IV, Biological Resources, of the MND/IS.

9-4 See Response 1-2.

9-5 See General Response GR-1 and Response 3-7.

COMMENT SET 10: MICHAEL A. POWELL & LISA A. DAHL

10-1 See General Response GR-1.

10-2 For potential impacts associated with overhead audible power line noise, see Noise Section XI(c) of the MND/IS.

10-3 See General Response GR-2.

10-4 See General Response GR-5.

10-5 See General Response GR-3.

10-6 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 11: DAN PETERS

11-1 See General Response GR-1.

11-2 See General Response GR-3.

COMMENT SET 12: BEVERLY HUMPHREY

12-1 See General Response GR-2.

12-2 See General Response GR-5.

12-3 See General Response GR-1.

12-4 See General Response GR-3.

COMMENT SET 13: ALLEGRA D. HAKIM

13-1 It is incorrect to imply that increasing the normal capacity of the area from 65 MW to 117 MW would provide emergency capacity of 77 MW. The two (normal and emergency capacities) are separate issues, and are stated separately on page A-2 of the MND/IS: "The proposed project would increase the normal capacity of this area from 65 MW to over 117 MW, as well as installing an additional line, thus providing an emergency capacity of 77 MW."

For this project, emergency capacity refers to how much power would be available from other lines if one of the lines serving the area goes out of service in an emergency. Now there is only one line serving this area. If power on that line is lost, there is no existing emergency capacity. Once the second line goes in, the area would have enough emergency capacity (77 MW) to handle more than the entire existing load.

Each power line serving the area (the existing and proposed lines) would by itself have approximately 65 MW of normal operating capacity. However, power lines can handle slightly more than normal operating capacity from time to time. This higher capacity is referred to as the "emergency rating" of a power line, which for this project is 77 MW. When one line is not available, the other can handle up to 77 MW for the short term in an emergency.

The information above has been added to the “Purpose and Need for the Project” (Section A) of the Revised Draft MND/IS to clearly define the emergency capacity associated with the project.

13-2 Please refer to the “Purpose and Need” (Section A) of Revised Draft MND/IS and General Response GR-4.

13-3 There would be no difference in appearance if the project was built to 60 kV standards versus the proposed 115 kV standard. Refer to Figures I-2 through I-7b of the Revised Draft MND/IS Aesthetics section for visual simulations of the proposed power line.

13-4 PG&E evaluated various route alternatives in accordance with Section IX.B.1(c) of the CPUC’s General Order 131-D prior to submitting its application for the project. The route that the commenter refers to is PG&E’s Route One Alternative. Refer to Appendix A of the Revised Draft MND/IS for a complete description of Route One and for the reasons that it was selected as PG&E’s preferred route.

13-5 Please refer to Hazards and Hazardous Materials Section VII(e) of the Revised Draft MND/IS. EMF design guidelines including measures that may be available to reduce the magnetic field strength levels from electric power facilities have been added to Section VII(e).

13-6 See General Response GR-5.

13-7 At the time PG&E submitted its application for the project, the anticipated construction start date was February 2002. However, this construction start date is no longer realistic. A revised construction schedule will be developed after the completion of the environmental review process and project approval.

Mitigation Measure B-2 presents a step-by-step approach for reducing impacts to nesting birds. The preferred method for reducing impacts is avoidance of the sensitive area entirely (i.e., no construction from February through November). However, if this will not allow construction of the line to occur, other measures are presented to reduce impacts to birds that may be nesting nearby. The steps would be implemented in the order listed in the measure, and the CPUC's Environmental Monitor would ensure that each step is implemented as fully as possible before moving to the next one. In addition, Mitigation Measure B-3 limits tree removal and trimming to occur between November 1 and February 1 to avoid the breeding seasons of the species listed in Table IV-3.

As described in APMs 7-3 and 7-17, a complete tree survey would be conducted when construction designs are finalized. The survey would include a list of all trees that would be removed and trimmed in accordance with the minimum requirements outlined in the Cities of Roseville and Rocklin's tree ordinances and required tree-removal permit applications. Compliance with the measures required in both the Roseville and Rocklin Tree Preservation ordinances would ensure that impacts to oaks and other native trees would be reduced to a less than significant level, either through avoidance, reduction, or replacement. Implementation of Mitigation Measure B-3 mitigates impacts to potential and active raptor nests to a less than significant level (refer to Response to Comment B-6).

13-8 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 14: LARRY AND KATHY FLURE

14-1 See General Response GR-3.

14-2 See General Response GR-5.

14-3 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 15: KIM NELSON

15-1 The intent of the Informational Meeting held in Rocklin on October 25, 2001, was to provide additional information about the project and the CEQA process and how to provide useful and meaningful comments to the CPUC on the Draft MND/IS. PG&E representatives were present only to answer technical questions about the project on an as needed basis. Several times at the meeting it was made clear that all verbal statements made would also need to be provided in writing or e-mail to be part of the formal record and so that adequate responses to all the comments could be developed.

15-2 See General Response GR-1 and Response to Comment 3-7.

15-3 As described in the Project Description of the MND/IS, the City of Rocklin has requested that PG&E engineer and construct a portion of the proposed new line to accommodate the future relocation of the existing line that would be in conflict with the City's Pacific Street project. Also refer to Responses 13-1 and 13-2.

15-4 See General Response GR-1 and Response 3-7.

15-5 See Response A-8.

COMMENT SET 16: JOHN AND CAROL PETERSON

16-1 See General Response GR-5.

16-2 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 17: BEVERLY HUGHES

17-1 See General Response GR-1.

17-2 See General Response GR-3.

COMMENT SET 18: RONALD TALMAGE

18-1 See Response 3-7.

18-2 See General Response GR-3.

18-3 See General Response GR-2.

18-4 See General Response GR-2 and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 19: KEVIN R. GEORGE

19-1 See General Response GR-1.

19-2 See General Response GR-3.

19-3 Pursuant to the Revised Draft MND/IS, Mitigation Measure V-1 requires that the power be installed underground from south of Sunset Boulevard to north of Midas Avenue (see General Response GR-1).

19-4 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 20: ROGER BARKHURST SR.

20-1 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 21: WAYNE ROTH

21-1 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 22: KAREN CLARK

22-1 See General Response GR-1.

22-2 See Response 1-2.

22-3 See General Responses GR-2 and GR-3.

22-4 It is noted that the above ground lines could restrict certain forms of alternative air travel (hot air ballooning and kiting, etc.) adjacent to the above ground route. Also see General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 23: RON AND DONNA PALMER

23-1 See responses to Comment Set 1.

23-2 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-5.

COMMENT SET 24: MIKE AND ELAINE SPEER

24-1 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-4

24-2 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 25: DOUGLAS AND BETH SCHELL

25-1 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-5.

COMMENT SET 26: SHELLEY HIATT

26-1 See General Response GR-5.

26-2 See General Response GR-3.

26-3 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 27: SUE HAVERY

27-1 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 28: ROBIN LEPORATI

28-1 See General Responses GR-2 and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 29: JOANNE TROY

29-1 See General Responses GR-2 and GR-5.

29-2 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-3 and Response 1-2.

COMMENT SET 30: GEORGE R. KELLOG

30-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 31: SANDRINE TOURNIER

31-1 See General Response GR-1.

31-2 Please refer to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section VII of the Revised Draft MND/IS, for potential impacts associated with public safety.

COMMENT SET 32: DR. AND MRS. MICHAEL BALCH

The commenter's opposition to the proposed project is noted.

COMMENT SET 33: MICHELLE LEONARD

The commenter's opposition to the proposed project is noted.

COMMENT SET 34: ERIK WINBLAD

34-1 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-2, and Response 1-2.

COMMENT SET 35: KEN JEFFRIES

35-1 Please refer to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section VII of the MND/IS, for potential impacts associated with public safety. Also see General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 36: CHAD STOUT

36-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 37: JESSICA PETERS

37-1 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 38: MR. AND MRS. DAVIS

38-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 39: GALA AND MARK HEGGEN

39-1 See General Response GR-1.

39-2 See General Response GR-2.

COMMENT SET 40: RICHARD FOSTER

40-1 See General Response GR-1

40-2 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 41: GAYLA HEGGEN

41-1 See General Responses GR-1, GR-2, and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 42: JOHN AND SHARON YOWELL

42-1 Please refer to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section VII of the MND/IS, for potential hazard impacts associated with the project. Also see General Response GR-3.

COMMENT SET 43: MICHAEL AND DANA MYERS AND FAMILY

43-1 See General Response GR-1

43-2 General Response GR-2.

43-3 See Response A-8.

COMMENT SET 44: TRAECY BERRYMAN

44-1 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 45: DICK AND CAROLE HAZELTINE

45-1 See General Response GR-1.

45-2 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 46: FRED W. HAYNES

46-1 See General Response GR-3.

46-2 See General Response GR-2.

46-3 See General Response GR-1 and GR-5.

COMMENT SET 47: MATT AND JANA OGT

47-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 48: BRIAN AND KAREN MCKENZIE

48-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 49: G.H. TOULSON

49-1 No comment was provided.

COMMENT SET 50: BRENT NYSTROM

50-1 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 51: ANN MCNELLIS

51-1 See General Response GR-1 and GR-2.

COMMENT SET 52: MR. AND MRS. BYRON DAY

52-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 53: KEN MORGAN

53-1 The comment provided is not relevant to the proposed project or the Draft MND/IS.

COMMENT SET 54: ANNIE WOODS

54-1 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 55: ERIK WINBLAD

55-1 See General Responses GR-1, GR-2, and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 56: E. RIBEIRO PIZANTE AND LAURA

56-1 See General Responses GR-1, GR-2, and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 57: ALVIN NIELSEN

57-1 See Response 4-5.

57-2 See General Responses GR-1 and GR-3.

COMMENT SET 58: SOPHIA PERRONE EPP

58-1 See General Response GR-1.

58-2 See General Response GR-2.

COMMENT SET 59: LYNDA NELSON

59-1 See General Response GR-1.

COMMENT SET 60: CECIL C. MC LAUGHLIN

60-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 61: KEN F. HISEY, SR.

61-1 See General Response GR-5.

COMMENT SET 62: MR. AND MRS. ROBERT SYPNIEWSKI

62-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 63: ROICE E. SIMKINS

63-1 Please refer to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section VII of the MND/IS, for potential hazard impacts associated with the project. Also see General Responses GR-3 and GR-1.

COMMENT SET 64: PEGGY PALMERTREE

64-1 Refer to Response Set 1.

64-2 Refer to Response 3-7.

64-3 Refer to Response 4-2.

64-4 The MND/IS does not contain PG&E cost estimates for the proposed project or an underground alternative. Also see Response 4-5.

COMMENT SET 65: SUSAN DOUGHERTY

65-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 66: NANCY AND ROGER JOHNSON

66-1 Refer to Response Set 1.

COMMENT SET 67: LOUIS RAFFERTY

67-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

COMMENT SET 68: DAN BURNS

68-1 The commenter's opposition to the project as proposed is noted.

B.3 Responses to Revised Draft MND/IS Comment Letters

The comment period for the Revised Draft MND/IS began October 15, 2002, and ended November 14, 2002. All comments postmarked or received by November 15 are considered in this document. Table B-2 lists all comments received on the Revised Draft MND/IS and shows the comment set identification number for each letter or e-mail. Section B.3.1 includes responses to comments from agencies and Section B.3.2 presents responses to public comments. See Part II of the Appendix for copies of comment letters on the Revised Draft MND/IS.

Table B-2. Commenters And Comment Set Numbers – Revised Draft MND/IS

Commenter	Comment Set
Letters from Public Agencies	
City of Rocklin	E
Placer County APCD	F
Fish and Wildlife Service	G
Letters from Private Parties	
Michael and Martha Totaro	69
Kent Dazey	70

B.3.1 Responses to Comments from Agencies

COMMENT SET E: CITY OF ROCKLIN

E-1 The City's understanding is correct. Mitigation Measures V-1 and HM-1, which require the line to be placed underground from south of Sunset Boulevard to 120 feet north of Midas Avenue and placement of aboveground poles at a safe distance from the Kinder Morgan tank farm, respectively, are incorporated into the project.

E-2 The CPUC will move to consider the proposed project as quickly as possible. However, it is up to PG&E and the City of Rocklin to coordinate the design and installation schedules of the Atlantic-Del Mar Reinforcement and Rocklin Train Depot projects.

E-3 The referenced paragraph was inadvertently omitted from the Revised Draft MND/IS. It is still accurate, and should have read as follows:

> The City of Rocklin has stated that Pacific Street is scheduled to be widened within 5 years at the southerly end of the City. The existing 60 kV line would be in conflict with the City's proposed street-widening plan. The City of Rocklin has requested that PG&E engineer and construct a portion of the proposed new line to accommodate the future relocation of the existing line that would be in conflict with the City's Pacific Street project. The poles would be engineered and constructed to accommodate a second circuit (see Figure B-3) from the point where the new line would enter the railroad right-of-way to the transition pole south of Sunset Boulevard. The double-circuit poles would support the new 60 kV line and would have a vacant second position. If the street-widening project occurs within 5 years, the existing 60 kV line along Pacific Street would be transferred to the vacant position on the new poles and reconnected into the existing line at Sunset Boulevard. The existing wood poles would than be "topped" to a point just above the distribution circuit. These poles supporting the distribution circuit and other utilities, would remain unless the City of Rocklin chooses to underground its distribution lines at some other future date.

COMMENT SET F: PLACER COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

F-1 The following mitigation measure has been added:

> **A-3** When feasible, (1) diesel powered construction equipment, on-road and off-road, shall be limited to no more than five minutes of idling when not actively being used in construction operations, and (2) equipment warm-up and storage areas shall not be within 500 feet of any residences.

F-2 It is noted that State Wide portable equipment or Placer County APCD permits are required for all portable equipment that require such registration. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure A-2 (see Section D for full text), the Placer County APCD must approve a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan prior to the start of construction. The District will have an opportunity during its review of the plan to ensure that all applicable permits and registrations are obtained.

COMMENT SET G: U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

G-1 Refer to Response C-1 (Section B.2).

B.3.2 Responses to Comments from Individuals or Private Organizations

COMMENT SET 69: MICHAEL AND MARTHA TOTARO

69-1 Refer to Response 3-8 (Section B.2).

69-2 The residences along the ridge south of Sunset Boulevard are elevated approximately 80 above the railroad corridor. Near distance power poles and conductor would not significantly obstruct the panoramic views experienced from those residences. The resulting visual impact would be

adverse, but less than significant in the context of an existing landscape that includes transportation infrastructure (SR 65 and rail corridor) and existing utility lines. Also refer to GR-3 provided in Section B.2.

COMMENT SET 70: KENT DAZEY

70-1 The third paragraph on page A-2 of this final MND/IS has been revised as follows:

> Based on analysis of visual impacts of PG&E's proposed project, an approximately 1.3-mile segment of underground power line is recommended in **Mitigation Measure V-1**. This underground power line segment would begin immediately south of Sunset Boulevard and extend to a point at least 120 feet north of Midas Avenue (see Section Ic for a detailed description of Mitigation Measure V-1). ~~The underground power line would begin within the UPRR ROW on the west side of the railroad tracks at its southern terminus and extend to a point approximately 500 feet south of Rocklin Road. North of this point the underground route would be east of the railroad ROW on either City land or private property that is undeveloped.~~

70-2 Refer to Section I(c) of the Revised Draft MND/IS. Key Viewpoint 1 (The Preserve at Creekside Residential Development) and Key Viewpoint 2 (North of Sunset) describe the potential visual impacts associated with the overhead line south of Sunset Boulevard.

70-3 The possibility of petroleum products reaching the location of the proposed transition structure site due to a spill at the Kinder Morgan petroleum tanks site is very remote. Such facilities are required by law to have retention basins that would prevent overhead spills from migrating offsite.

B.4 References

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1990. California's Wildlife, Volume 2 – Birds. November.

PG&E (Pacific Gas & Electric Company). 2001. Proponent's Environmental Assessment. Atlantic-Del Mar Reinforcement Project. July.

____. 2002. Personal communication between Matt Fagundes of Aspen Environmental Group and Jo Lynn Lambert of PG&E. February 8.

This section presents changes to the Revised Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study that resulted from comments made on this document. Responses to comments are presented in Section B, Responses to Comments. The text that has been removed from the Revised Draft MND/IS has been indicated by a strikeout. New text to be added is indicated with underlines. Changes to mitigation measures are also shown in Section D.

Page A-2, Revised Mitigated Negative Declaration (Comment 70-1)

The third paragraph on page A-2 of this final MND/IS has been revised as follows:

> Based on analysis of visual impacts of PG&E's proposed project, an approximately 1.3-mile segment of underground power line is recommended in **Mitigation Measure V-1**. This underground power line segment would begin immediately south of Sunset Boulevard and extend to a point at least 120 feet north of Midas Avenue (see Section Ic for a detailed description of Mitigation Measure V-1). ~~The underground power line would begin within the UPRR ROW on the west side of the railroad tracks at its southern terminus and extend to a point approximately 500 feet south of Rocklin Road. North of this point the underground route would be east of the railroad ROW on either City land or private property that is undeveloped.~~

Page B-5, Section 8 (Comment E-3)

The referenced paragraph was inadvertently omitted from the Revised Draft MND/IS. It is still accurate, and should have read as follows:

> The City of Rocklin has stated that Pacific Street is scheduled to be widened within 5 years at the southerly end of the City. The existing 60 kV line would be in conflict with the City's proposed street-widening plan. The City of Rocklin has requested that PG&E engineer and construct a portion of the proposed new line to accommodate the future relocation of the existing line that would be in conflict with the City's Pacific Street project. The poles would be engineered and constructed to accommodate a second circuit (see Figure B-3) from the point where the new line would enter the railroad right-of-way to the transition pole south of Sunset Boulevard. The double-circuit poles would support the new 60 kV line and would have a vacant second position. If the street-widening project occurs within 5 years, the existing 60 kV line along Pacific Street would be transferred to the vacant position on the new poles and reconnected into the existing line at Sunset Boulevard. The existing wood poles would than be "topped" to a point just above the distribution circuit. These poles supporting the distribution circuit and other utilities, would remain unless the City of Rocklin chooses to underground its distribution lines at some other future date.

Page B-72, Section III(a) (Comment F-1)

The suggested mitigation measure has been added:

> **A-3** When feasible, (1) diesel powered construction equipment, on-road and off-road, shall be limited to no more than five minutes of idling when not actively being used in construction operations, and (2) equipment warm-up and storage areas shall not be within 500 feet of any residences.

Page B-77 (Comment B-6)

Table IV-3 has been modified to more accurately define the nesting season of the white-tailed kite. The breeding season of this species has been changed as follows: "February ~~1~~ 15 to October 31" (CDFG, 1990).

Page B-77, Section IV(a) (Comment B-6)

Mitigation Measure B-2 has been revised as follows:

B-2 Construction during the avian breeding seasons (February 15 through November 1 ~~September~~) should be avoided if practicable. If construction commences between February 15 and November 1 ~~August 15~~, the following measures shall ~~will~~ apply to reduce the likelihood of impacting sensitive habitat or directly impacting birds that could be nesting:

- A qualified biologist, approved by the CPUC, shall perform a survey of the construction area for nesting special status raptors within 30 days prior to construction.
- Power line poles, access roads, and equipment staging areas shall be sited to avoid the vicinity of ~~existing~~ active raptor nest trees to the greatest extent practicable.
- If avoidance of active nests is not practicable, a construction-free buffer of at least 250 feet (or as otherwise specified by the appropriate resource agency) around the nest shall be maintained to protect breeding birds. If a special status raptor has an active nest in the project area, the biologist approved by the CPUC shall monitor the site during all construction activities to ensure there is no nest abandonment. In the event a Swainson's hawk nest is present, consultation and coordination with CDFG shall occur to determine appropriate actions.
- Should nest abandonment occur during the breeding season, despite all efforts to minimize disturbance, and if the nestlings are still alive, the biological monitor(s) shall notify the appropriate agencies as soon as it becomes apparent that the nest has been abandoned.

Page B-78, Section IV(a) (Comment B-6)

Mitigation Measure B-3 has been revised as follows:

B-3 If possible, ~~All~~ tree removal or trimming shall occur between November 1 ~~September 15~~ and February 15 ~~March 15~~ to avoid the breeding season of birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which includes the special status avian species listed in Table IV-3, and to discourage hawks from nesting in the vicinity of the proposed power line ROW. If tree removal or trimming must occur outside of this narrow window period, ~~Prior to the beginning of construction (between March 15 and September 15)~~ all trees within 250 feet of any construction activity shall be surveyed for active raptor nests by a qualified biologist approved by the CPUC. If active raptor nests are found within the tree to be removed or trimmed, removal or trimming shall be delayed until all juvenile birds have fledged. If active raptor nests are otherwise found within 250 feet of tree removal or trimming activity, protective fencing shall be erected around the tree at the dripline to prevent construction disturbance and intrusions to the nest area, and a construction-free buffer of at least 250 feet around the nest shall be maintained during the breeding season.

Page B-78, Section IV(a) (Comment B-5)

Mitigation Measure B-4 has been revised as follows:

B-4 Before the spring breeding season (and prior to construction), a survey of the construction area for any denning activity shall be performed by a qualified biologist approved by the CPUC. Sensitive habitat, including burrows and dens, shall be avoided by moving the pole locations. If an active den is located within the construction zone, a biological monitor shall be present during construction activities. A buffer of at least 300 feet (or as otherwise specified by the appropriate resource agency) shall be maintained around known dens or burrows of special status mammals during the breeding season (March through September) ~~of the American badger during the breeding season (March through September)~~ to avoid the direct loss of individuals or den abandonment. PG&E shall notify the CPUC and confer with USFWS to mitigate potentially significant impacts prior to construction, if construction is unavoidable within ~~this~~ the buffer zone. Vehicular speed will be kept to 10 miles per hour in sensitive wildlife habitat along construction access roads and within the construction right-of-way.

Page B-81, Section IV(b)

The section is referenced as "a) Effect on Riparian Habitat: Less than Significant Impact" in the Revised Draft MND/IS. The section is actually Section IV(b).

Page B-81, Section IV(b) (Comment B-7)

The first paragraph of the discussion of the effect of the proposed project on riparian habitat has been revised as follows:

Efforts to preserve r~~R~~iparian habitat within the project area would be made ~~avoided~~ by adhering to pre-construction measures outlined in APMs 7-1 and 7-2 (refer to Table B-7) and Mitigation Measures **B-1, B-5, B-6,** and **B-6a** which include the presence of biological monitors with the authority to stop construction activities, and flagging and documentation of potential wetland and riparian habitat, and disturbance-free buffer zones, as well as construction measures restricting construction equipment use within the vicinity of riparian habitats and the relocation of the underground segment away from sensitive areas. Plant surveys were conducted in February, March, April and late May of 2000. Although no special status plant species were identified along the project route during these surveys, pre-field research identified 25 special status plant species and 5 sensitive natural communities as having potential for occurrence in the project area (PG&E, 2001). Table IV-1 lists ten special-status plants that were identified as having the highest potential for occurrence in the project area. The remaining ~~15~~ 16 special status species were not included in Table IV-1 because their low potential for occurrence in the project area.

Page B-81, Section IV(b) (Comment B-7)

The following paragraph has been added to Section IV(b):

Initially, PG&E estimated that approximately 21 native or heritage trees would be removed during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures V-1 and B-6a would decrease the number of trees removed since the underground route would avoid many of the trees identified in the proposed project right-of-way. In addition, APMs 7-3 and 7-17 require a complete tree survey to be conducted when construction designs are finalized. The survey would include a list of all trees that would be removed and trimmed in accordance with the minimum requirements outlined in the Cities of Roseville and Rocklin's tree

ordinances and required tree-removal permit applications. Compliance with the measures required in both the Roseville and Rocklin Tree Preservation ordinances would ensure that impacts Valley Mixed Riparian Woodland would be reduced to a less than significant level, either through avoidance, reduction, or replacement.

Page B-82, Section IV(c) (Comment 3-15)

Mitigation Measure B-7 has been revised as follows:

B-7 If the 200-foot and 250-foot disturbance free zones described in APM 7-2 cannot be adhered to and construction will occur in jurisdictional wetlands, PG&E must comply with applicable requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

D. MITIGATION IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING PLAN

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has proposed the Atlantic-Del Mar Reinforcement Project to respond to growth in electrical service demand and maintain system reliability. PG&E proposes to upgrade their existing 60 kV power line and associated substations that serve the City of Rocklin and south Placer County by adding an additional 60 kV power line between the Atlantic Substation in the City of Roseville and the Del Mar Substation in the City of Rocklin. The primary components of the project include constructing a new single-circuit 60 kV power line that would include approximately 2.7 miles of overhead and 1.3 miles of underground new 60 kV line, installing a new 60 kV breaker at the Atlantic Substation, and installing a new switch at the Del Mar Substation. Construction is anticipated to commence in early 2003.

An Initial Study was prepared to assess the potential effects on the environment from the various components of the proposed project. The Initial Study was prepared based on information in the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA), a project site visit, and supplemental research. The majority of the proposed project's impacts would occur during project construction, as a result of disturbance caused by construction activity. Within PG&E's Application, Applicant Proposed Measures addressing potentially significant impacts were proposed to reduce potentially adverse impacts related to project construction.

The purpose of this Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan is to ensure that the Applicant Proposed Measures, as well as the Agency Recommended Mitigation Measures that PG&E has agreed to, are adequately implemented. This plan includes specific actions to be taken to implement each measure, information on monitoring requirements, and the timing of implementation (see Table D-1). This plan includes:

- The Agency Recommended Mitigation Measures, which PG&E must implement as part of the proposed project, followed by the Applicant Proposed Measures that PG&E has made part of the proposed project and is responsible for implementing;
- The actions required to implement these measures;
- Monitoring requirements; and
- Timing of implementation for each measure.

Construction field monitoring shall be carried out by a CPUC-designated environmental monitor to ensure that the measures are implemented. In all instances where non-compliance occurs, the CPUC's designated environmental monitor shall issue a warning to the construction foreman and PG&E's project manager. Continued non-compliance shall be reported to the CPUC's designated project manager. Any decisions to halt work due to non-compliance shall be made by the CPUC. The CPUC's designated environmental monitor shall keep a record of any incidents of non-compliance with mitigation measures. Copies of these documents shall be supplied to PG&E and the CPUC.

Table D-1. Mitigation Implementation And Monitoring Plan

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
AGENCY RECOMMENDED MEASURES				
Aesthetics				
Visual impacts of overhead power line to Rocklin's Historic District.	**V-1**: The proposed project shall be installed underground within the Union Pacific railroad corridor from immediately south of Sunset Boulevard and east of the railroad ROW to a location at least 120 feet north of Midas Avenue also on the east side of the railroad ROW. PG&E shall consult with CPUC staff on the exact location of the transition structure north of Midas Avenue. In addition, the overhead line shall cross from the west side to the east side of the railroad in the vicinity of the tank farm, with the transition structure on the east side of railroad tracks. From this transition structure, the line would proceed underground along the east side of the railroad corridor to the transition structure located north of Midas Avenue. .	PG&E to implement measure as defined.	CPUC to verify project construction plans comply with measure.	Prior to construction
Air Quality				
Fugitive Dust and Equipment Exhaust Associated with Project Construction Activities.	**A-1:** PG&E shall implement PCAPCD Mitigation Measures No. 1 through 6 as described below. PG&E shall provide CPUC with documented compliance of how each PCAPCD Mitigation Measure is/will be complied with prior to the commencement of construction activities. 1. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed PCAPCD Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. 2. The applicant shall submit to the PCAPCD and receive approval of a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking. 3. The prime contractor shall submit to the PCAPCD a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower of greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. PCAPCD personnel, with assistance from the California Air Resources Board, will conduct initial Visible Emission Evaluations of all heavy-duty equipment on the inventory list. 4. An enforcement plan shall be established to weekly evaluate project-related on-and-off- road heavy-duty vehicle engine emission opacities, using standards as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2180 - 2194. An Environmental Coordinator, CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE), shall routinely evaluate project related off-road and heavy-duty on-road equipment emissions for compliance with this requirement. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours. 5. Construction contracts should stipulate that at least 20% of the heavy-duty off-road equipment included in the inventory be powered by CARB certified off-road engines, as follows: 175 hp B 750 hp — 1996 and newer engines 100 hp B 174 hp — 1997 and newer engines 50 hp B 99 hp — 1998 and newer engines In lieu of or in addition to this requirement, an applicant can use other measures to reduce particulate matter and nitrogen oxide emissions from their project through the use of emulsified diesel fuel and or particulate matter traps. The PCAPCD should be contacted to discuss this measure. 6. No open burning of removed vegetation during infrastructure improvements. Vegetative material should be chipped or delivered to waste-to-energy or composting facilities.	PG&E to provide documented compliance of how each PCAPCD is complied with prior to construction	CPUC site visit to verify compliance.	Prior to and During construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Equipment Exhaust Associated with Concurrent Construction Activities.	**A-2:** PG&E shall schedule construction activities so that exhaust levels do not violate PCAPCD exhaust requirements. Prior to construction, PG&E shall submit to the CPUC the Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan, approved by PCAPCD as set out in Mitigation Measure A-1, that demonstrates how construction exhaust emission levels will be kept below the PCAPCD significance thresholds for exhaust emissions.	PG&E to implement measure as defined.	CPUC to verify that the subject constructed are not constructed concurrently.	During construction
	A-3: When feasible, (1) diesel powered construction equipment, on-road and off-road, shall be limited to no more than five minutes of idling when not actively being used in construction operations, and (2) equipment warm-up and storage areas shall not be within 500 feet of any residences.			
Biology				
Affect Sensitive Status Species	**B-1:** Floristic surveys of the project area, conducted in 2000, were not performed during the flowering period of two special status species with potential to occur along the right-of way. • Hispid bird's-beak (Cordylanthus mollis ssp. hispidus) has a low to moderate potential to occur in a small patch of saltgrass (Distichlis sp.) in a disturbed seasonal stream crossing north of Sunset Avenue. This species blooms from June to September. • Sanford's arrowhead (Sagittaria sanfordii) has a high potential to occur in suitable habitat along Antelope Creek and in a seasonal stream and small drainage north of Sunset Avenue. This species blooms from May to October. To prevent possible disturbance to these species, a qualified biologist, approved by the CPUC, will place flags (or direct installment of exclusion fencing) around the small patch of saltgrass (*Distichlis* sp.) and all suitable habitat of Hispid bird's-beak (*Cordylanthus mollis* ssp. *hispidus*) and Sanford's arrowhead (*Sagittaria sanfordii*) along Antelope Creek and the seasonal stream and small drainage north of Sunset Boulevard within 100 feet of any construction activity. Construction activities will subsequently be prohibited within this exclusion area.	PG&E to place flags or fencing around all suitable habitat; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to verify flag and/or fencing is in place prior to construction.	Prior to and during construction
Affect Sensitive Status Species during Nesting	**B-2**: Construction during the breeding season (February 15 through November 1) should be avoided if practicable. If construction commences between February 15 and November 1, the following measures shall apply to reduce the likelihood of impacting sensitive habitat or directly impacting birds that could be nesting: • A qualified biologist, approved by the CPUC, shall perform a survey of the construction area for nesting special status raptors within 30 days prior to construction. • Power line poles, access roads, and equipment staging areas shall be sited to avoid the vicinity of active raptor nest trees to the greatest extent practicable. • If avoidance of active nests is not practicable, a construction-free buffer of at least 250 feet (or as specified by the appropriate resource agency) around the nest shall be maintained to protect breeding birds. If a special status raptor has an active nest in the project area, the biologist approved by the CPUC shall monitor the site during all construction activities to ensure there is no nest abandonment. In the event a Swainson's hawk nest is present, consultation and coordination with CDFG shall occur to determine appropriate actions. • Should nest abandonment occur during the breeding season, despite all efforts to minimize disturbance, and if the nestlings are still alive, the biological monitor(s) shall notify the appropriate agencies as soon as it becomes apparent that the nest has been abandoned.	PG&E to submit surveys to CPUC for review and approval 15 days prior to the start of construction; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Affect Sensitive Status Species During Breeding	**B-3**: If possible, tree removal or trimming shall occur between November 1 and February 15 to avoid the breeding season of birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, witch includes the special status avian species listed in Table IV-3, and to discourage hawks from nesting in the vicinity of the proposed power line ROW. If tree removal or trimming must occur outside of this narrow window period, all trees within 250 feet of any construction activity shall be surveyed for active raptor nests by a qualified biologist approved by the CPUC. If active raptor nests are found within the tree to be removed or trimmed, removal or trimming shall be delayed until all juvenile birds have fledged. If active raptor nests are otherwise found within 250 feet of tree removal or trimming activity, protective fencing shall be erected around the tree at the dripline to prevent construction disturbance and intrusions to the nest area, and a construction-free buffer of at least 250 feet around the nest shall be maintained during the breeding season.	PG&E to submit surveys to CPUC for review and approval 30 days prior to the start of construction; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Affect Breeding Habitats of Sensitive Status Species	**B-4**: Before the spring breeding season (and prior to construction), a survey of the construction area for any denning activity shall be performed by a qualified biologist approved by the CPUC. Sensitive habitat, including burrows and dens, shall be avoided by moving the pole locations. If an active den is located within the construction zone, a biological monitor shall be present during construction activities. A buffer of at least 300 feet (or as specified by the appropriate resource agency) shall be maintained around known dens or burrows of special status mammals during the breeding season (March through September) to avoid the direct loss of individuals or den abandonment. PG&E shall notify the CPUC and confer with USFWS to mitigate potentially significant impacts prior to construction, if construction is unavoidable within the buffer zone. Vehicular speed will be kept to 10 miles per hour in sensitive wildlife habitat along construction access roads and within the construction right-of-way.	PG&E to submit surveys to CPUC and USFWS for review and approval 30 days prior to start of construction; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review document and consult with USFWS; if near an active den, a biological monitor will be present during construction.	Prior to and during construction
Affect Aquatic Habitat	**B-5:** No construction activities shall occur in or immediately adjacent to Antelope Creek. A buffer zone of 200 feet during the wet season (November through April) and 30 feet during the dry season (May through October) shall be established around Antelope Creek to protect the western pond turtle and the Chinook salmon. If work must be conducted within these buffer zones, PG&E shall notify the CPUC in writing prior to construction and shall negotiate with the appropriate resource agencies (i.e., the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game) the type, timing, and duration of the work to mitigate any potential significant impacts.	PG&E to avoid buffer zone; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Affect Vernal Pool Habitat	**B-6:** To avoid potential construction impacts to vernal pool aquatic habitats, a buffer zone of 200 feet during the wet season (November through April) and 30 feet during the dry season (May through October) shall be established around the seasonal pools in the project area that contain protected species and could potentially be impacted by project activities. If work must be conducted within these buffer zones, PG&E shall notify the CPUC in writing prior to construction and shall negotiate with the appropriate resource agencies (i.e., the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game) the type, timing, and duration of the work to mitigate any potential significant impacts. To avoid potential construction impacts to aestivation habitat, all of the proposed pole sites shall be surveyed to ensure that poles are placed in locations where aestivation habitat is absent.	PG&E to avoid buffer zone; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
	B-6a: If PG&E cannot completely avoid direct (100-foot buffer) or indirect (250-foot buffer) impacts to vernal pool crustaceans, they will be required to comply with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) 404 permitting/ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Section 7 process, if necessary, and any other applicable USFWS or USACE consultation requirements. Appropriate compensation to mitigate impacts will be determined by the USFWS. PG&E must provide the CPUC with a copy of the Biological Opinion from USFWS that indicates agreed-upon avoidance buffer zones, compensation for anticipated impacts, and/or measures to reduce impacts to less than significant.	Implement measure as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
	B-6b: PG&E shall initiate consultation with CDFG to determine if an "Incidental Take Permit" would be required for the project. PG&E shall provide documentation to the CPUC that either: (1) CDFG found that an Incidental Take Permit would be necessary for the project, or that (2) CDFG would not require that PG&E obtain an Incidental Take Permit. If an Incidental Take Permit is required, PG&E must provide all provisions of the permit to the CPUC prior to the commencement of construction and all said provisions shall be incorporated into the Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan and implemented as stipulated.	Implement measure as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Affect Wetland Habitat	**B-7:** If the 200-foot and 250-foot disturbance free zones described in APM 7-2 cannot be adhered to and construction will occur in jurisdictional wetlands, PG&E must comply with applicable requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.	PG&E to submit report to CPUC and USACE for review and approval; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance; CPUC and USACE to review report.	Prior to and during construction
	B-7a: PG&E will be required to initiate U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) 404 permitting if any of the 'other waters of the U.S.' or associated wetlands, identified in the May 2002 Assessment of Biological Resources for PG&E's Atlantic Del-Mar Underground Evaluation in Rocklin, CA by Jones & Stokes are directly impacted by the project. Appropriate compensation for anticipated impacts to these waters and wetlands will be determined by the USACE for this project. PG&E must provide the CPUC with a copy of the 404 permit (or notice of authorization under a Nationwide Permit) that documents the agreed-upon compensation for impacts to these jurisdictional resources.	Implement measure as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
	B-7b: PG&E shall initiate consultation with CDFG to determine if a Streambed Alternation Agreement Permit would be required for the project. PG&E shall provide documentation to the CPUC that either: (1) CDFG found that a Streambed Alternation Agreement Permit would be required for the project, or (2) CDFG would not require that PG&E obtain a Permit. If a Streambed Alternation Agreement Permit is required, PG&E must provide all provisions of the Permit to the CPUC prior to the commencement of construction and all said provisions shall be incorporated into the Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring Plan and implemented as stipulated.	Implement measure as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
	B-7c: Boring operations under wetlands shall be limited to daylight hours because of the difficulty in identifying the loss of bentonite or machine pressure without daylight. This shall be defined by the termination of drilling 30 minutes before dusk, and resumption of drilling at dawn. The contractor will make every effort to schedule drilling activities to be completed between dawn and 30 minutes to dusk. Should the drilling activities be within one hour of completion, 30 minutes before dusk, drilling activities may be allowed to continue for one more hour if the project environmental monitor determines that completing the drilling activities will result in less risk to the wetland area. In the event that the wetland is dry and the National Weather Service forecasts indicate no possibility of rain for a 24-hour period, this condition shall not apply. PG&E shall develop site specific Bore Plans for each proposed bore location that document the design, measures to minimize the risk of spills of all types, and contingency plans in the event of the release of drilling lubricants through fractures in the streambed or wetland ("frac-outs"). In substrates where frac-outs are likely to occur, the plan shall require boring in a manner that would reduce risk, such as using lower pressure and greater boring depths. The Bore Plan(s) shall be approved by the CPUC prior to the start of construction. Boring plans should include: • A sketch of the construction site, including equipment staging areas, approximate location of drill entry and exit points, the approximate location of access roads in relation to the surrounding area, and conduit stringing areas (if required). • Proposed depth of bore and statement of streambed/wetland condition (subsurface strata, percent of gravel and cobble, and estimated scour depth) that support the depth of the bore. • Approximate length of bores (50-foot increments). • Type and size of boring equipment to be used (categorized as mini, mid or maxi). • Estimated time to complete bore. • List of lubricants and horizontal directional drill additives to be used • Name of Operator's agents and cell phone numbers. • Location of disposal site and description of disposal arrangements. • Frac-out prevention and contingency plan that includes: name(s) and phone numbers of biological monitor(s), third-party monitors, and crew supervisor(s); site-specific resources of concern (if applicable, include factors such as possible presence of sensitive species); monitoring protocols (include biological monitoring and frac-out monitoring; containment and clean-up plan (include staging location of vacuum trucks and equipment, equipment list, necessary hose lengths, etc. at each location). To prevent frac-outs, the following or similar prevention measures will be instituted: before thermal grout is pumped into the casing, thermal concrete of compressive strength 2,500 psi(same as the duct bank concrete) will be used to form concrete plugs at the casing ends to prevent escape of the grout during the pumping operation. Overflow standpipes will be directed into a sandbagged, fabric or plastic lined dam to prevent contamination of any surrounding areas. PG&E's biological monitor shall provide on-site training for the work crews to ensure protection of all stream and wetland zones. The contractor will provide continuous monitoring of the boring operation to ensure that adequate protection controls have been installed as specified in the bore plan. In addition, a contractor compliance inspector will be present during drilling operations. All field personnel will be briefed in their responsibility for timely reporting of frac-out releases to the monitor on site. PG&E's biological monitors shall inspect the route within 4 hours prior to the commencement of bore at the permitted sites for the presence of sensitive species. If sensitive species are found, work shall cease immediately and appropriate resource agencies shall be consulted in order to develop mitigation and new construction plans. Secondary containment will be utilized for any portable equipment brought onto the project site (i.e., portable pumps). Secondary containment will consist of spill basins large enough to contain the equipment. In addition, spill kits will be kept on site at all times for use in vehicle/equipment fuel or oil leaks. Spill kits will consist of a 5-gallon plastic bucket, 3-inch ring booms, and absorbent padding. Frac-out containment materials will also be kept on site.	Implement measure as defined. Submit Plan to CPUC for review and approval.	CPUC to review plan and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Cultural Resources				
Disturb Known Cultural Resources	**C-1:** No transmission towers, anchor points, or construction disturbance shall be placed within 15 feet of the boundaries of CA-Pla-841-H, Archaeological Site YH-2, Archaeological Site A-1, and Structure 5250 Front Street, Rocklin. The transmission towers shall also avoid, within 15 feet, the eleven features that accompany CA-Pla-841-H [Culvert RM-1, Feature RM-2, the Rocklin Passenger Depot (California Historical Landmark 780-2 and RM-3), Culvert RM-4, the Rocklin Roadhouse (C-Rocklin-B-10), Culvert-1, Culvert-2, Culvert-3, Culvert-4, Culvert-5, and the Railroad Bridge]. In addition, vehicles shall be restricted to existing access roads and/or shall not be permitted within 15 feet of the external boundaries of these resources. A cultural resource specialist shall approve all these locations and the specialist shall monitor all excavation. To prevent physical damage to the 18 identified resources, PG&E shall flag these sites, if within 100 feet of any work area as environmentally sensitive areas for at least 48-hours prior to construction work on the project. A cultural resource specialist approved by the CPUC shall install the flagging.	PG&E to flag and avoid cultural resources; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to verify flagging is in place prior to construc-tion; monitor con-struction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Disturb Unknown Cultural Resources	**C-2**: PG&E shall develop and implement a *Cultural Resources Management Plan* (CRMP) for the project covering pre-construction, construction, and post-construction activities. PG&E shall submit the CRMP to the CPUC at least 30 days prior to construction for review and approval. The CRMP shall include procedures for pre-construction field survey, designation and avoidance of cultural resources areas, significance evaluation including potential testing and possible data recovery prior to construction, archaeological monitoring during construction, treatment of the unexpected discovery of cultural resources (including Native American burials), and treatment of significant sites that may be exposed during all phases of the project. The CRMP shall detail the qualifications of the Project Archaeologist, reporting requirements by the Project Archaeologist; designate a location for the curation of cultural materials collected during the project; and, specify that archaeologists and other discipline specialists meet any Professional Qualifications Standards mandated by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). The CRMP shall include requirements detailing that prior to construction or ground-disturbing activities, PG&E shall (1) complete cultural resources training for all construction personnel; and, (2) insure that any excavation contract (or contracts for other activities that may have subsurface soil impacts) shall include clauses that require construction personnel to attend training so they are aware of the potential for inadvertently exposing buried archaeological deposits. The CRMP shall include the requirement for and definition of a background briefing for supervisory construction personnel describing the potential for exposing cultural resources, the location of any potential Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) and anticipated procedures to treat unexpected discoveries. Construction personnel shall be trained regarding the recognition of possible buried prehistoric and historic resources during construction. PG&E shall inform all construction personnel of the procedures to be followed upon the discovery of archaeological materials including Native American burials. Upon discovery of potential cultural resources during construction, work in the immediate area of the find shall be halted and PG&E's archaeologist and the CPUC Environmental Monitor shall be notified. Once the find has been identified, PG&E's archaeologist shall make the necessary plans for treatment of the find(s) and for the evaluation and mitigation of impacts if the finds are found to be important according to CEQA. A report on the find shall be submitted to the CPUC.	PG&E to submit report to CPUC 30 days prior to construction for review and approval; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review report and monitor construction activ-ities for compliance of the report.	Prior to and during construction
Recognition of Cultural Resources	**C-3**: Prior to the initiation of construction activities, PG&E shall provide all construction personnel with environmental training. Training shall describe the possible cultural resources in the project area and emphasize the importance of the cultural resource sites. Training shall also address the possibility that previously unidentified cultural resources may become apparent during ground-disturbing activities, and shall define procedures to be implemented if possible resources are discovered. The contents of the training course shall be provided to the CPUC for review and approval before the start of construction, and documentation regarding the specific construction personnel who have attended the training shall be provided to the CPUC.	PG&E to submit contents of training course and provide sign-in sheet to CPUC prior to con-struction; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review and approve contents of training course.	Prior to construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Disturb Unknown Cultural Resources as a Result of Underground Power Line Excavation	**C-3a:** PG&E shall ensure that a Cultural Resources Specialist is on site to monitor all excavation activities associated with underground construction required by Mitigation Measure V-1. PG&E shall provide the CPUC with the resume of the Cultural Resources Specialist for approval prior to the commencement of construction. The Cultural Resources Specialist shall have the authority to stop construction if there is a perceived impact to Cultural Resources	Implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review and approve resume of PG&E-appointed Cultural Resources Specialist.	Prior to and during construction
Disturb Unknown Paleontological Resources	**C-4**: Prior to construction, PG&E shall develop a Paleontological Resources Monitoring Plan (PRMP) for review and approval by the CPUC, which shall address the treatment of paleontological resources discovered during transmission line construction. The PRMP shall identify specific areas with high sensitivity for paleontological resources and shall define procedures for evaluation of resources found during construction. It shall define procedures for actions to be taken if paleontological resources are found during construction, procedures for fossil recovery, a data recovery program, and a qualified curation facility. A qualified paleontologist approved by the CPUC shall prepare the PRMP; it shall include procedures for significance testing and data recovery. The PRMP shall defer to the Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan (see Mitigation Measure C-1) if paleontological resources are found with archaeological resources. The PRMP shall include a requirement for training of construction workers on why vertebrate fossils are important and what they look like. The training shall explain prohibitions against collecting fossils found during construction.	PG&E submit report to CPUC for review and approval 30 days prior to construction; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review report and monitor construction activities for compliance of the report.	Prior to and during construction
Hazards & Hazardous Materials				
Power Line Accident at the Tank Farm	**HM-1:** PG&E shall site all power poles and/or underground transition structures at least 200 feet away from the nearest petroleum products storage tank at the Kinder Morgan tank farm.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to verify project construction plans comply with measure.	Prior to construction
Encounter Contaminated Material	**HM-2:** PG&E shall conduct an updated review of regulatory databases and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) files to identify current potentially contaminated properties on or adjacent to the proposed power line route or the existing substation sites. PG&E or it's contractor shall assign trained personnel during active excavation in the vicinity of any of sites identified in Table VII-1 or potential new sites discovered as a result of the updated review of databases to observe visual evidence of contamination and perform monitoring with appropriate testing equipment (e.g., photoionization or flame ionization detectors). If field evidence of contamination is observed during excavation, sampling and direct laboratory testing shall be conducted as necessary. Alternately, subsurface sampling and laboratory analysis would be performed prior to excavation, to determine subsurface conditions and appropriate actions. Personnel conducting soil sampling and field analysis should meet the Federal OSHA requirement for 40-Hour Training for Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response and be familiar with the calibration and operation of the testing equipment. The monitoring personnel shall have authority to implement a health and safety plan that complies with applicable OSHA requirements and is approved by a certified industrial hygienist. The health and safety plan shall present specific alternatives for action to be taken in the event contaminated soils are encountered. The plan shall specify procedures for monitoring, identifying, handling, and disposing of hazardous waste.	PG&E to submit contingency plan and updated site list to CPUC 30 days prior to construction for review and approval; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review report and monitor construction activities for compliance with the report.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Erosion Associated with Trenching Activities	**H-1:** All refueling, lubrication, and other machinery or vehicular maintenance activities required during construction of the project shall be performed at least 100 feet from any tributary or stream channel, or slough. PG&E shall submit its Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan (HSCERP), as described in APM 10-8, to the CPUC for review and approval prior to the commencement of construction. The plan shall describe specific measures, such as the use of drip sheets, to minimize spillage of fuels and lubricants.	PG&E to submit HSCERP to CPUC 30 days prior to construction for review and approval; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review report and monitor construction activities for compliance with the report.	Prior to and during construction
	H-2: Trenched spoils shall be removed to an off-site location, and/or temporarily collected and placed in a controlled area surrounded by siltation fencing, hay bales, or a similarly effective erosion control technique that prevents the transport of sediment. Upon completion of trenching activities, excavated soil shall be replaced and graded to match the surroundings. Surplus soil shall be transported from the site and disposed of in a CPUC approved manner. Open portions of the trench shall be covered when not under active construction. Standard erosion and dust control practices shall be used during construction according to PG&E's Best Management Practices (Applicant Proposed Measure APM 10-1) to protect biological and hydrological resources.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	During construction
Impacts to Groundwater Hydrology	**H-3**: Groundwater levels along the underground transmission line route shall be tested by drilling pilot borings. The location, distribution, or frequency of such tests shall be determined to give adequate representation of the conditions along the underground line. Suitable testing locations (for example at 1,000 or 1,500 ft intervals) shall be determined by a qualified geologist approved by the CPUC. Locations where groundwater depth is less than 8 ft deep shall be identified prior to trenching activities and avoided, where possible, for the underground route. Avoidance is especially recommended where shallow groundwater flow direction is not parallel to the orientation of the underground line. Where avoidance is not possible, PG&E Co. shall consider construction in a wider, shallower trench, depending upon structural requirements of the underground method and other practical concerns. PG&E Co. shall document results of test drilling in a letter report to the CPUC at least 30 days before construction starts and shall propose specific means to minimize the impact on groundwater if shallow groundwater is found. These measures must be approved by the CPUC prior to the start of construction of the underground segment. This measure can be eliminated if information on local groundwater levels is obtained that indicates that groundwater depth is over 8 feet below the ground surface.	PG&E to implement measure as defined.	CPUC review groundwater level documentation.	Prior to construction
Noise				
Construction Equipment Noise	**N-1:** PG&E or its construction contractor shall provide advance notice, between two and four weeks prior to construction, by mail to all sensitive receptors and residences that would be within 300 feet of construction. The announcement shall state specifically where and when construction will occur in the area. If construction delays of more than 7 days occur, an additional notice shall be made, either in person or by mail. Notices shall provide tips on reducing noise intrusion, for example, by closing windows facing the planned construction. The notice shall also advise the recipient on how to inform the Applicant/contractor if specific noise or vibration sensitive activities are scheduled so that construction can be rescheduled, if necessary, to avoid a conflict and a reasonable deadline for such contact shall be stated. PG&E shall also publish a notice of impending construction in local newspapers, stating when and where construction will occur.	PG&E to provide notice to CPUC for review and approval, and provide documentation of mailing and publishing; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review notice and documentation of mailing and publishing.	Prior to construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Noise Construction Disturbance	**N-2**: PG&E shall identify and provide a public liaison person before and during construction to respond to concerns of neighboring receptors, including residents about noise construction disturbance. Procedures for reaching the public liaison officer via telephone or in person shall be included in notices distributed to the public in accordance with Mitigation Measure N-1. PG&E shall also establish a toll-free telephone number for receiving questions or complaints during construction and develop procedures for responding to callers (procedures to be approved by the CPUC).	PG&E to provide notice and procedures for responding to callers to CPUC for review and approval;	CPUC to review notice; verify toll-free number; and review procedures for responding to callers.	Prior to and during construction
Transportation/Traffic				
Traffic Impacts Associated with Lane Closures	**T-1*:*** PG&E shall develop and implement detailed Traffic Control Plans (TCPs) for the entire route at all locations where construction activities would interact with the existing transportation system. Input and approval from the City of Rocklin Public Works Department shall be obtained as required; copies of all required approval letters from City of Rocklin Public Works Department must be provided to the CPUC prior to the start of construction. The TCP shall define the use of flag persons, warning signs, lights, barricades, cones, etc. according to standard guidelines outlined in the Caltrans Traffic Manual, the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction, and the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (WATCH).	Implement measure as defined. Submit Plans to CPUC for review and approval.	CPUC to review plans and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
APPLICANT PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES				
Aesthetics				
Landscaping and Reflection and Contrast Reduction	**APM 5-1:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company has agreed to the City of Rocklin's requests to implement the following visual mitigation measures to further ensure that the project will not negatively impact the existing visual environment within the City of Rocklin. These measures include: • Landscaping around poles, where possible; • Use of non-reflective wires; and • Use of gray self-weathering steel poles.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to verify implementation.	Prior to and during construction
Air Quality				
Construction Fugitive Dust and Equipment Exhaust	**APM 6-1 through 6-3:** These APMs are superseded by Agency Recommended Mitigation Measure A-1 (see above).			

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Biological Resources				
Standard Construction Practice to Avoid or Minimize Impacts to Biological Resources	**APM 7-1:** As part of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's standard construction practice, the following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project and will be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to biological resources: • An ongoing environmental education program for construction crews will be conducted before beginning the site work and during construction activities. Sessions will include information about the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the consequences of noncompliance with these acts, identification of sensitive species and wetland habitats, and review of mitigation requirements. • Vehicles will be restricted to established and identified roadways. • Sensitive resource areas, such as rare plant populations, habitat for listed species, and active nests in the project vicinity, will be mapped and marked in the field. • If sensitive species are located prior to or during construction, Pacific Gas and Electric Company will consult with the USFWS and CDFG to coordinate avoidance measures. • A biological monitor will be onsite during any construction activity near sensitive habitat to ensure implementation of, and compliance with, mitigation measures. The monitor will have the authority to stop activities and determine alternative work practices in consultation with construction personnel, if construction activities are likely to impact sensitive biological resources. • Photo documentation of preconstruction habitat conditions at all tower and pull-site locations within sensitive habitat will occur prior to the start of work, as well as immediately after construction activities. • Pacific Gas and Electric Company will make diligent efforts to protect the existing plant community and wetlands and to keep temporary impacts to a minimum. However, temporary impacts to habitat will be addressed through a revegetation/restoration plan. • Trash dumping, firearms, open fires (e.g., barbecues), hunting, and pets will be prohibited in the project area.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to verify implementation.	Prior to, during and after construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Wetlands and Riparian Habitat	**APM 7-2:** To ensure avoidance of wetland habitat (includes vernal pools, artificial seasonal pools, freshwater marsh, and other natural wetlands, riparian vegetation, and perennial and ephemeral streams) the following mitigation measures will be implemented: • Rubber-tired construction vehicles will be used on the site and no new roads will be excavated, with the exception of a small pad at the base of the tower west of Antelope Creek. Where holes are augered for poles located within the 250-foot buffer zone of vernal pools and other seasonal pools, runoff will be contained and care will be taken to prevent cast-off of excavated soil. For other aquatic habitats (i.e., perennial and ephemeral streams, wetlands, and quarry ponds) poles are located within 200 feet of these habitats, and care will be taken to prevent cast-off of excavated soil. Once the seated pole has been back-filled, any excess excavated soils will be moved away from the stream or wetland. • All vehicle and equipment access into the site will be limited to marked access routes to avoid entering streams, wetlands, vernal, and seasonal pools. Wetland habitat will be marked with flagging by a qualified biologist. When possible, indirect impacts to vernal pools and seasonal pools will be avoided by maintaining a disturbance-free zone of 250 feet from the edge of all wetland habitats. For other aquatic habitats (perennial and ephemeral streams, wetlands, and quarry ponds) indirect impacts will be avoided when possible, by maintaining a disturbance-free zone of 200 feet from the edge of all aquatic habitat during the wet season (November through April) and 30 feet during the dry season (May through October). • Riparian vegetation along the Antelope Creek corridor and the unnamed ephemeral streams that occur in the project area will be marked as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA's) prior to construction and under the supervision of a qualified biologist. • Prior to construction, silt fencing will be installed in areas where any soil disturbance within 100 feet of the Antelope Creek corridor, or within 50 feet of any of the ephemeral streams or pools is anticipated. The disturbed area will be restored to a pre-existing grade and any bare soil will be covered with certified weed-free straw or wood chips immediately following construction. • Refueling or equipment repair will occur outside the defined project area.	PG&E to identify construction boundaries; implement as defined.	CPUC to verify silt fencing is in place prior to construction; verify implementation of measure during construction.	Prior to and during construction
Native Trees	**APM 7-3:** • Permits will be obtained as necessary from the City of Roseville and City of Rocklin for the removal or trimming of native oaks or other native trees. A complete tree survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist or forester, and will include a list and location of all trees to be removed or trimmed. Any oaks or other native trees removed, or trimmed in excess of 20 percent of the tree canopy, will be mitigated to be consistent with local tree protection ordinances. • Any oaks or other native trees over six inches diameter-at-breast-height that are not slated for removal and are within pole laydown areas will be protected. Placement of temporary fencing at the dripline of the tree prior to construction to protect the resource from direct impacts will be implemented.	PG&E to install fencing and submit survey report to CPUC for review and approval 30 days prior to construction and provide documentation to CPUC that permits are obtained.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Noxious Weeds	**APM 7-4:** Construction vehicles will avoid disturbing or driving through significant populations of noxious and invasive exotic species. Flagging will identify these areas to be avoided.	PG&E to install flagging prior to construction	CPUC to verify implementation	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Interruption of Breeding and Nesting Activities of Avian Species	**APM 7-5:** "Take" of individual animals will be avoided by conducting preconstruction surveys before the spring breeding season (and prior to start of construction). A qualified biologist will perform a survey of the construction area for potential avian species within 30 days prior to construction, if scheduled during the breeding season. It is expected that if construction occurs in suitable habitat before the onset of the breeding season, the construction disturbance would cause bird species to seek alternate sites for breeding and nest construction. The following measures will reduce the likelihood of impacting sensitive habitat or directly impacting birds that could be nesting: • To the extent possible, power line towers and access roads will avoid sensitive habitat; • To the extent possible, construction during the breeding season (February through September) will be avoided. If avoidance of active nests is not possible, a construction-free buffer of at least 250 feet around the nest will be maintained to protect breeding birds. In the unlikely event a Swainson's hawk nest is present, consultation will occur with CDFG; • In the event a nesting raptor is identified in the project vicinity, a biologist will monitor the site during construction activities to ensure there is no nest abandonment; and • Should nest abandonment occur during the breeding season, despite efforts to minimize disturbance, and if the nestlings are still alive, the biological monitor(s) will notify the appropriate agencies.	PG&E to complete and submit the survey to CPUC 30 days prior to construction for review and approval	CPUC to review report and monitor construction activities for compliance	Prior to and during construction
Trimming or Removal of Nest Trees	**APM 7-6:** • When feasible, all tree removal or trimming will occur between September 15 and March 15 to avoid the breeding season of birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and to discourage hawks from nesting in the vicinity of the proposed power line ROW. • Prior to the beginning of construction (between March 15 and September 15), all trees within 250 feet of any construction activity will be surveyed for active raptor nests by a qualified biologist. If active raptor nests are found within 250 feet of potential construction activity, flagging will be erected around the tree at the dripline to prevent construction disturbance and intrusions on the nest area.	PG&E to submit surveys to CPUC for review and approval 30 days prior to the start of construction; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Interruption of Breeding/Denning Activities of Sensitive Wildlife Mammals	**APM 7-7:** Before the spring breeding season (and prior to construction), a survey of the construction area for any denning activity will be performed by a qualified biologist. It is expected that if construction occurs in suitable habitat before the onset of breeding season, the construction disturbance would cause mammal species to seek alternate sites for breeding and denning; • To the extent possible, sensitive habitat, including burrows, will be avoided by moving the location of the transmission pole. Some flexibility exists in the exact placement of these features along the route; • If an active den is located within the construction zone, a biological monitor will be present during construction activities; • If possible, a buffer of at least 300 feet will be maintained around known dens of the American badger during the breeding season (March through September) to avoid the direct loss of individuals. PG&E will consult with USFWS if construction must occur within this buffer; and • Vehicular speed will be kept to 20 miles per hour in sensitive wildlife habitat.	PG&E to submit surveys to CPUC for review and approval 30 days prior to the start of construction implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Potential Loss of VELB Habitat	**APM 7-8:** • Two elderberry shrubs are located outside the ROW; • Fencing or flagging will identify all areas to be avoided during construction activities. The avoidance area will be photographed and flagged prior to construction. Signs will be installed at 50-foot intervals along the edge of the avoidance area, according to USFWS 1999 guidelines; • Towers will be constructed no closer than 100 feet to the existing shrubs; • A qualified biologist will monitor both elderberry shrubs during construction; • Informal consultation with the USFWS will occur prior to construction; and • Should impacts occur to the elderberry shrubs, the USFWS will be notified immediately.	PG&E to install fencing; implement measure as defined.	CPUC to inspect area, verify that flagging is in place prior to during construction.	Prior to and during construction
Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp, Vernal Pool Tadpole Shrimp, and California Linderiella Fairy Shrimp	**APM 7-9:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company will comply with Endangered Species Act requirements for mitigating impacts to these species. Where possible, a 250-foot buffer zone around pools in the project vicinity that have the potential to support vernal pool fairy shrimp, vernal pool tadpole shrimp, and California Linderiella shrimp will be fenced. This will prevent impacts to these species. Where construction activities must occur within 250 feet of a pool potentially supporting these species, the following precautions (in consultation with the USFWS) will be taken: • A biological monitor approved by the USFWS will be present during construction activities and will have the authority to halt work to ensure that unnecessary impacts do not occur; • Adequate fencing will be placed and maintained around the vernal pool habitat; • Construction personnel will be provided environmental training that includes a description of the species involved, the importance of avoiding impacts, and the measures that they must follow while working within 250 feet of vernal pools; • Runoff from the construction activities will be prevented from draining into the pool; and • Activities that could interfere with protection of the vernal pools will be prohibited. These include alteration of existing topography; use as a staging or laydown area; building new roads; burning, burying, or leaving behind wastes; alteration of any native vegetation; and use of pesticides.	PG&E to consult with USFWS and provide CPUC with documentation of consultation; install fencing and avoid buffer zone; approved biological monitor on site during construction; implement as defined.	CPUC verify consultation with USFWS, monitor construction activ-ities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
California Red-legged Frog	**APM 7-10:** To avoid construction impacts to potential aestivation or foraging habitat, the proposed pole site in the general vicinity of potential CRLF habitat will be placed where aestivation habitat is absent. Excavation and other construction activities will not occur in wetlands identified as suitable foraging habitat. If construction activities are necessary inside the wet and dry season buffer zones, avoidance and minimization measures by the USFWS will likely be required, including the following: • Prior to the initial site investigation and subsequent ground-disturbing activities, a qualified biologist will instruct all project personnel in recognition of CRLF and their habitat. Workers will be informed about the presence of CRLF and their habitat, and that unlawful "take" of the animal or destruction of its habitat is a violation of the federal Endangered Species Act. The biologist will instruct all construction personnel regarding the life history of CRLF, the importance of marshes/wetlands to the frog, and the terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion; • A qualified biologist will be present during construction activities to monitor and determine the extent of potential ground-disturbing activities within 30 feet of suitable habitat; • Between November 1 and April 30, ground-disturbing activities will not occur within 30 feet of suitable habitat; • Between May 1 and October 31, equipment will not be allowed within 30 feet of suitable habitat until a qualified biologist inspects the site to ensure the route is clear of CRLF; • Clearing of wetland vegetation will be confined to the minimal area necessary. Excavation activities will be accomplished by using equipment located on and operated from the side of the drainage with the least interference practical for emergent vegetation; • If a CRLF is encountered during excavations, activities will cease until the frog is removed and relocated by a USFWS approved biologist; and • After completion of construction activities, any debris will be removed and, wherever feasible, disturbed areas will be restored to preconstruction conditions.	PG&E to implement measure as defined	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance	Prior to and during construction
California Tiger Salamander (CTS)	**APM 7-11:** To avoid potential construction impacts to aestivation habitat, all of the proposed pole sites will be surveyed to ensure that poles are placed in locations where aestivation habitat is absent. Measures described above to protect the vernal pool tadpole shrimp, the vernal pool fairy shrimp, and the California linderiella fairy shrimp will minimize potential impacts to the salamander. Additional measures include: • If a CTS is encountered during excavations, activities will cease until the salamander is removed and relocated by a biologist approved by CDFG; • After completion of construction activities, any construction debris will be removed and, wherever feasible, disturbed areas will be restored to preconstruction conditions.	PG&E to submit survey; avoid buffer zone; and implement measure as defined.	CPUC to review survey report and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Central Valley Fall-Run Chinook Salmon	**APM 7-12:** • No construction activities will occur in or immediately adjacent to Antelope Creek; • A buffer zone of 200 feet during the wet season (November through April) and 30 feet during the dry season (May through October) will be established around Antelope Creek to protect this species; and • If work must be conducted in buffer zones, the type and duration of the work will be negotiated with the appropriate resource agency prior to construction in the area.	PG&E to avoid buffer zone or provide documentation that the appropriate resource agency has been consulted.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance, review documentation.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Foothill Yellow-legged Frog	**APM 7-13:** • No construction activities will occur in or immediately adjacent to Antelope Creek; • A buffer zone of 200 feet during the wet season (November through April) and 30 feet during the dry season (May through October) will be established around Antelope Creek to protect this species; and • If work must be conducted in buffer zones, the type and duration of the work will be negotiated with the appropriate resource agency prior to construction in the area.	PG&E to avoid buffer zone or provide documentation that the appropriate resource agency has been consulted.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance, review documentation.	Prior to and during construction
Western Pond Turtle	**APM 7-14:** • No construction activities will occur in or immediately adjacent to Antelope Creek; • A buffer zone of 200 feet during the wet season (November through April) and 30 feet during the dry season (May through October) will be established around Antelope Creek to protect this species; and • If work must be conducted in buffer zones, the type and duration of the work will be negotiated with the appropriate resource agency prior to construction in the area.	PG&E to avoid buffer zone or provide documentation that the appropriate resource agency has been consulted.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance, review documentation.	Prior to and during construction
Western Spadefoot Toad	**APM 7-15:** To avoid potential construction impacts to aquatic habitats, a buffer zone of 200 feet during the wet season (November through April) and 30 feet during the dry season (May through October) will be established around the seasonal pools in the project area that contain this species (those between MP 0.80 and MP 1.00) and could potentially be impacted by project activities. If work must be conducted in buffer zones, the type and duration of the work will be negotiated with the appropriate resource agency prior to construction in the area. To avoid potential construction impacts to aestivation habitat, all of the proposed pole sites will be surveyed to ensure that poles are placed in locations where aestivation habitat is absent.	PG&E to avoid buffer zone or provide documentation that the appropriate resource agency has been consulted.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance, review documentation.	Prior to and during construction
Vernal Pool Plant Species	**APM 7-16:** To ensure that indirect impacts to special-status vernal pool plant species does not occur during annual inspection of the power line, inspection vehicles will remain on existing access roads and avoid entering streams, wetlands, vernal, and seasonal pools.	PG&E inspection vehicles to remain on existing roads.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance	During operations
Oak Tree Trimming During Operations	**APM 7-17:** Any oak tree trimming required for compliance with CPUC General Order 95 will also be conducted in accordance with Rocklin and Roseville tree ordinances.	PG&E to comply with CPUC General Order 95.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	During construction and operations
Cultural Resources				
Disturb Cultural and Paleontological Resources	**APM 8-1 through 8-7:** These APMs are superseded by Agency Recommended Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-4 (see above).			
Geology				
Soils and Ground Shaking	**APM 9-1:** The proposed project's construction and operations will incorporate measures to minimize potential soil and geologic impacts. In addition, underground and overhead structures will be built to the design specifications set out in General Order 95 and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. Standard 693 to withstand potential seismic ground shaking. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's standard procedures incorporate Best Management Practices, which include removal of excavated materials where required, and the use of erosion control measures, such as straw bales, silt fences, and seeding with vegetative cover to protect biological resources.	PG&E to implement Best Management Practices.	CPUC monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Hydrology, Water Quality, and Public Health Hazards				
Best Management Practices	**APM 10-1:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company will implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) at pole construction locations, equipment laydown areas, and cable pull-sites, to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation of waterways. Special attention will be given to construction activities near Antelope Creek. Erosion control measures will be performed to protect the waterways, such as straw bales, silt fences, and seeding with vegetative cover to protect biological resources. These additional mitigation measures will further reduce any potential impacts to hydrology and resulting from hazardous materials to a less than significant level.	PG&E to implement Best Management Practices.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
No new roads	**APM 10-2:** No new roads will be constructed to access pole locations.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance	Prior to, during, and after construction
Bermed Areas for Excess Water and Liquid Concrete	**APM 10-3:** Excess water and liquid concrete that escapes the pole foundation pours will be directed to bermed areas adjacent to the borings where the water will infiltrate or evaporate and the concrete will remain and begin to set. Once the excess concrete has been allowed to set up (but before it is dry), it will be removed and recycled or transported to an approved landfill for disposal.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	During and after construction
Rocklin and Roseville Fire Departments will Review Construction Methods, etc.	**APM 10-4:** Should the project schedule require construction during the fire season, the Rocklin and Roseville Fire Departments will review the specific construction methods and equipment, and identify any additional requirements that will minimize the potential for wildfires, such as: • Any motor, engine, welding equipment, cutting torch, grinding device or equipment from which a spark, fire or flame may originate will not be used without first (a) clearing away all flammable material for a distance of 10 feet, and (b) having on hand a round-point shovel with an overall length of not less than 46 inches and a fire extinguisher or water-filled backpack pump fully equipped and ready to use. This does not apply to power saws and other portable tools powered by a gasoline-fueled internal combustion engine (Public Resources Code 4427). • Any portable gasoline-powered tool (chainsaws, etc.) will not be used within 25 feet of any flammable materials without providing one round-point shovel with an overall length of not less than 46 inches or a fire extinguisher having a minimum rating of 2-BC. The fire tools must be unobstructed and within 25 feet of the tool operation at all times (PRC 4431). Motor vehicles will not be parked or operated outside of cleared work areas except for the specific purpose of clearing vegetation.	PG&E to submit documentation to the CPUC that Rocklin and Roseville Fire Departments concur with the project's specific construction methods	CPUC to review documentation and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Welding Procedures	**APM 10-5:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company's standard procedures are to select a welding site that is void of native combustible material and/or clear the site of such material to minimize the fire hazard. All welding on supporting structures will be performed during fabrication of the poles at the fabricator's yard. Prior to performing welding at the substations, Pacific Gas and Electric or its contractor will obtain a welding permit.	PG&E to provide proof that a welding permit has been obtained and implement as defined.	CPUC to review documentation and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to, during, and after construction
Construction Equipment Requirements	**APM 10-6:** Construction equipment will meet the following requirements: • The exhausts of all equipment powered by gasoline, diesel, or other hydrocarbon fuel will be equipped with effective spark arrestors; • The spark arrestor will be designed to prevent the escape from the exhaust of carbon or other flammable particles over 0.0232 inches. Motor trucks, truck tractors, buses, and passenger vehicles (except motorcycles) will not be subject to this provision if their exhaust systems are equipped with mufflers (PRC 4442); and • In addition to the requirements of PRC 4427 described above, all welding rigs will be equipped with a minimum of one 20 lb. or two 10 lb. fire extinguishers, and a minimum of 5 gallons of water in a fire-fighting apparatus.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction and during operations.

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
1994 Uniform Fire Code Section 1109.5	**APM 10-7:** In accordance with the most recent edition of the 1994 Uniform Fire Code Section 1109.5, and as part of standard construction practice, Pacific Gas and Electric Company will inform its field personnel that lighted matches, cigarettes, cigars or other burning objects will not be discarded in such a manner that could cause ignition of other combustible material.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction and during operations.
Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan	**APM 10-8:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company will prepare a Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan (HSCERP) that will include preparations for quick and safe cleanup in the event of an accidental release of hazardous material. The plan will prescribe BMPs for reducing the potential for significant impacts to surface and ground water in the unlikely event of an oil or other liquid spill, including: • Prescribing methods for safe collection and disposal of hazardous substances generated during construction activities • An emergency response program to ensure quick and safe cleanup of accidental chemical spills The plan will identify areas where refueling and vehicle maintenance activities, temporary storage of unused concrete, and storage of hazardous materials will be permitted, and how these materials will be managed. Adherence to the HSCERP when managing hazardous materials will reduce the potential for impact to less than significant levels.	PG&E to submit plan to CPUC for review and approval 30 days prior to construction.	CPUC to review plan and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Avoid Sites Known for Hazardous Material Re\leases	**APM 10-9:** Construction and other earth moving activities in the vicinity of sites known or suspected of being associated with releases of hazardous material will be avoided, where possible, to prevent the spread of contamination and the risk of worker exposure.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Pole Placement over Landfill Waste and Notification of Release	**APM 10-10 and 10-11:** These APMs are superseded by Agency Recommended Mitigation Measure HM-1 (see above).			
Use of Approved Landfill	**APM 10-12:** Excavation spoils will be disposed of at an approved landfill.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Environmental Training Program	**APM 10-13:** An environmental training program will be established to communicate environmental concerns and appropriate work practices, including erosion control methods, fire prevention, and spill prevention and response measures, to all field personnel.	PG&E to submit contents of training course to CPUC for review and approval.	CPUC to review contents of training course and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Reduce Fire Hazard by Removal of Objects Within 10 Feet of Wires	**APM 10-14:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company's standard procedures are to clear potential proximate objects, such as trees, during construction and maintenance clearance for the life of the power line to reduce the fire hazard potential. Routine maintenance will include the clearing of all vegetation within a radial distance of 10 feet of wires (Public Resources Code [PRC] 4293) to minimize fire and other hazards. PRC 4293 also requires the removal or trimming of hazardous trees that are dead, decayed, diseased, or leaning into the line. Clearing of vegetation consistent with Section 4293 and California Department of Forestry guidelines will reduce the threat of fire during construction and operation of the project.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
National Electric Safety Code Requirements	**APM 10-15:** The National Electric Safety Code requires that power lines be designed so no more than 5 milliamperes of short-circuit current will flow through a person's body when contacting a large metal object beneath a power line. As is standard with all utility power line projects, adherence to this requirement (by identifying and grounding affected metallic buildings and structures) will reduce potential impacts from induced voltages to a less than significant level.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
General Order 95	**APM 10-16:** Pursuant to standard design practices and General Order 95, Pacific Gas and Electric Company takes into account normal and unusual structural loads, such as ice and wind that can cause the conductors to break. Pacific Gas and Electric Company installs high-speed relay equipment that senses a broken line condition and actuates circuit breakers to de-energize the line in about one-tenth of a second. This procedure has proven to be a reliable safety measure and reduces the risk of fire or electrical shock to a less than significant level.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Minimum distances between Equipment at the Substations	**APM 10-17:** A minimum distance of 25 feet between transformers and circuit breakers will be maintained to reduce the potential for fires at the Atlantic or Del Mar Substations. A minimum distance of 50 feet will be maintained between oil-filled equipment and ignition sources**.** When construction is complete, the Atlantic and Del Mar Substations will be equipped with automated central alarm systems, which will immediately alarm in the unlikely event of a fire at either substation.	PG&E to avoid buffer zone and implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Spill Prevention, Countermeasure, and Control Systems	**APM 10-18:** The existing Spill Prevention, Countermeasure, and Control (SPCC) containment systems will be used at the Atlantic and Del Mar Substations to retain any release in the event of a catastrophic failure of oil-filled electrical equipment during equipment removal or installation. Catch basin capacities will be maintained at levels sufficient to contain the amount of insulating oil that could be released in the event of a sudden accidental spill. Oil-absorbent material, tarps, and storage drums will be used to contain and control any minor releases. Pacific Gas and Electric Company will revise their SPCC plans for the Atlantic and Del Mar Substations if there are significant future changes in the amount of oil used. The plans will include engineered methods for containing and controlling any oil release, and preparations for a quick and safe cleanup. The plans will be submitted to Placer County for review.	PG&E to submit plan to CPUC and Placer County for review and approval 30 days prior to project operations, implement as defined.	CPUC and Placer County to review plan and CPUC to verify compliance.	Prior to and during operations

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Noise				
Techniques to Minimize Construction Noise	**APM 12-1:** The following noise and vibration suppression techniques will be employed to minimize (to the extent possible) the impact of temporary construction noise and vibration on nearby sensitive receptors: • Equipment exhaust stacks/vents will be directed away from buildings. • Truck traffic will be routed away from noise-sensitive areas, where feasible. • Temporary sound barriers or sound curtains will be employed, if necessary, under the following conditions: - The other noise reduction methods are not effective or possible - Construction will occur within 100 feet of businesses - Sensitive receptors will be exposed to construction noise for more than one day • Construction techniques, including, but not limited to, non-vibratory means of compressing the soil, will be used where possible to reduce noise and vibration levels to the extent possible and to ensure that the determined construction criteria are not exceeded.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	During construction
Transportation and Traffic				
Road Closure Timing	**APM 14-1:** The timing of temporary road closures will be coordinated with Rocklin and Roseville Public Works Departments, the CHP, and Caltrans.	PG&E to provide documentation of coordination and implement as defined	CPUC to review documentation and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Flagger Control	**APM 14-2:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company will maintain the maximum amount of travel-lane capacity possible when working adjacent to or crossing roadways during non-construction periods. A contract traffic management company will be deployed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (or its contractor) to provide flagger control to maintain traffic flows and manage traffic control during temporary closures. Construction activities in road rights-of-ways will be subject to the conditions of encroachment permits from the cities of Rocklin and Roseville, and from the California Department of Transportation.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Coordination with UPRR	**APM 14-3:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company will maintain, at a minimum, the UPRR safety and engineering guidelines when installing power line within the railroad ROW. All construction crews and project personnel will be trained on UPRR safety guidelines prior to commencing work in the railroad ROW. Construction activities will be conducted in coordination with UPRR so as not to impact scheduled commuter train routes and to avoid delays on freight train services out of the Roseville switching station.	PG&E to provide documentation of coordination and implement as defined.	CPUC to review documentation and monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction
Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems				
Conduct Surveys and contact USA	**APM 15-1:** Pacific Gas and Electric Company will conduct surveys to locate underground and overhead utilities, and all utilities encountered by project facilities will be put on the construction plan maps. During construction, before any ground disturbance occurs, Underground Service Alert (USA) will be contacted to verify the location of existing underground utilities, in order to insure that they are avoided.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Actions	Monitoring Requirements	Timing of Action
Routine Measures to Protect Existing Utilities and RR	**APM 15-2:** In addition, other measures routinely implemented by Pacific Gas and Electric Company include: • Pacific Gas and Electric Company's technicians will locate Pacific Gas and Electric Company's underground distribution gas lines. • Representatives from all non-Pacific Gas and Electric Company aerial and underground utilities crossed by the project will be notified in advance that construction will be occurring near their lines. • Representatives from the utilities will provide the location of non-Pacific Gas and Electric Company underground utilities. Representatives from these utilities will be requested to be on-site for monitoring during construction. • Where the project crosses or is adjacent to live, overhead electric lines, signs will be installed warning equipment operators of the presence of the line. • Pacific Gas and Electric Company will locate poles and install conductors at a safe distance from intersecting transmission line structures, conductors, and telephone wires in accordance with the distances specified in the CPUC General Order No. 95. • During stringing, temporary crossing structures will be installed at major roads, railroad crossings, and in the vicinity of other lines to prevent accidental contact during conductor installation.	PG&E to implement as defined.	CPUC to monitor construction activ-ities for compliance.	Prior to and during construction