

Exhibit CC: Response to 1.5-17

Line 1600 Laterals Screening Matrix

Exhibit AA has been compiled in response to Item 1.5-17. Table 1: Line 1600 Laterals Screening Matrix includes Line 1600 Laterals 1, 2, 3, and 27.

For the purposes of this response, Table 1: Line 1600 Laterals Screening Matrix uses the same methodology that was used for Table 5-1: Alternatives Screening Matrix in Chapter 5 – Discussion of Significant Impacts and Project Alternatives in the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment for the Pipeline Safety & Reliability Project (Proposed Project).

Table 1: Line 1600 Laterals Screening Matrix

Criteria	Lateral 1	Lateral 2	Lateral 3	Lateral 27
SITE SUITABILITY				
Dimensions/Location (miles)				
Length of line	0.14	0.01	0.12	0.32
Undeveloped/cross-country crossed	0.14	0.01	0.12	0
Urban areas crossed ¹	0	0	0	0.32
JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES				
Land Ownership (miles)				
Federal	0	0	0	0.004
United States (U.S.) Bureau of Indian Affairs	0	0	0	0
U.S. Department of Defense	0	0	0	0.004
U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM)	0	0	0	0
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	0	0	0	0
U.S. Forest Service	0	0	0	0
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	0	0	0	0
State	0	0	0	0
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	0	0	0	0
California Department of Parks and Recreation	0	0	0	0
California State Lands Commission	0	0	0	0
University of California	0	0	0	0
Private ²	0	0	0	0.32
Number of Local Jurisdictions				
Counties	1	1	1	1
Cities	0	0	0	1
Number of Infrastructure Crossings				
Rivers and streams	0	0	0	1
Man-made waterways ³	0	0	0	0
Major highways	0	0	0	0
Railroads	0	0	0	0

¹ The urban areas that would be crossed were identified using the California Department of Transportation’s geographic information system data and were not field-verified.

² Mileage does not include where the pipeline would likely be located in franchises and roads, but only where it would cross private property. Private is assumed to be land that is not federally, state, or locally owned.

³ Man-made waterways include canals, ditches, water pipelines, and underground conduit.

Criteria	Lateral 1	Lateral 2	Lateral 3	Lateral 27
PROJECT OBJECTIVES COMPATIBILITY				
Implement pipeline safety requirements for existing Line 1600 and modernize the system with state-of-the-art materials as soon as practicable	Not Applicable (NA)	NA	NA	NA
Improve system reliability and resiliency by minimizing dependence on a single pipeline	NA	NA	NA	NA
Enhance operational flexibility to manage stress conditions by increasing system capacity	NA	NA	NA	NA
FEASIBILITY				
Able to be permitted and constructed in a reasonable period of time ⁴	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Relative cost compared to the Proposed Project ⁵	NA	NA	NA	NA
Avoids lands that have legal protections that may prohibit or substantially limit the feasibility of permitting ⁶	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Known conservation easements crossed (miles)	0	0	0	0
BLM Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Crossed (miles)	0	0	0	0
Able to meet technological requirements, considering available technology and the construction, operation, and maintenance or spacing requirements of multiple facilities using common rights-of-way	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS				
Biological Sensitivity				
USFWS critical habitat crossed ⁷ (miles)	0	0.02	0.35	0
Number of California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) records within 1 mile	0	3	3	20
Number of unique species reported in CNDDDB within 1 mile	0	3	3	6
Cultural sensitivity ^{8, 9}	Low	Low	Low	Low
Protected parks and forests ¹⁰ crossed (miles)	0	0	0	0
Designated scenic roads within 0.5 mile	0	0	0	0
Potential for encountering hazardous material based on known hazardous contamination within 0.25 mile ¹¹	Low	Low	Low	Low

⁴ This criterion assumes landowner approval and land access requirements can be met.

⁵ The following criteria were used to assign the relative cost of alternatives compared to the Proposed Project: Similar (up to 50-percent cost increase); Slightly Higher (50- to 100-percent cost increase); Higher (100- to 200-percent cost increase); and Much Higher (more than 200-percent cost increase).

⁶ Lands with legal protections that may prohibit or substantially limit the feasibility of permitting include known conservation easements, BLM Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and Mission Trails Regional Park.

⁷ USFWS critical habitat includes all critical habitat designated for various species by the USFWS.

⁸ Cultural sensitivity was determined based on the number of known cultural resource sites intersected by the route, taking into account the percentage of the route that was covered by available records.

⁹ Line 1600 is over 50 years old, and could therefore be considered a historic resource; however, it has not been formally evaluated for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, the Local Register, or the County of San Diego's Resource Protection Ordinance.

¹⁰ Protected parks and forests include those managed by federal, state, and local agencies.

¹¹ Hazard potential was determined by the number of existing hazardous sites within 0.25 mile of each alternative. The following criteria was used: Low (zero to 20); Medium (21 to 40); and High (41 to 60+).