Table of Contents

1 Introduction

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) published the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the South Orange County Reliability Enhancement Project (proposed project) on April 25, 2016. The Final EIR will be used to support the CPUC's decision with respect to San Diego Gas & Electric Company's (SDG&E) application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct the proposed project.

This Errata document includes minor clarifications and corrections to the Final EIR that were identified following the publication of the Final EIR. Revisions included in this Errata document are shown in double underlined text or ~~double strike out~~ text; revisions that were included in the original Final EIR are shown in underlined text or ~~strike out~~ text.

Revisions presented in this Errata document do not present significant new information that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a significant environmental impact of the proposed project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an impact. Additionally, information clarified in this Errata document does not present a new feasible project alternative or mitigation measure that is considerably different from what was previously analyzed in the Final EIR. All of the information in this document merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications to the Final EIR. Because the clarifications or corrections in this document are not considered "significant," recirculation of the Final EIR is not required in accordance with Section 15088.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

2 Changes to the Final EIR

This section describes changes to the Final EIR text.

2.1 Minor Corrections Related to Comparison Methodology Text

The revisions in this section consist of minor corrections to the text of the Comparison Methodology to make Section 5.1 of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR internally consistent with the environmental impact analyses in Chapter 4 of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR. The following corrections were made to page 5-1 (lines 35–38) and page 5-2 (lines 1–2) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

> This EIR identified ~~six~~three resource areas for which impacts from the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable (air quality, ~~biological resources,~~ cultural resources, ~~land use and planning,~~ ~~transportation and traffic,~~ and cumulative impacts) and 1~~4~~0 resource areas for which impacts would be less than significant with or without mitigation (Chapter 4, "Environmental Analysis" and Chapter 6, "Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Considerations").

2.2 Minor Corrections Related to Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

The revisions in this section consist of minor corrections to clarify that the proposed project would result in a significant cumulative air quality impact by resulting in emissions of criteria pollutants for which the proposed project region is in nonattainment. The revisions were made for consistency with the analysis for Impact AQ-3, which found that the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution of particles less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) and particles less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), even after mitigation.

In addition to clarifying that the proposed project would result in a significant cumulative air quality impact, the revisions made in Sections 2.2.4, 2.2.8, and 2.2.9 of this Errata document consist of revisions to clarify that the text under the "Determination" headings in Section 5.0 of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR

only compares the impacts of the alternatives against significant impacts resulting from the proposed project (air quality, cultural resources, and cumulative air quality impacts). Impacts to other resource areas, relative to the proposed project, are discussed under their respective headings in Section 5.0 and summarized in Table 5-1 of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR.

2.2.1 Proposed Project

The following revisions were made to Table ES-1, "Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures," on page ES-3 of the Final EIR (relevant cells of table shown):

Table ES-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Resource	Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Cumulative	~~***Less than Significant with Mitigation***~~[~~(a)~~] ***Significant***
Notes: ~~(a) Mitigation measures from other resource sections are used to mitigate impacts under this section.~~ (b) Mitigation measure TR-1 was deleted in the Final EIR.	

The following revisions were made to page ES-5 of Executive Summary of the Final EIR under the heading "Major Conclusions of the Final EIR":

> The Final EIR resulted in the following major conclusions:
>
> - **~~Two~~Three Significant Impacts.** ~~Two~~Three significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts have been identified. Construction of the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impact related to air emissions, as described in Section 4.3, "Air Quality," ~~and~~ a significant and unavoidable adverse impact on a historic resource as described in Section 4.5, "Cultural Resources," and a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact related to air emissions, as described in Section 6.0, "Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Considerations. (See Exhibit 1).

The following revisions were made to Table 5-1 on page 5-3 of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR (relevant cells of table shown):

Table 5-1 Summary of the Alternatives Analyses and Determinations

Resource Area	Proposed Project
Cumulative	~~S~~LTS~~S~~

LTS = Less than significant (including impacts that are Less Than Significant with Mitigation)
S = Significant

The following revisions were made to page 6-15 (lines 20–34) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

> Based on the analysis presented in Section 4.3, "Air Quality," construction emissions associated with the proposed project would have significant impacts on air quality in the SCAQMD, specifically for ROG, NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Maximum daily construction emissions would exceed the regional significance thresholds for ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ in the SCAQMD. Daily construction emissions would exceed Localized Significance Thresholds for NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Despite implementation of mitigation measures to control dust and reduce vehicle emissions, project emission levels would still

exceed the SCAQMD's localized and regional thresholds for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ and would result in a significant cumulatively considerable increase in these criteria pollutants for which Orange County is in nonattainment.

~~Construction of the proposed project would contribute to cumulative air impacts by contributing to violations of air quality standards, increasing criteria pollutants for which the region is currently in nonattainment, and exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Construction emissions resulting from the proposed project represent less than one percent of the total SCAQMD daily emissions inventory (South Coast Air Quality Management District 2013); therefore, the proposed project would not result in a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on air quality.~~

2.2.2 Alternative A – No Project

The following revisions were made to page 5-5 (lines 21–24) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

The No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior in comparison to the proposed project. Significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project on air quality~~, biological resources,~~ and cultural resources~~, land use and planning, transportation and traffic, and cumulative~~ would be avoided. Additionally, significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts would be avoided.

2.2.3 Alternative B1

The following revisions were made to page 5-8 (lines 32–36) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

Alternative B1 would result in fewer impacts on air quality ~~and land use~~ than the proposed project; however, this~~ese~~ impact~~s~~ would remain significant and cumulatively considerable under Alternative B1. Alternative B1 would reduce the proposed project's cultural resources~~, transportation and traffic, and cumulative~~ impact~~s~~ to less than significant.

2.2.4 Alternative B2

The following revisions were made to page 5-11 (lines 4–8) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

Alternative B2 would result in fewer impacts on air quality ~~and land use~~ than the proposed project; however, this~~ese~~ impact~~s~~ would remain significant and cumulatively considerable under Alternative B2. Alternative B2 would reduce the proposed project's cultural resources~~, transportation and traffic, and cumulative~~ impact~~s~~ to less than significant.

2.2.5 Alternative B3

The following revisions were made to page 5-13 (lines 20–24) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

Alternative B3 would result in fewer impacts on air quality ~~and land use~~ than the proposed project; however, this~~ese~~ impact~~s~~ would remain significant and cumulatively considerable under Alternative B3. Alternative B3 would reduce the proposed project's

cultural resources~~, transportation and traffic, and cumulative~~ impact~~s~~ to less than significant.

2.2.6 Alternative D

The following revisions were made to page 5-23 (lines 47–49) and page 5-24 (lines 1–2) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

Alternative D would result in less impacts on air quality than the proposed project; however, impacts on air quality would remain significant and cumulatively considerable under Alternative D. Alternative D would reduce the proposed project's cultural resources impact to less than significant. ~~have similar significant impacts on biological resources, cultural resources, and land use. Alternative D would reduce the proposed project's transportation and traffic and cumulative impacts to less than significant.~~

2.2.7 Alternative E

The following revisions were made to page 5-26 (lines 16–20) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

Alternative E would result in fewer impacts on air quality ~~and land use~~ than the proposed project; however, ~~these~~ impacts on air quality would remain significant and cumulatively considerable under Alternative E. Alternative E would reduce the proposed project's cultural resources~~, transportation and traffic, and cumulative~~ impact~~s~~ to less than significant.

2.2.8 Alternative F

The following revisions were made to page 5-28 (lines 41–46) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

Alternative F would result in impacts on air quality that are greater than the proposed project. ~~Impacts on biological resources and land use would be similar to the proposed project, and impacts on land use would be reduced under this alternative. However, impacts on land use would remain to be significant.~~ Alternative F would reduce the proposed project's cultural resources~~, transportation and traffic, and cumulative~~ impact~~s~~ to less than significant. Impacts on air quality would remain significant and cumulatively considerable under Alternative F.

2.2.9 Alternative G

The following revisions were made to page 5-31 (lines 11–14) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Determination

Alternative G would result in impacts on air quality~~, transportation and traffic, and cumulative impacts~~ and cultural resources that are greater than the proposed project. Impacts on air quality would remain significant and cumulatively considerable under Alternative G. ~~Impacts on biological resources, cultural resources, and land use and planning would be similar to the proposed project.~~

2.3 Minor Corrections Related to Cumulative Impacts

The revisions to the alternatives analysis for cumulative impacts include minor corrections to clarify that the proposed project would not result in significant cumulative impacts on transportation and traffic. Additionally, text has been added to the alternatives analysis for cumulative impacts to clarify that the proposed project and some of the alternatives would result in cumulative air quality impacts.

2.3.1 Alternative B1

The following revisions were made to page 5-8 (lines 17–22) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative B1 does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation. Therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano that are required under the proposed project would not occur, and the capacity of Camino Capistrano would not be reduced. Alternative B1 would avoid a cumulatively significant impact on the performance standard of Camino Capistrano.~~ Alternative B1 criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 62 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative B1 would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.2 Alternative B2

The following revisions were made to page 5-10 (lines 38–43) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative B2 does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation. Therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano that are required under the proposed project would not occur, and the capacity of Camino Capistrano would not be reduced. Alternative B2 would avoid a cumulatively significant impact on the performance standard of Camino Capistrano.~~ Alternative B2 criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 57 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative B2 would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.3 Alternative B3

The following revisions were made to page 5-13 (lines 6–11) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative B3 does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation. Therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano that are required under the proposed project would not occur, and the capacity of Camino Capistrano would not be reduced. Alternative B3 would avoid a cumulatively significant impact on the performance standard of Camino Capistrano.~~ Alternative B3 criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 28 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative B3 would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.4 Alternative B4

The following revisions were made to page 5-15 (lines 19–26) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative B4 includes the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation; therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano would occur similar to the proposed project. Additionally, as discussed above, Alternative B4 includes reconductoring of 138-kV transmission lines to the Laguna Niguel Substation, Trabuco Substation, and Pico Substation. This additional reconductoring would likely result in additional cumulative impacts to other street segments. Alternative B4 would increase the cumulatively significant impact on the performance standards of local roadways.~~ Alternative B4 criteria pollutant emissions would be greater than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative B4 would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.5 Alternative C1

The following revisions were made to page 5-17 (lines 20–24) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative C1 includes the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation; therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano would occur similar to the proposed project. Alternative C1 would have similar cumulative impacts on the performance standards of local roadways.~~ Alternative C1 criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 42 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative C1 would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.6 Alternative C2

The following revisions were made to page 5-19 (lines 36–39) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative C2 includes the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation; therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano would occur similar to the proposed project.~~ However, this impact is less than significant. Alternative C2 criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 43 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative C2 would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.7 Alternative D

The following revisions were made to page 5-23 (lines 2328) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative D does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation. Therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan~~

~~Capistrano that are required under the proposed project would not occur, and the capacity of Camino Capistrano would not be reduced. Alternative D would avoid a cumulatively significant impact on the performance standard of Camino Capistrano~~. Alternative D criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 61 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative D would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.8 Alternative E

The following revisions were made to page 5-26 (lines 2–7) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative E does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation. Therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano that are required under the proposed project would not occur, and the capacity of Camino Capistrano would not be reduced. Alternative E would avoid a cumulatively significant impact on the performance standard of Camino Capistrano.~~ Alternative E criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 33 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative E would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.9 Alternative F

The following revisions were made to page 5-28 (lines 25–30) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative F does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation. Therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano that are required under the proposed project would not occur, and the capacity of Camino Capistrano would not be reduced. Alternative F would avoid a cumulatively significant impact on the performance standard of Camino Capistrano.~~ Alternative F criteria pollutant emissions would be greater than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative F would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.10 Alternative G

The following revisions were made to page 5-30 (lines 46–49) and page 5-31 (lines 1–4) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative G includes the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation; therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano would occur similar to the proposed project. Additionally, as discussed above, Alternative G includes reconductoring of 138-kV transmission lines between San Mateo Substation and San Luis Rey Substation, which are approximately 20 miles apart. This additional reconductoring would likely result in additional cumulative impacts to other street segments. Alternative G would increase the cumulatively significant impact on the performance standards of local roadways.~~ Alternative G criteria pollutant emissions

would be greater than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions resulting from construction of Alternative F would result in a cumulatively considerable significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.

2.3.11 Alternative J

The following revisions were made to page 5-34 (lines 2–5) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Cumulative Impacts

~~Alternative J does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation; therefore, the associated partial closures of Camino Capistrano in the City of San Juan Capistrano would not occur and cumulative impacts would be avoided.~~ Alternative J criteria pollutant emissions would be approximately 88 percent less than criteria pollutant emissions for the proposed project. Alternative J would reduce emissions of ROG, NOX, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ to less than significant levels. Therefore, Alternative J would not result in a cumulatively considerable significant impact on air quality.

2.3.12 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The following revisions were made to page 5-34 (line 41) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

- ~~Alternative J would reduce significant cumulative impacts to less than significant.~~
- Alternative J would reduce significant cumulative impacts on air quality to less than significant.

2.3.13 Master Response C: Environmentally Superior Alternative

Minor revisions were made under the "Master Response C: Environmentally Superior Alternative" heading of Chapter 3 of the Final EIR to make the text internally consistent with the revisions in Sections 2.3.1, 2.3.7, 2.3.11, and 2.3.12 of this Errata document. The following revisions were made to page 3-22 of Chapter 3 of the Final EIR:

Draft EIR

As further discussed in Master Response A regarding significant impacts, the Draft EIR identified three resources that would have significant impacts, including air quality, transportation and traffic, and cumulative impacts. Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR identified Alternative A (No Project) as the Environmentally Superior Alternative as it would avoid all significant impacts of the proposed project. However, as stated in Section 5.3 of the Draft EIR, when the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA requires the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). Therefore, Alternatives B1 and D were found to be the Environmentally Superior Alternatives because:

- Both alternatives would substantially reduce the proposed project's air emissions.
- Both alternatives would reduce significant impacts on transportation and traffic to less than significant.
- Both alternatives would reduce significant cumulative impacts on transportation and traffic to less than significant.

Alternative B1 was identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative for air quality because it would reduce the proposed project's air emissions more than all other alternatives (62 percent). However, Alternative D would reduce the proposed project's air emissions by 61 percent. The difference of the percentage was negligible, and therefore, impacts on air quality were considered equivalent under both alternatives.

Alternative D would completely avoid the roads identified as having a significant impact under the proposed project without generating new traffic impacts. Alternative B1 may result in minor trip generation along Via Pamplona as well as a short-term partial closure of Via Pamplona; however, these impacts would be negligible and, therefore, impacts on transportation and traffic as well as cumulative impacts on traffic and transportation were considered equivalent under both alternatives.

The following revisions were made to page 3-24 of Chapter 3 of the Final EIR:

Final EIR

As further discussed in Master Response A regarding significant impacts, public comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR resulted in reducing significant impacts on biological resources, land use, transportation and traffic, and cumulative impacts to less than significant with mitigation. Chapter 5 was revised; however, Alternative J remains to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative (after Alternative A) as:

- Alternative J would substantially reduce air quality emissions when compared to the proposed project's air emissions.
- Alternative J would reduce significant impacts on historic resources to less than significant.
- Alternative J would reduce significant cumulative impacts on air quality to less than significant.

2.4 Minor Corrections Related to Transportation and Traffic Impacts

The revisions to the transportation and traffic analysis for the proposed project, including as referenced in the comparison of alternatives analysis, consist of minor revisions to reflect that the proposed project would not result in a significant and unavoidable traffic impact and that certain impacts would be less than significant even without mitigation.

2.4.1 Proposed Project

The following revisions were made to page 4.15-21 (lines 2–14) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR to clarify that project would not result in a degradation of the intersection level of service (LOS) at Vista Montana/ La Pata Avenue and Vista Montana/San Juan Hills High School Driveway. Text has also been added to clarify that a significant impact would occur, before mitigation, at the Vista Montana/San Juan Hills High School Driveway intersection as a result of prohibiting southbound traffic from making a left turn, which would result in significant out-of-direction travel.

As shown in Table 4.15-7, t~~T~~he proposed project would result in the following Vista Montana intersections operating at an unacceptable LOS:

- Vista Montana / Via Granada
- Vista Montana / La Pata Avenue

- ~~Vista Montana / San Juan Hills High School Driveway~~

Additionally, at the Vista Montana / San Juan Hills High School Driveway intersection, a significant amount of traffic intending to make a southbound left turn would be forced to travel out of direction due to the project prohibiting the southbound left turn movement. Although the out-of-direction travel at this intersection is not reflected in the delay and LOS at this intersection in Table 4.15-7, the proposed project would still result in a significant impact at this intersection due to the out-of-direction travel.

The following revision was made to page 6-36 (lines 33–43) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR to be consistent with the conclusion that transportation and traffic impacts associated with the proposed project can be mitigated to less than significant. Text was also added to clarify that the cumulative impact resulting from the proposed project is a cumulatively considerable impact on air quality.

Construction of the proposed project would result in significant impacts on air quality~~, transportation and traffic,~~ and a cumulatively considerable impact~~s~~ on air quality. As further discussed in Section 4.3, "Air Quality," impacts on air quality standards, cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants, and exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations would be significant and unavoidable during construction after the implementation of all feasible mitigation. The proposed project would result in maximum daily construction emissions of ROG, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ that would exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. Additionally, the proposed project would result in emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ during various substation and transmission line construction phases that are above the SCAQMD's local significance thresholds. The SCAQMD is currently in nonattainment for ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, the proposed project's ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would result in a cumulatively significant impact on ambient air quality during construction activities.

2.4.2 Alternative B4

The following revisions were made to page 5-15 (lines 14–17) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

This additional reconductoring would likely require additional temporary partial or full road closure or could have increased impacts to I-5 (see Figure 3-2). Alternative B4 would increase ~~significant~~ impacts on transportation and traffic when compared to the proposed project.

2.4.3 Alternative E

The following revisions were made to page 5-25 (lines 46-47) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

Alternative E does not include the expansion of the existing Capistrano Substation; therefore, the associated partial ~~or full~~ closure~~s~~ of Calle San Diego and trenching within Camino Capistrano would not occur.

2.5 Clerical Errors

The following revision to page ES-5 of the Final EIR is to correct a minor clerical error:

- **Environmentally Superior Alternative.** Among the alternatives considered in this EIR Alternative J – SCE 230-kV Loop In to Trabuco Substation ~~at Landfill~~ was found to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative compared to the proposed project and to the other alternatives.

2.6 Revisions to Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures in the Aesthetics (Section 4.01), Air Quality (Section 4.03), Noise and Vibration (Section 4.11), and Transportation and Traffic (Section 4.15) sections have been modified to clarify aspects of the mitigation measures that may have made them difficult to implement and enforce. These insignificant corrections do not alter the effectiveness of the measures or change the outcome of environmental analysis.

2.6.1 Mitigation Measure AES-1

The CPUC has revised Mitigation Measure (MM) AES-1 as follows to reflect the CPUC's exclusive authority over approval of the proposed project. The following revisions were made to page 4.1-40 (lines 17–24) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

> **MM AES-1: Architectural Review of San Juan Capistrano Substation.** To ensure that the aesthetic design of San Juan Capistrano Substation facilities such as walls, buildings, and landscaping are consistent with the City of San Juan Capistrano's aesthetic design criteria, the applicant shall submit a revised series of elevations and a landscape plan to the City's Architectural Review Board (ARB) prior to filing for grading and building permits. The ARB shall have the opportunity to provide input to the CPUC on whether ~~determine if~~ the applicant's revised plans are consistent with the City's aesthetic design criteria and if any modifications are ~~needed~~ appropriate. The CPUC will take into account the ARB's input in reviewing and approving the aesthetic design and landscaping for the San Juan Capistrano Substation. The applicant shall not initiate ground disturbing activities until the ~~ARB~~ CPUC approves the aesthetic design and landscaping plan for the proposed San Juan Capistrano Substation.

The proposed project, Alternative C1, Alternative C2, and Alternative G would result in significant impacts due to their aesthetic inconsistency with the visual character and quality of the Camino Capistrano site (Key Observation Point [KOP] 1) and its surroundings. The revision to MM AES-1 is procedural only, in that it does not allow the City of San Juan Capistrano's Architectural Review Board to have authority to approve the San Juan Capistrano Substation's aesthetic design. The revisions to MM AES-1 still require input from the City but ultimately give the CPUC authority to determine whether to approve or deny the aesthetic design and landscaping for the San Juan Capistrano Substation, consistent with the CPUC's authority to monitor implementation of mitigation. MM AES-1, as revised, would therefore be equally effective at minimizing impacts on aesthetics along Camino Capistrano. Impacts would remain less than significant with revisions to MM AES-1.

2.6.2 Mitigation Measure AQ-1

The CPUC has revised MM AQ-1 as follows to allow for annual purchase of Regional Clean Air Incentive Market Trading Credits (RTCs) rather than one purchase of all credits prior to construction. The following revisions were made to page 4.3-20 (lines 39–45) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

> **MM AQ-1: Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_X) Credits.** The emissions of NO_X due to construction of the proposed project will be mitigated through the purchase of Regional Clean Air Incentive Market Trading Credits (RTCs) for every pound of NO_x emissions in excess of the SCAQMD regional significance threshold of 100 pounds per day. The total amount of NO_X RTCs to be purchased will be calculated when the construction schedule is finalized. The applicant will purchase and submit the required RTCs to the SCAQMD at least 60 days prior to the start of each construction year for the upcoming year of ~~project~~ construction. The applicant will also track actual daily emissions during

construction according to a monitoring plan that includes records of equipment and vehicle usage.

The proposed project, Alternative B1, Alternative B2, Alternative B3, Alternative B4, Alternative C1, Alternative C2, Alternative D, Alternative E, Alternative F, and Alternative G would result in significant impacts due to daily emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_X). The revisions to MM AQ-1 merely change the timing for purchase of NO_X RTCs considered in MM AQ-1. The revisions do not change the substantive requirements in MM AQ-1 that require purchase of RTCs and describe how the amount of RTCs would be determined. MM AQ-1, as revised, would therefore be equally effective at minimizing impacts from NO_X emissions. Impacts would remain less than significant with revisions to MM AQ-1.

2.6.3 Mitigation Measure NV-4

The CPUC made editorial revisions to MM NV-4 to provide clarity. The following revisions were made to page 4.11-27 (lines 40–44) and page 4.11-28 (lines 1–14) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

> **MM NV-4. Corona Noise Reduction during Wet Weather Conditions.** The applicant will ensure that the incremental increase in ambient noise levels from the proposed 230-kV transmission line corona noise levels will not exceed ~~45 dBA~~ FTA Cumulative Noise Levels Allowed by Criteria (Figure 4.11-1) at the closest sensitive receptor during nighttime operations (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.), ~~in compliance with the City of San Juan Capistrano, City of San Clemente, and County of Orange exterior noise standards. This will be achieved by the use of additional insulation equipment and additional technological solutions to reduce corona noise levels during rainy weather conditions.~~ To verify ~~the efficiency of the corona noise reduction equipment~~ compliance with this measure, the applicant will measure ambient noise levels before the proposed project's 230-kV line operations and the operational noise levels at sensitive residential receptors located within 45 feet from the proposed 230-kV line segments. Operational noise levels will be measured during three rain events during the first two rainy seasons when the 230-kV line is operating. ~~Monitoring~~ Rreports shall provide noise measurements in Ldn and indicate the existing ambient noise levels and weather conditions during measurements~~. The applicant shall conduct noise level measurements in compliance with the City of San Juan Capistrano and City of San Clemente requirements, as applicable.~~ The applicant will submit measurement results ~~of the monitoring~~ to the CPUC annually. If the ~~monitoring~~ reports determine that the corona noise levels exceed ~~45 dBA~~FTA Cumulative Noise Levels Allowed by Criteria at sensitive residential receptors located within 45 feet, the applicant will implement the use of additional insulation equipment and additional technological solutions ~~and installation equipment~~ and will repeat the measuring of operational noise levels at sensitive residential receptors located within ~~2~~45 feet of the proposed 230-kV line segments during three rain events during the subsequent two rainy seasons, until the ~~45 dBA~~FTA Cumulative Noise Levels Allowed by Criteria threshold is no longer exceeded during rain events.

The proposed project would result in significant impacts due to corona noise that exceeds nighttime ambient noise levels in the project area during wet weather conditions. The revisions to MM NV-4 are editorial in nature and do not change the substantive requirements to ensure that nighttime noise during wet weather events stays below the applicable threshold. MM NV-4, as revised, would therefore be equally effective at minimizing permanent night time ambient noise effects during wet weather. Impacts would remain less than significant with revisions to MM NV-4.

2.6.4 Mitigation Measure TR-5

The CPUC has revised MM TR-5 to reflect the specific time when significant traffic impacts may occur. The following revisions were made to page 4.15-29 (lines 29–41) of Exhibit 1 of the Final EIR:

> **MM TR-5: Content Requirements of the Traffic Control Plan.** The applicant shall include and implement the following restrictions within their Traffic Control Plan (APM TR-7):
>
> - Lane closures along Vista Montana shall only be implemented to avoid the start and ending time for the San Juan Hills High School. Lane closures along Vista Montana shall not be allowed during the periods of 6:30 to 8:00 AM and 2:00 to 3:30 PM on days when San Juan Hills High School is ~~not~~ in session.
> - Construction-generated traffic associated with the project shall avoid the start and ending time for San Juan Hills High School. Workers shall avoid traveling along Vista Montana during the periods of 6:30 to 8:00 AM and 2:00 to 3:30 PM on days that San Juan Hills High School is in session. These times shall be modified as necessary over the duration of the project in response to changing school arrival/dismissal times.
>
> Additionally, a final traffic control plan shall be provided to the CPUC for approval prior to the start of construction.

The proposed project and Alternative C1 would result in significant impacts due to road closures on Vista Montana on days that San Juan Hills High School is in session due to school-related traffic that occurs at the beginning and the end of the school day. The revision to MM TR-5 reflects a restriction on traffic and closures during the beginning and end of the school day. MM TR-5, as revised, would therefore be equally effective at minimizing impacts on traffic on Vista Montana. Impacts would remain less than significant with revisions to MM TR-5.

2.6.5 Revisions to Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program

The following changes were made to Table 4-1 (pages 4-8 through 4-53) of the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program in Chapter 4 of the Final EIR to reflect the revisions made to the mitigation measures in Section 2.5.1-2.5.4 of this Errata document (relevant cells of table shown):

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program

Impact	Applicant Proposed Measure (APM) or Mitigation Measure (MM)	Monitoring Requirements
4.1 Aesthetics		
Impact AE-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	**MM AES-1: Architectural Review of San Juan Capistrano Substation.** To ensure that the aesthetic design of San Juan Capistrano Substation facilities, such as walls, buildings, and landscaping, are consistent with the City of San Juan Capistrano's aesthetic design criteria, the applicant shall submit a revised series of elevations and a landscape plan to the City's Architectural Review Board (ARB) prior to filing for grading and building permits. The ARB shall have the opportunity to provide input to the CPUC on whether ~~determine if~~ the applicant's revised plans are consistent with the City's aesthetic design criteria	Ensure that the City of San Juan Capistrano's Architectural Review Board has the opportunity to provide input to the CPUC on whether the applicant's revised plans for ~~approves the design of~~ the San Juan Capistrano Substation are consistent with the City's aesthetic design criteria and if any modifications are appropriate.

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program

Impact	Applicant Proposed Measure (APM) or Mitigation Measure (MM)	Monitoring Requirements
	and if any modifications are ~~needed~~ appropriate. The CPUC will take into account the ARB's input in reviewing and approving the aesthetic design and landscaping for the San Juan Capistrano Substation. The applicant shall not initiate ground-disturbing activities until the ~~ARB~~ CPUC approves the aesthetic design and landscaping plan for the San Juan Capistrano Substation.	
4.3 Air Quality		
Impact AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	**MM AQ-1: Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_X) Credits.** The emissions of NO_X due to construction of the proposed project will be mitigated through the purchase of Regional Clean Air Incentive Market Trading Credits (RTCs) for every pound of NO_X emissions in excess of the SCAQMD regional significance threshold of 100 pounds per day. The total amount of NO_X RTCs to be purchased will be calculated when the construction schedule is finalized. The applicant will purchase and submit the required RTCs to the SCAQMD at least 60 days prior to the start of each construction year for the upcoming year of ~~project~~ construction. The applicant will also track actual daily emissions during construction according to a monitoring plan that includes records of equipment and vehicle usage.	Ensure that the applicant purchases a sufficient number of RTCs.
4.11 Noise and Vibration		
Impact NV-3: Permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.	**MM NV-4: Corona Noise Reduction during Wet Weather Conditions.** The applicant will ensure that the incremental increase in ambient noise levels from the proposed 230-kV transmission line corona noise levels will not exceed FTA Cumulative Noise Levels Allowed by Criteria (Figure 4.11-1) at the closest sensitive receptor during nighttime operations (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). ~~This will be achieved by the use of additional insulation equipment and additional technological solutions to reduce corona noise levels during rainy weather conditions~~. To verify ~~the efficiency of the corona noise reduction equipment~~ compliance with this measure, the applicant will measure ambient noise levels before the proposed project's 230-kV line operations and the operational noise levels at sensitive residential receptors located within 45 feet of the 230-kV line segments. Operational noise levels will be measured during three rain events during the first two rainy seasons when the 230-kV line is operating. ~~Monitoring R~~reports shall provide noise measurements in Ldn and indicate the existing ambient noise levels and weather conditions during measurements. ~~The applicant shall conduct noise level measurements in compliance with the City of San Juan Capistrano and City of San Clemente requirements, as applicable~~. The applicant will	Ensure that the applicant monitors and addresses corona noise as necessary

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program

Impact	Applicant Proposed Measure (APM) or Mitigation Measure (MM)	Monitoring Requirements
	submit measurement results ~~of the monitoring~~ to the CPUC annually. If the ~~monitoring~~ reports determine that the corona noise levels exceed FTA Cumulative Noise Levels Allowed by Criteria at sensitive residential receptors located within 45 feet, the applicant will implement the use of additional insulation equipment and additional technological solutions ~~and installation equipment~~ and will repeat the measuring of operational noise levels at sensitive residential receptors located within ~~250~~45 feet of the 230-kV line segments during three rain events during the subsequent two rainy seasons~~,~~ until the FTA Cumulative Noise Levels Allowed by Criteria threshold is no longer exceeded during rain events.	
4.15 Transportation and Traffic		
Impact TT-1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.	**MM TR-5: Content Requirements of the Traffic Control Plan.** The applicant shall include and implement the following restrictions within their Traffic Control Plan (APM TR-7): • Lane closures along Vista Montana shall only be implemented to avoid the start and ending time for the San Juan Hills High School. Lane closures along Vista Montana shall not be allowed during the periods of 6:30 to 8:00 AM and 2:00 to 3:30 PM on days when San Juan Hills High School is not in session. • Construction-generated traffic associated with the project shall avoid the start and ending time for San Juan Hills High School. Workers shall avoid traveling along Vista Montana during the periods of 6:30 to 8:00 AM and 2:00 to 3:30 PM on days that San Juan Hills High School is in session. These times shall be modified as necessary over the duration of the project in response to changing school arrival/dismissal times. Additionally, a final traffic control plan shall be provided to the CPUC for approval prior to the start of construction.	Ensure that the applicant prepares and implements traffic control plans.