PREFACE

INTRODUCTION

SDG&E Application

On April 7, 2014, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E; the Applicant) submitted Application 14-04-011 seeking a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for its proposed Sycamore-Peñasquitos 230-Kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line Project (Proposed Project). SDG&E seeks to construct, operate, and maintain a new 16.7-mile-long 230-kV transmission line between the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation and the existing Peñasquitos Substation between the City of San Diego and the City of Poway in San Diego County (County), California.

Purpose of the Environmental Impact Report

The CPUC is the lead agency responsible for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is an informational document; it does not make a recommendation regarding the approval or denial of the Proposed Project. The purpose of the Final EIR is to inform the public about the environmental setting and impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives to the Proposed Project. This Final EIR will be used by the CPUC to conduct the proceeding to determine whether to grant SDG&E's requested CPCN.

This Final EIR will be used by other agencies to support their decision on whether to issue permits for the project.

Contents of the Final EIR

This Final EIR contains the following information consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132:

a. The Draft EIR or a revision of the draft;
b. Comments received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary;
c. A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies that commented on the Draft EIR;
d. The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process; and
e. Any other information added by the lead agency.

This Final EIR is organized as follows:

- **Volume 1: Comments and Responses to Comments.**
  - **Section 1, Introduction.** Provides an overview of the purpose as well as the organization of the Final EIR, and provides a brief description of the Proposed Project.
  - **Section 2, Public Review Process.** Describes the public review process, the organization of the comment letters and lists the commenters (agencies, organizations, individuals, and SDG&E).
  - **Section 3, Comments and Responses.** Contains copies of all the comment letters received on the Draft EIR. General responses to recurrent comments are provided first, and responses to individual comments are provided thereafter. Individual comments are identified within the comment letter or transcript using an alphanumeric code. Following each comment letter are individual responses directed specifically to each comment.
  - **Attachment 1, Draft EIR Public Review Materials.** Contains the Notice of Availability, newspaper advertisements, flier advertising the public information workshop, Draft EIR public informational workshop sign-in sheet, and Draft EIR informational workshop presentation and posters.
  - **Attachment 2, Agency Correspondences.** Contains records of agency correspondence in preparation of the Final EIR
  - **Attachment 3, EMF Data for Project Alternatives.** Contains modeled EMF levels for Alternatives 3, 4, and 5.
  - **Attachment 4, Park Village Road Measurements.** Contains methodology and field notes from distance measurements along Park Village Road.
  - **Attachment 5, Summary and Detailed Tables of Vegetation Community Impacts.** Contains a comparison of the data used in the Draft EIR and the refinements provided by SDG&E.
- **Volumes 2 and 3: Modified Draft EIR.** Contain the Draft EIR, as modified in response to comments.

SUMMARY OF FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Summary of Draft EIR Notice and Review

The CPUC released the Draft EIR for a 45-day public review period starting on September 17, 2015 and ending on November 2, 2015. The comment period was extended until November 16, 2015 upon request from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group, SDG&E, and Timothy Young. The CPUC mailed over 17,000 notices to agencies, organizations, and individuals regarding availability of the Draft EIR for public review. The CPUC also conducted three public workshops in the City of San Diego to provide information on the Draft EIR and accept written comments. These three public workshops were held on September 28 and 29, 2015.

List of Commenters

The CPUC received 135 comment letters including comments from eight federal and state agencies, two tribal governments, seven community groups and organizations, 169 individuals (including multiple signatories to individual comment letters) and the Applicant. The CPUC has considered all comments and provides responses in the Final EIR document to all written comments. Table P-1 lists the agencies, organizations, and individuals that submitted comments on the Draft EIR.

Table P-1 Commenters on the Draft EIR

Comment Letter Designation	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Numbers
Public Agencies and Tribal Governments			
Federal			
A1	11/12/15	J. H. Lias, United States Marine Corps, Marine Corps Air Station	A1-1 and A1-2
A2	11/18/15	Karen A. Goebel, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	A2-1 through A2-9
State			
A2	11/18/15	Gail K. Sevrens, California Department of Fish and Wildlife	A2-1 through A2-9
A3	10/27/15	Jacob Armstrong, California Department of Transportation	A3-1 through A3-3
A4	10/30/15	Joseph Street, California Coastal Commission	A4-1 through A4-6
Tribal Governments			
A5	09/22/15	Shasta C. Gaughen, Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office	A5-1
A6	10/29/15	Joseph Ontiveros, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians	A6-1 and A6-2
Local			
A7	09/28/15	Eric Rubalcava, City of San Diego Public Utilities Department	A7-1 through A7-4
A8	10/07/15	Mike Faramarzi, City of San Diego Public Utilities Department	A8-1
A9	11/02/15	Myra Herrmann, City of San Diego	A9-1 through A9-39
Community Groups, Private Companies, and Private Organizations			
B1	09/28/15	Sandra Wetzel-Smith, Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group	B1-1 and B1-2
B2	09/28/15	Wallace Wulfeck, Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group	B2-1 through B2-3
B3	10/24/15	Frank Landis, California Native Plant Society San Diego	B3-1 through B3-3

Comment Letter Designation	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Numbers
B4	11/02/15	Delphine Hou, California Independent System Operator Corporation	B4-1
B5	11/02/15	Gary Stanford, San Diego Unified School District	B5-1 through B5-4
B6	11/02/15	Joyce Kinnear, City of Santa Clara Electric Department, Silicon Valley Power	B6-1 and B6-2
B7	11/11/15	Wallace H. Wulfeck, Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group	B7-1 through B7-26
Individuals			
C1	09/18/15	Paul Crandell	C1-1
C2	09/18/15	Art Lewis	C2-1
C3	09/19/15	Scott Ellis	C3-1 through C3-3
C4	09/19/15	Jessica Jensen	C4-1
C5	09/21/15	Hadi Parandeh	C5-1
C6	09/22/15	Andrew Sefkow	C6-1 through C6-4
C7	09/22/15	Jeff Turk	C7-1
C8	09/27/15	Med Dyer	C8-1
C9	09/28/15	Anonymous	C9-1
C10	09/28/15	Ming Hu	C10-1 through C10-3
C11	09/29/15	Jan Kane	C11-1
C12	09/29/15	Marsha Ruether	C12-1 through C12-5
C13	09/30/15	Katharine Farrow	C13-1 through C13-6
C14	09/30/15	Anna Flournoy	C14-1 through C14-3
C15	09/30/15	Daniel and Tracy Jackson	C15-1 through C15-3
C16	09/30/15	Grazyna Krajewska	C16-1 through C16-3
C17	09/30/15	Donna Nasielski	C17-1 through C17-6
C18	09/30/15	Julie North	C18-1 through C18-4
C19	10/03/15	Amjat Rajput	C19-1
C20	10/04/15	Paritosh Khanna	C20-1
C21	10/04/15	Divya Krishnamoorthy	C21-1
C22	10/05/15	Susan Baghbeh	C22-1
C23	10/06/15	Todd and Heather Saier	C23-1
C24	10/07/15	Antonia Mahoney	C24-1 and C24-2

Comment Letter Designation	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Numbers
C25	10/07/15	Joseph and Allison Nebel	C25-1 through C25-3
C26	10/07/15	Hadi Parandeh	C26-1 through C26-5
C27	10/07/15	Net Shopper	C27-1 through C27-7
C28	10/07/15	Yibin Zhang	C28-1 through C28-3
C29	10/08/15	Katherine Cresto	C29-1
C30	10/08/15	Wei Yi	C30-1 through C30-4
C31	10/09/15	Anne Branson	C31-1 through C31-5
C32	10/11/15	Henry Chong	C32-1 through C32-6
C33	10/11/15	Yi Louie Lu	C33-1
C34	10/12/15	Tracy Nguyen	C34-1
C35	10/13/15	Hamed Abrishami	C35-1 through C35-3
C36	10/13/15	Fatemeh Kashfi	C36-1 through C36-4
C37	10/14/15	Grazyna Krajewska	C37-1
C38	10/14/15	Jim Wilk	C38-1
C39	10/14/15	Linda Willms	C39-1 through C39-6
C40	10/14/15	Suzy Winston	C40-1
C41	10/14/15	Zilin Ying	C41-1 through C41-4
C42	10/17/15	Kevin Yang	C42-1
C43	10/18/15	Josie Bravo	C43-1
C44	10/18/15	Guowei Wu	C44-1 and C44-2
C45	10/19/15	Emily Feng	C45-1 through C45-6
C46	10/19/15	Miranda Feng	C46-1 through C46-6
C47	10/20/15	Patrick Berry	C47-1 and C47-2
C48	10/20/15	Lauraine Dwyer	C48-1 through C48-3
C49	10/21/15 and 10/23/15	Josie Bravo	C49-1 through C49-4
C50	10/21/15	Theresa McCarty	C50-1 through C50-5
C51	10/24/15	David and Susan Skaar	C51-1 through C51-7
C52	10/27/15	Helen Dominguez	C52-1 through C51-3
C53	10/28/15	Scott Gellerman	C53-1 and C53-2
C54	10/30/15	Neil Berkley	C54-1 through C54-3
C55	10/30/15	Sean Clayton	C55-1 and C55-2

Comment Letter Designation	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Numbers
C56	10/30/15	Allen Jackel	C56-1 and C56-2
C57	10/30/15	Sherry Ledakis	C57-1 and C57-2
C58	10/30/15	Wuxiang Liao	C58-1 and C58-2
C59	10/30/15	Irina Masarky	C59-1
C60	10/30/15	Irina Masarky	C60-1 and C60-2
C61	10/30/15	Jeff, Joanne, Leah and Madison Tibali	C61-1 and C61-2
C62	10/30/15	Wei Zhang and Yun Liao	C62-1 and C62-2
C63	10/30/15	Wenyue (Lydia) Zhang	C63-1 and C63-2
C64	10/31/15	De Diep	C64-1 and C64-2
C65	10/31/15	Julie Diep	C65-1 and C65-2
C66	10/31/15	Jessica Hunt	C66-1 and C66-2
C67	10/31/15	Jay Libman	C67-1 and C67-2
C68	10/31/15	Marc and Tammy Rubenzik	C68-1 and C68-2
C69	10/31/15	Sukumar and Saritha Sakamuri	C69-1 and C69-2
C70	10/31/15	Han Suh	C70-1 and C70-2
C71	10/31/15	Stephen Thunder	C71-1 and C71-2
C72	11/01/15	Rachel Bittker	C72-1 and C72-2
C73	11/01/15	Wei Wang, Amy Berkley, Gabrielle G. Doss, Steve Harden, Minh Le, Edward J. Lowndes, Steven D. Hawley, Carolyn Hawley, Pablo Bravo, Josie Bravo, Mike Mitrani, Jian-Sen Li, April Fink, Mathew Fink, Mark Selecky, Andrew Sefkow, Paul Russel, Deborah T. Rana, Ladan Eblagh, Troy Morrison, Jeanine Neeley, Scott Neeley, Jeff Little, Philip Harrison, Jeremy Cohn, Craig Cohen, Chris Breault, William Crabb, Swarna Navubothu, Sharon Thunder, Charles J. Ingber, Vandana Prasad, Paola Tempesti, Barbara Imamoto, Manisha Kanodia	C73-1 and C73-2
C74	11/01/15	Josie Bravo	C74-1 through C74-3
C75	11/01/15	Jeffrey Brown	C75-1 and C75-2
C76	11/01/15	Jack Cooper	C76-1 through C76-3
C77	11/01/15	Patricia Elliot and Mark Paine	C77-1 through C71-3
C78	11/01/15	Brad Hatch	C78-1
C79	11/01/15	Patricia Hatch	C79-1 and C79-2
C80	11/01/15	Dan Huang	C80-1

Comment Letter Designation	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Numbers
C81	11/01/15	Tracy and Daniel Jackson	C81-1 and C81-2
C82	11/01/15	Jieun Kim	C82-1 and C82-2
C83	11/01/15	Jose Langenauer	C83-1 and C83-2
C84	11/01/15	Ray and Kathy Liu	C84-1 and C84-2
C85	11/01/15	Christina Mannion	C85-1 through C85-3
C86	11/01/15	Laura Moran	C86-1
C87	11/01/15	Ansha Purwar	C87-1 and C87-2
C88	11/01/15	Chris Rosin	C88-1 and C88-2
C89	11/01/15	Sharon Schwab	C89-1 and C89-2
C90	11/01/15	Sivakumar Vadivelu and Porkodi Ramasamy	C90-1 and C90-2
C91	11/01/15	Sumarlin William	C91-1 and C91-2
C92	11/01/15	Bo Xia	C92-1 and C92-2
C93	11/01/15	Zhou Xiaohong	C93-1 and C93-2
C94	11/01/15	Matt and Ayesha Zierhut	C94-1 and C94-2
C95	11/02/15	Thaddeus Braun	C95-1 through C95-5
C96	11/02/15	Toni Church	C96-1 and C96-2
C97	11/02/15	Jim Donnelly	C97-1
C98	11/02/15	Kate Glenn	C98-1 through C98-3
C99	11/02/15	Sandy Jackel	C99-1 and C99-2
C100	11/02/15	Daehyon Kim	C100-1 through C100-4
C101	11/02/15	Pamela Koop	C101-1 through C101-5
C102	11/02/15	Gayanah Krasnyanskiy	C102-1 and C102-2
C103	11/02/15	Levi Kuknariev	C103-1 and C103-2
C104	11/02/15	Donna Likes	C104-1 and C104-2
C105	11/02/15	Brian Miller	C105-1 through C105-9
C106	11/02/15	M. K. Nasab	C106-1 through C106-3
C107	11/02/15	Guy Oshiro	C107-1 through C107-4
C108	11/02/15	Sandi Oshiro	C108-1 through C108-4
C109	11/02/15	Sunju Park	C109-1 through C109-3
C110	11/02/15	Harvey Payne	C110-1 through C110-8
C111	11/02/15	Phoebe Senowitz	C111-1
C112	11/02/15	Jamie VanderWal	C112-1 and C112-2

Comment Letter Designation	Date of Letter	Commenter	Response Numbers
C113	11/08/15	Raymond and Mali Koosha	C113-1
C114	11/10/15	Lianle Shao and Yurong Guo	C114-1 and C114-2
C115	11/10/15	Aimee Farr	C115-1 and C115-2
C116	11/13/15	Christopher and Caroline Davis	C116-1 and C116-2
C117	11/16/15	Thomas and Lisa Young	C117-1 and C117-2
C118	11/17/15	Dennis Corcoran	C118-1
Applicant			
D1	11/16/15	David L. Geier, San Diego Gas and Electric Company	D1-1 through D1-8
D2	11/16/15	David L. Geier, San Diego Gas and Electric Company	D2-1 through D2-76
D3	11/16/15	David L. Geier, San Diego Gas and Electric Company	D3-1 through D3-258

Summary of Comments and Responses

Agency and organization comments included topics such as technical clarifications and corrections, concerns regarding underground utilities, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) notification, impacts on biological resources, impacts on traffic, cumulative impacts, and preference for the environmentally superior alternative. Individual comments included concerns about health and safety, impacts on property values, impacts on traffic and emergency access, support for the environmentally superior alternative, rejection of the Proposed Project and Alternative 3, and suggested variations on Alternative 4. Applicant comments included technical clarifications and corrections, and provision of supplemental data on minor project and alternative refinements.

The Final EIR includes a response to each comment received from agencies, organizations, individuals, and the Applicant. General responses were prepared to address comments that were made by multiple commenters.

Summary of Changes to the Draft EIR

The Draft EIR was revised in response to comments. Revisions included:

- Minor modifications to the Proposed Project and alternatives to reflect comments from the Applicant
- Modification of the No Project Alternative to reflect comments from the Applicant
- Minor revisions to visual simulations to improve technical accuracy
- Editorial changes
- Minor changes to mitigation measures
- Technical clarifications and corrections

- Re-evaluation of the alternative ranking to more accurately reflect the impacts from Alternative 3 (Alternative 3 is ranked comparable to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR)

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a) requires recirculation of an EIR "when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notices is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review". The minor modifications and clarifications presented in this Final EIR do not contain new significant information as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The Draft EIR identified Alternative 5: Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North Combination Underground/Overhead, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2). Alternative 5 would avoid construction within all segments of the Proposed Project as it would follow a different alignment that would minimize significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics, noise, recreation, and traffic. Significant and unavoidable impacts on visual quality would be limited to one cable pole, and Alternative 5 would avoid all other significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts of the Proposed Project. Alternative 5 would substantially reduce significant and unavoidable noise impacts by reducing the potential for corona noise generation along Proposed Project transmission line Segments A, C, and D. The alternative would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts on recreational value by eliminating new structures in open space recreational areas, including Black Mountain Open Space Park and Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve. Alternative 5 would eliminate impacts on parking capacity by avoiding construction within Black Mountain Ranch Community Park. Alternative 5 would also further reduce impacts that are less than significant with mitigation in the following resource areas by eliminating 11.5 miles of new overhead transmission line:

- **Biological Resources.** Avoids impacts on special-status plants and reduces impacts on special-status wildlife and habitats by reducing construction within open spaces and vernal pools
- **Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources.** Reduces potential for erosion and landslides by installing fewer structures and constructing the majority of the alignment within existing roadways
- **Hydrology and Water Quality.** Reduces the amount of impervious surface area created from pole installation, reduces the amount of water necessary during construction and operation, and reduces the potential for sedimentation in Los Peñasquitos Creek and its tributaries
- **Fire and Fuels Management.** Reduces risk of igniting a wildfire by substantially decreasing the amount of overhead transmission line constructed in areas with flammable vegetation

As identified in the Draft EIR, Alternative 5 would result in greater temporary significant and unavoidable air quality impacts than the Proposed Project, from NO_x emissions generated during construction. Alternative 5 remains the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it would eliminate the majority of significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from

implementation of the Proposed Project and substantially reduce significant impacts that are less than significant after mitigation as compared to the Proposed Project.

CPUC Process after Final EIR

CEQA requires that the CPUC provide written responses to public agency comments at least 10 days prior to certifying the EIR (Public Resource Code 21092.5(a)). The CPUC has accomplished this by sending the Final EIR to all agencies that commented on the Draft EIR at least 10 days prior to EIR certification.

The CPUC will determine the adequacy of the Final EIR, and if adequate, will certify the document as compliant with CEQA. The CPUC will issue a Proposed Decision on the Sycamore—Peñasquitos 230-kV Transmission Line Project, which will be announced and published concurrent with a scheduled CPUC Commission Meeting. Each Commissioner may draft an Alternate Decision presenting differing conclusions or opinions. All five Commissioners will then vote on the Proposed Decision and any Alternate Decision at a meeting of the full Commission. If the Proposed Project or an alternative is approved, the CPUC will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to require monitoring of adopted mitigation measures and definition of mitigation monitoring procedures.