

Questions and Answers

- 1. You have concluded that further environmental analysis is not required for Sunrise Powerlink. What is your rationale for that determination?**

Answer: The rationale for concluding that additional analysis is not required is based on my determination that although there have been changes in the final Sunrise Powerlink alignment on the CNF, these changes have been made in response to mitigation identified in the Final EIREIS, and are reasonably close to the approved project alignment. The net effect of these changes is to reduce the overall impact of the project when compared to effects disclosed in the FEIR/EIS.

- 2. You indicate that mitigation measures have been incorporated into the ROD. What are some of these project mitigations and how have they reduced Sunrise Powerlink environmental impacts?**

Answer: The Forest has been able to mitigate ground disturbances throughout the project area. We have been successful in reducing miles of new road from 10 miles to 2.1 miles by requiring helicopter landing pads, reducing size of project work acres from 106 acres to 46 acres, re-locating infrastructure to less sensitive areas resulting in 80 acres of less habitat disturbance, and avoiding cultural resources.

- 3. How are you mitigating the risk of wildfire associated with Sunrise Powerlink construction, maintenance and operations?**

Answer: The Forest recognizes there is a risk of wildfire from any electrical transmission line on NFS lands. We have taken a comprehensive approach to mitigating Sunrise Powerlink wildfire risks. For example, we are incorporating strict control measures associated with construction activities, SDG&E will be required to create and maintain “defensible space” around communities at risk, will provide funding of fire facilities to improve emergency response times, and increase coordination between local emergency services and agencies.

- 4. Why are you amending the Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan and what areas of the Plan are you amending?**

Answer: The CNF LMP is being amended in order to support the purpose and need of the Sunrise Powerlink project to promote renewable energy, improve system reliability, and reduce transmission congestion and energy supply costs.;

Answer: I have determined that the Record of Decision will require the following amendments to the CNF LMP, hence my decision amends the CNF LMP to provide for the following exceptions only for Sunrise Powerlink:

Sunrise Powerlink Record of Decision

- a. Amending the plan to permit an exception to standards for scenic integrity along the Sunrise Powerlink Project alignment in the Morena, Sweetwater, and Pine Creek places
- b. Amending the plan to permit an exception to Riparian Conditions and Biological Resource Condition goals for project activities in Riparian Conservation Areas.
- c. Amending the plan to permit construction of a transmission line tower in a Back Country Non-motorized (BCNM) land use zone.

5. Why are these Sunrise Powerlink LMP amendments not considered significant amendments?

Answer: These project-specific exceptions to the LMP are not significant amendments to the plan. Consistent with Forest Service Policy (FSM 1926.51), these amendments do not significantly alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management or change the plan standards as they apply to other actions. There are no adjustments to management areas or land use zones, and approval of the Sunrise Powerlink will not preclude other actions.

6. How have you incorporated public comments into your Record of Decision for Sunrise Powerlink?

Answer: I have reviewed over 650 public comments associated with the recent 45-day public comment period for Sunrise Powerlink. I am profoundly touched by the citizens who have expressed their concerns, issues and opportunities involving the CNF. I want the citizens of San Diego to know that I did not take this decision lightly.

7. Why didn't you collocate the Sunrise Powerlink with the Southwest Powerlink?

Answer: The BLM and CPUC eliminated that alternative from detailed consideration early in the process because it did not meet the project reliability objectives. The rationale for the alternatives eliminated from detailed study is in the Final EIR/EIS Alternatives Screening Report.