

SUPPLEMENTAL EVALUATION 5
CONVERTING TEMPORARY
ACCESS ROADS 12B AND 62
TO PERMANENT ROADS IN
SEGMENT 2

ON SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON'S
APPLICATION FOR

Antelope Transmission Project, Segments 2 & 3

Application No. A.04-12-008

SCH No. 2006041160

Prepared By:



August 2009

Table of Contents

A.	Introduction and Background.....	1
B.	Modifications to the Project	1
C.	Evaluation of Modification	2
C.1	Issue Areas Where Modifications Result in a Potential Change	2
C.2	Issue Areas Where Modifications Result in No Change	3
D.	Other CEQA Considerations	3
D.1	Significant Unavoidable Impacts	3
D.2	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources.....	4
D.3	Growth Inducing Effects.....	4
D.4	Cumulative Impact Analysis	4
D.5	Effects Found Not to be Significant.....	4
E.	References	4

Figures – Located at the end of this document

B.1-1	Segment 2, Antelope-Vincent Access Roads (Const. 19)
B.1-2	KOP Locations Segment 2 (Const. 19)
B.1-3	KOP Locations Segment 2 (Const. 83)

A. Introduction and Background

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Antelope Transmission Project, Segments 2 & 3 (Project) (Aspen Environmental Group, 2006) was certified and a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) was granted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) (Docket #A.04-12-008, SCH #2006041160) on March 15, 2007. For a history, background, and overview of the Project, please see Section A of the First Supplemental Evaluation (March 2009).

Southern California Edison (SCE) has completed final engineering on the approved Project and has begun building portions of the Project. Based on final engineering, additional details of various components of the Project have been further defined. Please see Supplemental Evaluations 1 through 4 for a description and analysis of previous Project modifications. These include the following:

- 1) *Supplemental Evaluation [1] of Project Modifications*, March 2009
- 2) *Supplemental Evaluation 2 for Project Modifications*, April 2009
- 3) *Supplemental Evaluation 3 for Wilderness Transmission Line Modification*, April 2009
- 4) *Supplemental Evaluation 4: Construction of Dead-End Lattice Steel Towers in Segment 3B*, May 2009

This Fifth Supplemental Evaluation addresses additional modifications to the approved Project per communication submitted by SCE to the CPUC on June 26, 2009. These modifications are described in detail in Section B, below.

Based on the evaluation of SCE's proposed modification to the approved Project described in Section C below, no new or substantially different impacts have been identified, no changes to impact significance conclusions are needed, and no new mitigation is necessary. Therefore, there is no need for any additional CEQA analysis of the project modifications described in Section B, below.

B. Modifications to the Project

Based on final engineering and construction completed to date by SCE on Segment 2, additional modifications to the Project have been identified, as presented in electronic communication dated June 26, 2009. These modifications include: (1) reclassifying temporary access road (AR) 12B as a permanent dirt road and eliminating AR12A; and (2) reclassifying temporary AR62 as a permanent dirt road. Access roads AR12B and AR62 would be approximately 416 feet and 1,700 feet in length, respectively. Both roads would have a drivable area of 15 feet of width, with three to five feet of berm on either side.

Per the Segment 2 Access and Spur Road Report, two access roads for Construction Site (Const) 19 were identified, as shown in Figures B.1-1 and B.1-2. These two roads were to allow for an entry and exit to the transmission tower and avoid having to build a turn-around on steep terrain. One road was designated as permanent (AR12A) for the purposes of future operation and maintenance of the transmission tower and the other road (AR12B) would be built for the purposes of construction only (temporary). Following construction of AR12B, it was determined that sufficient access to Const 19 was provided without having to further impact the resources in the area by building AR12A. Therefore,

SCE has requested to designate AR12B as the permanent road for operations and maintenance and no longer build AR12A.

The second proposed modification is to road AR62 leading to Const 83, as shown in Figure B.1-3. This road was previously approved as Variance #35, which allowed for a revised alignment of AR62. The new road alignment was necessary to avoid impacting a cultural site and existing underground gas lines that the previously approved road alignment traversed. The cultural site was discovered after the Segment 2 Access and Spur Roads plan had been submitted and approved by the CPUC. After approval of Variance #35, further discussion determined that restoration of the road would be difficult due to the steep and rocky terrain. Therefore, SCE has requested to designate AR62 as a permanent access road to be used for the operations and maintenance of the transmission line at Const 83.

C. Evaluation of Modifications

After review of the Final EIR, it was determined that the proposed modifications would not result in any new or substantially different environmental impacts, as discussed below. Those environmental issue areas where a potential change in the nature or magnitude of an impact could occur as a result of the proposed modifications are discussed in Section C.1 and are indicated in the table below. Those issue areas for which it was determined that no change in impacts would occur as a result of the proposed modifications are discussed in Section C.2.

<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils/Paleontology	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual Resources

C.1 Issue Areas Where Modifications Result in a Potential Change in Impacts

Air Quality. Air quality impacts associated with the Project would be incrementally reduced as a result of the proposed modifications, as one less road would need to be created (AR12A is eliminated); however, the change would be minimal compared to the overall scope of the Project and air quality impacts would not differ from the approved Project. No new air quality impacts would result, no impact significance conclusions would change, and no new mitigation is necessary.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Surface water runoff as a result of the conversion of AR12B and AR62 from temporary to permanent would slightly increase (greater impermeable surface area); however, as discussed in Final EIR Section C.7 (Hydrology and Water Quality, Impact H-5), potential impacts from spur roads and access roads would be localized and temporary and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) required by APM HYD-1 would include an erosion control plan to minimize any potential increase in surface water runoff resulting from new or improved roads. Therefore, hydrology and water quality impacts would be the same as the approved Project.

Noise. The conversion of roads AR12B and AR62 to permanent facilities would not result in any additional construction activities. Furthermore, converting AR12B to a permanent road eliminates the need to construct AR12A, thereby reducing construction activities within the area of Const 19. As such, noise impacts in the immediate area of this tower location would occur over a shorter duration. The overall impacts to noise would not differ from the approved Project.

Transportation and Traffic. Converting roads AR12B and AR62 to permanent facilities would not result in a change in traffic and transportation impacts compared to the approved Project, as these roads would be utilized strictly for operations and maintenance of Const 19 and 83, which have been determined by SCE to be the most efficient and effective routes for accessing these areas. No new traffic or transportation impacts would result, no impact significance conclusions would change, and no new mitigation is necessary.

Visual Resources. As shown in Figure B.1-2, road AR12B to Const 19, which has already been constructed and is proposed as a permanent road for operations and maintenance activities, traverses the west side of a hill outside of the viewshed of KOP 8. Road AR12A would have traversed the east side of the same hill, also located outside of the viewshed of KOP 8; however, per this amendment, AR12A would no longer be constructed as AR12B provides adequate access. As such, views of this area would not show a new permanent road with a "scar" from the temporary road while it is being re-vegetated, but rather just the permanent road being AR12B. Furthermore, the length of AR12B has been estimated by SCE to be approximately 20 linear feet shorter than AR12A. Therefore, the magnitude of the change in visual impacts would be reduced compared to the approved Project as a result of this modification.

As shown in Figure B.1-3, road AR62 leading to Const 83 is within the viewshed of KOP 12. While the conversion of AR62 to a permanent road would result in a permanent change to the visual environment, this additional roadway segment is within the same area as the new transmission structure which would dominate the view. Furthermore, the road would be located within the same roadway network proposed for the approved Project and, therefore, such a minor modification to the roadway network would not result in any new or substantially different impacts on visual resources. No impact significance conclusions would change and no new mitigation is necessary.

C.2 Issue Areas Where Modifications Result in No Change

The proposed conversion of roads AR12B and AR62 to permanent access roads would occur within existing disturbance areas. Therefore, potential environmental impacts to agriculture resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils/paleontology, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems are not expected to change or increase in severity from the approved Project.

D. Other CEQA Considerations

D.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The environmental impacts of the approved Project are described in detail in Section C (Environmental Analysis) of the Final EIR, and for the proposed modifications in Supplemental Evaluations 1 (March 2009), 2 (April 2009), 3 (April 2009), 4 (May 2009) and Section C (Evaluation of Modification) of this supplemental evaluation. All the significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts identified for the

approved Project, as discussed in Section E.1 (Significant and Unavoidable Impacts) of the Final EIR, would be the same as for the approved Project with implementation of the proposed modifications.

D.2 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

Construction of the proposed modifications identified by SCE would result in the same irretrievable commitment of natural resources as described in the Final EIR. Please see Section E.2 of the Final EIR for a complete discussion of irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources for the approved Project.

D.3 Growth-Inducing Effects

Construction and operation of the proposed modifications identified by SCE would not change the growth-inducing effects described for the approved Project in the Final EIR. Please see Section E.3.1 and E.3.2 of the Final EIR for a complete discussion of growth-inducing effects for the approved Project.

D.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Construction and operation of the proposed modifications identified by SCE would not change the cumulative impacts described for the approved Project in the Final EIR. Please see Section E.5 (Cumulative Impact Analysis by Issue Area) of the Final EIR for a discussion on the impacts of the Project that could potentially be "cumulatively considerable" or might be able to combine with similar impacts of other identified projects in a substantial way.

D.5 Effects Found Not to be Significant

As discussed in Section E.6 (Effects Found Not to be Significant) of the Final EIR, impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Public Services, and Utilities and Service Systems for the approved Project would not be significant.

The proposed modifications identified by SCE would not result in any different or new impacts to these issue areas and as such would not change the impact significance as identified in the Final EIR.

E. References

Aspen Environmental Group. 2006. Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Antelope Transmission Project, Segments 2 and 3. Report prepared for the California Public Utilities Commission. December.