

7.0 Environmental Impacts of the Past Work Along Segment 3A

7.1 Background

As discussed in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” and further described in Chapter 6, “Cumulative Impacts,” Southern California Edison (SCE, or the applicant) commenced construction on unpermitted upgrades along Segments 1, 2, and 3A and several surrounding substations between 1999 and 2004 (see Section 6.1.2). Segment 3A is located within the California Coastal Zone. Development in the Coastal Zone requires Santa Barbara County’s discretionary approval of a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. Although CEQA does not require review of prior unpermitted activity (*Fat v. County of Sacramento* [2002] 97 Cal.App.4th 1270; *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* [1999] 76 Cal.App.4th 1428), the County will require the CDP to cover both the proposed project and the past work in the Coastal Zone (Segment 3A).

To facilitate Santa Barbara County’s review of the CDP application, this chapter analyzes the nature and extent of the environmental impacts from the past work within the Coastal Zone (Segment 3A) by comparing current environmental and regulatory conditions to conditions as they existed at the time the past work commenced in 1999. The purpose of this analysis is to support Santa Barbara County’s CDP process by identifying any significant long-term impacts that may have resulted from the past work along Segment 3A. The analysis is based on information that was compiled from the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment, the applicant’s responses to data requests, previous field investigations conducted by the applicant, and estimates based on available GIS data. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) independently prepared this analysis, and it is not based on any assumed impacts. Given the elapsed time between previous activities and the present proposed project, a good faith effort was made to gather a reasonable level of data to characterize impacts; however, environmental conditions prior to 1999 are unknown for many resource areas or would be unreasonably onerous to identify (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15144, 15145, and 15151).

The analysis in this chapter also provides a brief, generally qualitative analysis of short-term impacts of the past work but does not attempt to identify or quantify the significance of such impacts due to the difficulty of obtaining relevant data retroactively and the inability to address such impacts through the County’s CDP process.

This analysis also includes project options that would modify the design of the proposed project along Segment 3A in order to reduce long-term significant impacts. Similar to the alternatives to the proposed project discussed in Chapter 3, project options were identified and screened in the Screening Report (Appendix H) using the same CEQA screening criteria to determine whether each option would reduce a significant long-term impact, meet most of the objectives of the proposed project, and be potentially feasible. The term “option” is used to differentiate them from the alternatives of the proposed project as they are not required under the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(a)).

7.2 Description of Past Work Along Segment 3A

Segment 3A originates at Carpinteria Substation and terminates at the border of Santa Barbara County and Ventura County. The linear length of this segment is approximately 3.7 miles (Figure 2-1c). The past construction activities along Segment 3A include the following components:

- 1 | • Approximately 32 existing wood poles and three existing LWS poles along Segment 3A were not
2 replaced; the condition of these poles was determined to be sufficient to support the new
3 conductor, and the only work conducted on these poles was the installation of the new
4 conductor.
- 5 • Forty-nine new lightweight steel (LWS) poles were installed to replace approximately 49 wood
6 subtransmission poles that previously supported 66-kilovolt (kV) facilities. Work on these poles
7 included the installation of new conductor and the transfer of distribution circuits.
- 8 • With respect to the pre-existing 49 wood subtransmission poles, 34 of these wood
9 subtransmission poles were removed entirely, and 17 of them were “topped” by removing the
10 upper portion of the pole, thus leaving shorter poles in place on which 16-kV distribution
11 circuits and third-party telecommunications facilities remain.
- 12 • Approximately 19,500 feet of single-circuit 954 stranded aluminum conductor (SAC) was
13 installed, replacing 653 aluminum conductor steel-reinforced (ACSR) conductor.
- 14 • One tubular steel pole (TSP) was installed at the eastern terminus of Segment 3A; this TSP
15 replaced an existing wood pole, which was topped and left in place.
- 16 • Approximately five wood guy stubs with heights between 20 and 30 feet were replaced with
17 five new wood guy stubs with heights between 25 and 40 feet.

18
19 Construction methods along Segment 3A were similar to the pole and conductor replacement for
20 the proposed project, as described in Section 2.3, “Construction.” The work likely required the
21 establishment of temporary staging areas, which were used as reporting locations for workers,
22 vehicle and equipment parking, and material storage. Similar to the staging yards for the proposed
23 project, some of the staging areas were previously disturbed; however, the exact nature and
24 location of temporary staging yards is unknown.

25
26 Limited access and spur roads restoration, including re-grading and repair of the existing roadbed,
27 was likely required as most of the segment is located adjacent to an existing road; however, without
28 baseline data related to road conditions prior to construction, it is unknown to what extent the
29 roads were upgraded. Therefore, long-term disturbance related to road work cannot be calculated.

30
31 Operation and maintenance activities associated with the existing subtransmission along Segment
32 3A are similar to the operation and maintenance activities that were performed for the
33 subtransmission structures and conductors that existed prior to 1999 and to the operation and
34 maintenance activities described for the proposed project in Section 2.5, “Operation and
35 Maintenance.” Routine inspections, access road maintenance, tree trimming, and insulator washing
36 were conducted on an annual or as needed basis, similar to current operations. The
37 subtransmission lines were and continue to be maintained in a manner consistent with CPUC
38 General Order (GO) 95.

39
40

7.3 Environmental Impacts

7.3.1 Aesthetics

Impact AE-SB-A: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

NO IMPACT

As stated in Section 4.1.1.5., there are no designated scenic vistas in the project area within Santa Barbara County. Therefore, there is no long-term impact on scenic vistas.

Impact AE-SB-B: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The eastern end of Segment 3A crosses over State Route (SR) 150, which is an eligible state scenic highway (Caltrans 2012). Activities associated with construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A temporarily damaged scenic resources within viewsheds of SR 150 because construction activities were visible to sensitive viewers. However, this impact was short term and less than significant.

Of the five structures that run parallel to SR 150, three of the wood poles were replaced with LWS poles, one wood pole was replaced with a TSP, and one wood pole was left in place. Two of the LWS poles are each five feet taller than the wood poles that they replaced; one of the LWS poles is the same height as the wood pole that it replaced. The TSP is 65 feet tall; it replaced a wood pole that was 60 feet tall. Although the exact height of the old poles is unknown, LWS poles are typically up to 15 feet taller than wood poles. TSPs are up to 85 feet taller than wood poles.

Prior to construction, SR 150 provided views of high scenic quality, intactness, vividness, and unity in this area. The vertical forms and lines of the wood poles with horizontal cross members and conductors contrasted somewhat with the dominant forms and lines in the rural/natural landscape; however, their dark reddish-brown color helped balance them with their surroundings, and they appeared generally in scale and character with other rural elements and the landscape as a whole. Also, wood power poles often appear as common elements within rural landscapes. The LWS poles and TSP that were installed between 1999 and 2004 have a metallic finish and are lighter in color than the wood poles, and thus and tend to contrast more with their surroundings than the darker, more natural wood poles that they replaced. The LWS poles and TSP appear as encroaching elements that are out of scale and character with the rural/ natural scene (see Figure 7-1). The contrast of the new poles reduces the intactness and unity of the view along SR 150.

Motorists and others traveling along SR 150 include local residents, commuters, and recreationalists and have moderately high sensitivity to changes in scenic resources. However, these poles are only visible for a short duration to motorists and others- traveling along SR 150. In addition, views of these poles are partially obscured due to dense vegetation along SR 150. Because of the dense vegetation within the area of the poles visible along SR 150, the fact that these five poles are no more than 5 feet taller than the wood poles that they replaced, and given the short duration for which they would be visible to passing motorists and others along SR 150. Therefore, long-term impacts to the visual quality of scenic resources along SR 150 from the four new structures would be less than are considered significant.

Figure 7-1 Existing Condition of Scenic Resources along SR 150



Clockwise, starting at the top: Views of Segment 3A from SR 150 (north); View from SR 150 (north); View from SR 150 (south)

Source: SCE 2012

- 1
- 2
- 3

1 | **Impact AE-SB-C: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and**
2 **its surroundings.**

3 *SIGNIFICANT*

4
5 Activities associated with construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A were
6 visible to the public. However, these impacts were short term and less than significant.

7
8 Figure 7-2 compares Segment 3A (SR 192/Casitas Pass Road) conditions as they existed prior to
9 construction of the existing subtransmission line to the existing conditions along SR 192/Casitas
10 Pass Road. Prior to the past work along Segment 3A, wood poles lined SR 192/Casitas Pass Road.
11 This portion of the roadway and surrounding area was characterized by near views of orchards,
12 trees, and agricultural operations and background views of coastal hills and ridges. The
13 combination of rural and natural character provided views of high scenic quality, intactness,
14 | vividness, and unity in this area. Similar to the discussion provided for Impact AE-SB-B, the vertical
15 forms and lines of the wood poles with horizontal cross members and conductors contrasted with
16 the dominant forms and lines in the rural/natural landscape; however, their dark reddish-brown
17 color helped blend them with their surroundings. They appeared generally in scale and character
18 with other rural elements and the landscape as a whole. Moreover, wood power poles often appear
19 as common elements within rural landscapes. The taller galvanized metal poles introduced into the
20 landscape in this area appear as encroaching elements that are out of scale and character with the
21 rural/natural scene. Although their forms and lines are similar to those of the wood structures, they
22 are taller, and their color and finish texture contrast with their surroundings and cause them to be
23 more noticeable. Although the introduction of the taller metal poles slightly reduced the unity of
24 views within the area, they substantially reduced intactness, vividness, and the overall scenic
25 quality of these views.

26
27 Viewer sensitivity along this segment ranges from moderately high to high due to the large number
28 of motorists that frequently travel along SR 192/Casitas Pass Road and from the long duration
29 views of surrounding residents. Additionally, the City of Carpinteria has identified SR 192/Casitas
30 Pass Road as a potential future scenic highway (City of Carpinteria 2003). Therefore, the aesthetic
31 impact of introducing the metal subtransmission poles along and in the vicinity of SR 192/Casitas
32 Pass Road is considered a significant long-term impact.

33
34 Similar to the poles along SR 192/Casitas Pass Road, wood poles were located on private property
35 between Shepard Mesa Road and SR 192 prior to the past work along Segment 3A. Residents' views
36 within this portion of Segment 3A include orchards, trees, and agricultural operations and
37 background views of coastal hills and ocean. The high intactness, vividness, and unity of the
38 combination of rural and natural character provided high scenic quality. For the same reasons
39 discussed for SR 192/Casitas Pass Road, the taller galvanized metal poles appear as encroaching
40 elements that are out of scale and character with the rural/natural scene compared to the previous
41 wood poles. Viewer sensitivity along this segment is very high due to the several residents with
42 permanent views of the area. Therefore, the aesthetic impact of the metal subtransmission poles
43 within the Shepard Mesa area is considered long term and significant.

Figure 7-2 Casitas Pass Road (Prior to the Past Work Along Segment 3A and Existing Conditions)



Left to right: On the left, pre-2004 wooden poles; On the right, post-2004 LWS poles

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Impact AE-SB-D: Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Reflective construction equipment and materials may have generated glare during daytime hours. Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A primarily occurred during daytime hours. However, there is a possibility that some construction occurred at night and temporary artificial illumination could have been required. Potential impacts from glare or lighting during construction would have been temporary and less than significant.

Operation of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A has not created a new impact from lighting. The new conductor was reflective when it was first installed, but has weathered to a dull gray finish. The LWS and TSP structures are non-specular (non-reflective) structures. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

1 **7.3.2 Agriculture and Forestry**

2
3 | **IMPACT AG-SB-A: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide**
4 **Importance to Non-Agricultural Use**
5 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

6
7 Activities associated with construction may have temporarily occurred on designated Important
8 Farmland¹. However, these impacts were short-term and less than significant because agricultural
9 operations returned to normal upon completion of construction.

10
11 Of the 17 poles that were topped and remained in place along Segment 3A, 11 poles are located on
12 Important Farmland (two poles on Unique Farmland and nine on Prime Farmland) (CDC 2010).
13 Because they were not removed, the topped poles resulted in the conversion of approximately
14 0.001 acres of Important Farmland, which is considered less than significant. The remaining wood
15 poles along Segment 3A that were replaced were replaced one-for-one within an existing right-of-
16 way (ROW) and did not convert additional Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. Therefore,
17 long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

18
19 | **IMPACT AG-SB-B: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act**
20 **Contract**
21 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

22
23 As discussed in Section 4.10, "Land Use and Planning," most of Segment 3A within unincorporated
24 Santa Barbara County is located on lands zoned for agricultural use (Santa Barbara County 2006).
25 Additionally, most of this same area is under Williamson Act contracts (CDC 2010). However, past
26 work along Segment 3A occurred within an existing ROW and did not conflict with existing zoning
27 for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion
28 are less than significant.

29
30 | **IMPACT AG-SB-C: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land,**
31 **timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production**
32 *NO IMPACT*

33
34 As discussed in Chapter 4.2, "Agriculture and Forestry," Segment 3A is not located on land
35 designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore,
36 there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

37
38 | **IMPACT AG-SB-D: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-**
39 **forest use**
40 *NO IMPACT*

41
42 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A occurred within an existing
43 ROW, and the long-term presence of the transmission line has not caused tree coverage to drop
44 below 10 percent. Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

45

¹ Important Farmland is defined and designated by the California Department of Conservation as Prime, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance.

IMPACT AG-SB-E: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Construction vehicle traffic along private roads, agricultural roads, and access and spur roads may have resulted in a temporary increase in traffic that may have disrupted farming and grazing activities. Although agricultural activities may have been temporarily impacted, the previous construction did not result in the permanent conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use because the level of agricultural use is roughly similar to what it was before construction. No other activities involved changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

7.3.3 Air Quality

Impact AQ-SB-A: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A generated emissions from operation of heavy equipment and support vehicles. The applicant estimated annual construction air pollutant emissions for past work along Segment 3A using the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod) model for both on-road and off-road sources. A summary of estimated emissions for the past work along Segment 3A is presented in Table 7-1. A complete listing of the calculations and assumptions for the estimated emissions is included in Appendix C. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District's (SBCAPCD's) primary means of implementing air quality plans is the adoption of rules and regulations. The emissions associated with construction of the past work along Segment 3A were temporary and represented a very small fraction of the regional emission inventory. As a result, construction emissions did not substantially contribute to the regional emissions or obstruct the implementation of the air quality plan.

Table 7-1 Summary of Estimated Annual Past Work Along Segment 3A Emissions (tons/year)

ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
1.74	14.34	0.95	0.95

Source: SCE 2012

Key:

- NO_x nitrogen oxide
- PM₁₀ Particulate matter less than 10 microns
- PM_{2.5} Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns
- ROG reactive organic matter

Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to the operations of the subtransmission line prior to the work performed between 1999 and 2004. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

1 | **Impact AQ-SB-B: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or**
2 **projected air quality violation.**

3 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*
4

5 The SBCAPCD currently recommends that emissions be offset if emissions exceed 25 tons per year
6 for reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), particles 10 microns in diameter or
7 smaller (PM₁₀), or particles 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller (PM_{2.5}) SBCAPCD 2008). As shown in
8 Table 7-1, estimated construction emissions for the past work along Segment 3A did not exceed
9 annual emissions thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Additionally, the applicant states that
10 fugitive dust control measures required by the SBCAPCD (further discussed in Section 4.3, "Air
11 Quality") were implemented during the past work along Segment 3A (SCE 2012).
12

13 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
14 the operations of the subtransmission line prior to the work performed between 1999 and 2004.
15 No stationary emissions sources are associated with the existing subtransmission line. Therefore,
16 long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.
17

18 | **Impact AQ-SB-C: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant**
19 **for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient**
20 **air quality standard.**

21 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*
22

23 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A resulted in NO_x and ROG (O₃
24 precursors) emissions associated with fuel combustion from the operation of construction
25 equipment. As presented in Table 7-1, emissions of these pollutants were below the thresholds that
26 would have triggered emission control measures pursuant to SBCAPCD regulations (as discussed
27 | under Impact AQ-SB-B).
28

29 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
30 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
31 Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.
32

33 | **Impact AQ-SB-D: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.**

34 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*
35

36 The predominant types of receptors located within 1 mile of Segment 3A include single-family
37 residences, schools, places of worship, and local parks (see Section 4.11, "Noise," Table 4.11-2).
38 Similar to the proposed construction discussed in Section 4.11, sensitive receptors located in
39 proximity to past construction areas could have been exposed to criteria air pollutants and diesel
40 particulate matter.² However, pollutant emissions were short-term, distributed throughout
41 | Segment 3A, and were not concentrated in any one area.
42

43 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
44 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction. The
45 long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.
46
47

² A toxic air contaminant produced by diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment that is also classified as a subset of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions

1 | **Impact AQ-SB-E: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.**
2 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

3
4 | Vehicle exhaust was the primary odor associated with construction of the existing subtransmission
5 | line along Segment 3A. Vehicle exhaust from construction vehicles, when perceptible, was common
6 | in the environment, dissipated rapidly as it mixed with the surrounding air, and had very limited
7 | duration.

8
9 | Operation and maintenance activities associated with the past work along Segment 3A are similar
10 | to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to 1999. Therefore, long-
11 | term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

12 | **7.3.4 Biological Resources**

13
14
15 | **Impact BIO-SB-A: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or**
16 | **through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special**
17 | **status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?**
18 | *UNDETERMINABLE*

19
20 | The applicant did not complete biological surveys along Segment 3A prior to the start of the past
21 | work. Without baseline data related to the presence of biological resources prior to construction, it
22 | is unknown to what extent the construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A
23 | could have impacted biological resources. Therefore, short- and long-term impacts that may have
24 | resulted due to construction activities are undeterminable.

25
26 | Operations and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
27 | the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
28 | Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion from operation of the existing subtransmission
29 | line are less than significant.

30
31 | **Impact BIO-SB-B: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat**
32 | **or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies,**
33 | **regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?**
34 | *UNDETERMINABLE*

35
36 | See Impact BIO-SB-A.

37
38 | **Impact BIO-SB-C: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected**
39 | **wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to,**
40 | **marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption,**
41 | **or other means?**
42 | *UNDETERMINABLE*

43
44 | See Impact BIO-SB-A.

1 | **Impact BIO-SB-D: Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native**
2 **resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or**
3 **migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

4 *UNDETERMINABLE*

6 | See Impact BIO-SB-A.

8 | **Impact BIO-SB-E: Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting**
9 **biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

10 *NO IMPACT*

12 The applicant estimates that 12 trees were trimmed during construction, but no trees were removed (SCE
13 2012). No applicable tree preservation policies or ordinances would apply to the tree trimming.

14 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
15 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
16 Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

18 **7.3.5 Cultural Resources**

19 | **Impact CR-SB-A: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical**
20 **resource as defined in §15064.5.**

21 *UNDETERMINABLE*

23 The applicant did not complete cultural surveys along Segment 3A prior to the start of construction
24 of the existing subtransmission line. As detailed in Chapter 4.5, "Cultural Resources," cultural
25 | surveys were conducted along Segment 3A in 2005 and 2012 and did not identify any cultural
26 resources (SCE 2012). There are no records of cultural resources discovered during the past work
27 along Segment 3A, and the land was previously disturbed due to agricultural activities and the
28 presence of existing residences. However, without baseline data related to the presence of cultural
29 resources prior to construction, it is unknown to what extent cultural resources could have been
30 impacted. Therefore, both short and long-term impacts on cultural resources, while unlikely, are
31 undeterminable.

33 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
34 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
35 Therefore, long-term impacts from operation under this criterion are less than significant.

37 | **Impact CR-SB-B: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological**
38 **resource pursuant to §15064.5.**

39 *UNDETERMINABLE*

41 | See Impact CR-SB-A.

43 **Impact CR-C: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or**
44 **unique geologic feature.**

45 *UNDETERMINABLE*

47 | See Impact CR-SB-A.

1 | **Impact CR-SB-D: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal**
2 **cemeteries.**

3 *UNDETERMINABLE*

5 | See Impact CR-SB-A.

7.3.6 Geology and Soils

8 | **Impact GEO-SB-A: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects,**
9 **including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault as**
10 **delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the**
11 **State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to**
12 **Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); strong seismic ground shaking;**
13 **seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction; or landslides.**

14 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

16 As discussed in Section 4.6, “Geology, Soils, and Minerals,” Segment 3A is not within an A-P Zone
17 (see Figure 4.6-1); however, Segment 3A is located in a seismically active area and could experience
18 moderate to high levels of earthquake-induced ground shaking. Segment 3A is located in areas
19 identified by Santa Barbara County as having moderate liquefaction potential, low landslide
20 potential, moderate geologic problem area characteristics, and low collapsible soils (Santa Barbara
21 County 2010).

23 The work in Segment 3A involved the installation of 49 LWS poles and one TSP. LWS poles are steel
24 poles that are direct embedded into the ground, typically into native soil. The LWS poles fall under
25 the requirements of CPUC GO 95³ Rule 49.1c and Table 6. SCE determined the soils in Segment 3A
26 to be “firm soil” per Rule 49.1c and set the LWS poles in accordance with GO 95. No further
27 geotechnical investigation was performed for the LWS poles along Segment 3A. SCE installed the
28 TSP in accordance with the findings and recommendations provided in the geotechnical
29 investigation (SCE 2001) that covered the TSP location (SCE 2012). Therefore, long-term impacts
30 under this criterion are less than significant.

32 | **Impact GEO-SB-B: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.**

33 *UNDETERMINABLE*

35 Soils along Segment 3A are generally loamy with varying proportions of clay, silt, sand, and
36 gravel/cobbles/stones (NCRS 2008). The soils along Segment 3A have an erosion hazard rating that
37 ranges from low to severe (Santa Barbara County 2010). Construction of the past work along
38 Segment 3A included ground disturbance and grading, and the applicant did not prepare or
39 implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. Without
40 baseline data or data related to a grading plan or the implementation of measures to prevent
41 erosion, it is unknown to what extent the past work along Segment 3A could have resulted in soil
42 erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, short- and long-term impacts from the loss of topsoil
43 during construction are undeterminable.

45 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
46 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
47 Therefore, long-term impacts from operation under this criterion are less than significant.

³ GO 95 details the CPUC’s rules governing overhead line design, construction, and maintenance.

1 | **Impact GEO-SB-C: Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or would become**
2 | **unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral**
3 | **spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.**

4 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

5 |
6 | Segment 3A is located in areas identified by Santa Barbara County as having moderate liquefaction
7 | potential, low landslide potential, moderate geologic problem area, and low collapsible soils (Santa
8 | Barbara County 2010). As discussed regarding Impact GEO-SB-A, the LWS poles along Segment 3A
9 | were installed in accordance with GO 95. SCE installed the TSP in accordance with the findings and
10 | recommendations provided in the geotechnical investigation (SCE 2001) that covered the TSP
11 | location (SCE 2012). The CPUC assumes that the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A
12 | was constructed in compliance with all applicable building codes. Therefore, long-term impacts
13 | under this criterion are less than significant.

14 |
15 | **Impact GEO-SB-D: Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property.**

16 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

17 |
18 | As discussed in Section 4.6, "Geology and Soils," (see Table 4.6-2), expansive soils along Segment 3A
19 | are low to moderate. As discussed in Impact GEO-SB-A, the LWS poles along Segment 3A were
20 | installed in accordance with GO 95. SCE installed the TSP in accordance with the findings and
21 | recommendations provided in the geotechnical investigation (SCE 2001) that covered the TSP
22 | location (SCE 2012). The CPUC assumes that the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A
23 | was constructed in compliance with all applicable building codes. Therefore, long-term impacts
24 | under this criterion are less than significant.

25 | **7.3.7 Greenhouse Gases**

26 | **Impact GHG-SB-A: Direct and Indirect GHG Emission Levels**

27 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

28 |
29 |
30 | Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A directly contributed to local
31 | and regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. SCE estimated that approximately 514 metric tons of
32 | carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) were emitted during the construction of Segment 3A (SCE
33 | 2012). As further described in Section 4.7, "Greenhouse Gases," the most applicable GHG
34 | significance criteria are those set by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
35 | interim GHG significance thresholds adopted in 2008 (SCAQMD 2008). The applicable SCAQMD-
36 | recommended GHG emission threshold is 10,000 MTCO_{2e} per year, including construction
37 | emissions amortized over 30 years and added to operational GHG emissions.

38 |
39 | GHG construction emissions from the past work along Segment 3A amortized over 30 years would
40 | be approximately 17 MTCO_{2e}. These GHG emissions are well below the applicable thresholds of
41 | significance. Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are
42 | similar to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past
43 | construction. Therefore, operations and maintenance procedures along Segment 3A have not
44 | generated GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the
45 | environment. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

1 | **Impact GHG-SB-B: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the**
2 | **purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.**

3 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

4 |
5 | As described in Section 4.7, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions," Santa Barbara County has not officially
6 | adopted Climate Action Plans, policies, or regulations for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions
7 | from non-stationary sources. At the state level, a scoping plan, approved by the California Air
8 | Resources Board (CARB) on December 12, 2008, provides the outline for actions to reduce
9 | California's GHG emissions. The scoping plan now requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt
10 | regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHG emissions (CARB 2008). Although the existing
11 | subtransmission line along Segment 3A was constructed prior to approval of the CARB scoping
12 | plan, the past work along Segment 3A, as described by the applicant, did not conflict with any of the
13 | policies or GHG emission reduction measures outlined in the scoping plan. In addition, operation
14 | and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line do not conflict with a federal, state, regional,
15 | or local plan, policy, or regulation for reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, long-term impacts under
16 | this criterion are less than significant.

17 |
18 | **7.3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

19 | **Impact HZ-SB-A: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the**
20 | **routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.**

21 | *NO IMPACT*

22 |
23 | Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A involved transport, use, and
24 | disposal of hazardous materials. This included the use of hazardous materials typically used by
25 | construction vehicles and heavy equipment (e.g., gasoline, diesel fuel, transmission fluid), primarily
26 | within the subtransmission line ROW. Without information regarding hazardous material handling
27 | procedures, it is unknown if the hazardous materials created a significant hazard to the public or
28 | the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

29 |
30 | Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
31 | the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
32 | Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

33 |
34 | **Impact HZ-SB-B: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through**
35 | **reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous**
36 | **materials into the environment.**

37 | *NO IMPACT*

38 |
39 | As described under Impact HZ-SB-A, construction of the existing subtransmission line along
40 | Segment 3A involved transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. Without information
41 | regarding hazardous material handling procedures, it cannot be determined whether the handling
42 | of hazardous materials created a hazard to the public or the environment; however, no accidental
43 | releases of hazardous materials into the environment were recorded or reported by the applicant
44 | during construction.

45 |
46 | Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
47 | the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
48 | Therefore, there is no long-term operational impact under this criterion.

1 | **Impact HZ-SB-C: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous**
2 **materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school.**

3 *NO IMPACT*

4
5 As identified in Table 4.8-1 (Section 4.8, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials”), two schools are
6 located within 0.25 miles of Segment 3A. Construction of the past work along Segment 3A included
7 limited transport and use of hazardous liquids (e.g., gasoline, solvents, and lubricating fluids). These
8 types of hazardous materials are commonly used during construction activities associated with
9 commercial, residential, and industrial projects. Diesel-powered vehicles and construction
10 equipment were used during construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A.
11 Diesel exhaust emissions are considered toxic emissions by CARB. Diesel exhaust was emitted
12 within 0.25 miles of schools in the vicinity of the project; however, similar to the proposed
13 construction discussed in Section 4.11, construction activities were temporary and did not take
14 place at any single location for an extended period.

15
16 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
17 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
18 Therefore, there are no long-term impacts under this criterion.

19
20 | **Impact HZ-SB-D: Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites**
21 **compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a**
22 **significant hazard to the public or the environment.**

23 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

24
25 The applicant did not perform a search of the Cortese List (Government Code Section 65962.5)
26 database prior to construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A. However, the
27 applicant did not report the discovery of any new sites during the construction period, which would
28 be required by federal and state law (see Section 4.8, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” for
29 further discussion regarding regulatory requirements). As described in Chapter 4.8, the results of a
30 2012 Cortese List database search did not identify any sites within 1,000 feet of Segment 3A (DTSC
31 2012, 2013; SWRCB 2012, 2013a,b). Therefore, there are no significant long-term impacts under
32 this criterion.

33
34 | **Impact HZ-SB-E: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan**
35 **has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the**
36 **project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.**

37 *NO IMPACT*

38
39 As discussed in Chapter 4.8, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” Segment 3A is not located within
40 an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport. Therefore, there are no long-term
41 impacts under this criterion.

42
43 | **Impact HZ-SB-F: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project**
44 **result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.**

45 *NO IMPACT*

46
47 As discussed in Chapter 4.8, Segment 3A is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
48 Therefore, there are no long-term impacts under this criterion.

1 | **Impact HZ-SB-G: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted**
2 **emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.**

3 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

4
5 Past work along Segment 3A required temporary closure of travel lanes on public roadways and
6 involved the movement of heavy vehicles that could affect emergency vehicle access through work
7 areas. The applicant stated that traffic control measures from the Work Area Protection and Traffic
8 Control Manual (WATCH manual) were implemented during construction. Therefore, impacts to
9 emergency access were temporary. Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line
10 along Segment 3A are similar to the operations of the subtransmission line that existed prior to the
11 past work. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

12
13 | **Impact HZ-SB-H: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death**
14 **involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or**
15 **where residences are intermixed with wildlands.**

16 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

17
18 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A temporarily increased fire risk
19 during refueling, vehicle and equipment use, welding, vegetation clearing, worker cigarette smoking,
20 and other activities. Much of Segment 3A occurs near the border of state responsibility areas and local
21 responsibilities and similarly occurs between urbanized and wildland areas (Cal FIRE 2007).
22 However, there were no wildland fires along the Segment 3A route during construction.

23
24 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
25 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
26 Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

27
28 **7.3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality**

29 | **Impact HY-SB-A: Violate water quality standards**

30 *UNDETERMINABLE*

31
32 The applicant did not conduct a wetland delineation or prepare or implement a SWPPP for the
33 construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A. Without baseline data or data
34 related to a grading plan or the implementation of measures to prevent erosion, flooding, or water
35 contamination, it is unknown to what extent the past work along Segment 3A could have impacted
36 hydrology or water quality. Short- and long-term impacts on hydrology and water quality from
37 construction are undeterminable.

38
39 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
40 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
41 Therefore, long-term operational impacts under these criteria are less than significant.

42
43 | **Impact HY-SB-B: Substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or substantial interference**
44 **with groundwater recharge**

45 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

46
47 An unknown amount of water was used during construction of the past work; however, the
48 applicant did state that all water was obtained from existing entitlements (SCE 2012). Therefore,

1 while short- and long-term impacts on water resources from construction activities are
2 undeterminable, they are unlikely to have been significant.

3
4 Seventeen poles were topped and remained in place along Segment 3A. The diameter of the poles is
5 1 to 2 feet. The topped poles resulted in a total of approximately 68 square feet of impervious
6 surfaces spread out along the Segment 3A route, which is considered less than significant. The
7 remaining wood poles along Segment 3A that were replaced, were replaced one-for-one within an
8 existing ROW and did not result in additional impervious surfaces. The past work did not
9 significantly increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the area and, therefore, does not
10 substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. Long-term impacts under this criterion are less
11 than significant.

12
13 | **Impact HY-SB-C: Substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area**
14 **that results in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site**
15 *UNDETERMINABLE*

16
17 | See Impact HY-SB-A.

18
19 | **Impact HY-SB-D: Substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern or rate or amount of**
20 **surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding**
21 *UNDETERMINABLE*

22
23 | See Impact HY-SB-A.

24
25 | **Impact HY-SB-E: Create or contribute to runoff water exceeding the capacity of existing or**
26 **planned storm water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted**
27 **runoff**
28 *UNDETERMINABLE*

29
30 | See Impact HY-SB-A.

31
32 | **Impact HY-SB-F: Other substantial degradation of water quality**
33 *UNDETERMINABLE*

34
35 | See Impact HY-SB-A.

36
37 | **Impact HY-SB-G: Project structures would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year**
38 **flood hazard area**
39 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

40
41 Two LWS poles were constructed within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by the Federal
42 Emergency Management Agency. Given the circular shape of the above ground portion of their
43 bases and their small diameter (1 to 2 feet), these structures would not impede or redirect flood
44 flows. The long-term impact under this criterion is less than significant.

1 | **Impact HY-SB-H: Risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding**
2 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

3
4 The past construction work along Segment 3A temporarily exposed workers to the risk of loss,
5 injury, or death involving flooding from working within the designated 100 year flood zone.
6 However, no flooding occurred during construction, and therefore, there was no impact.

7
8 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
9 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
10 Considering that only two LWS poles are located in a 100 year flood zone, the risk of a worker being
11 present in the area at the time of a 100 year flood event is relatively low. Therefore, long-term
12 impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

13
14 | **Impact HY-SB-I: Risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or**
15 | **mudflow**
16 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

17
18 As discussed in Section 4.9, "Hydrology and Water Quality," Segment 3A is not located near any
19 water body that could generate a seiche in the event of an earthquake and is well outside of mapped
20 tsunami inundation areas (CDC 2009a,b). Segment 3A is located on generally flat terrain and has
21 low landslide potential (Santa Barbara County 2010). In addition, the existing subtransmission line
22 along Segment 3A replaced a previous subtransmission line in the same location. Therefore, risks
23 involving seiche, tsunami, or mudflow are similar to risks associated with the previous
24 subtransmission line that existed prior to 1999. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion
25 are less than significant.

26
27 **7.3.10 Land Use and Planning**

28 | **Impact LU-SB-A: Physically divide an established community**
29 | *NO IMPACT*

30
31 The existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A replaced a previous subtransmission line
32 within the same ROW. Therefore, the existing subtransmission line did not physically divide an
33 established community.

34
35 | **Impact LU-SB-B: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency**
36 | **with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific**
37 | **plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or**
38 | **mitigating an environmental effect.**

39 | *SIGNIFICANT*

40
41 Pursuant to GO 131-D, the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance,
42 and operation of public utilities in the State of California (Subsection 4.10.2.2, "State"). However,
43 the past work along Segment 3A is subject to the Santa Barbara County Article II Coastal Zoning
44 Ordinance because the route is located in the California Coastal Zone. Santa Barbara County
45 administers a Local Coastal Program, which was certified by the California Coastal Commission and,
46 therefore, has jurisdiction over the portions of the proposed project located within Segment 3A.
47 Construction and operation of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A conflicts with
48 Santa Barbara County Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance because applicable approvals and permits

1 | were not obtained prior to construction. Therefore, the long-term conflict with long-term impact on
2 | the Local Coastal Program is has been significant.

3
4 | As described in Section 7.1 of this chapter, the CPUC has prepared this chapter to provide the
5 | analysis needed for Santa Barbara County to issue a retroactive CDP for the past work along
6 | Segment 3A, as well as for the components of the proposed project within the California Coastal
7 | Zone. As described above in the introduction of this chapter, this analysis identifies significant long-
8 | term impacts of the past work along Segment 3A so that Santa Barbara County can consider
9 | modifications to the applicant's proposed project that would reduce those impacts.

10 11 | **7.3.11 Noise**

12 | **Impact NS-SB-A: Noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or** 13 | **noise ordinance.**

14 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

15
16 | Equipment and vehicles involved in construction of the past work along Segment 3A exposed
17 | receptors located in the proximity of Segment 3A (less than 200 feet) to noise levels of 75 A-
18 | weighted decibels equivalent continuous noise level or higher, which is above the applicable Santa
19 | Barbara County standards (Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual; 2008) and the City
20 | of Carpinteria (Resolution No. 408; 2006). Sensitive receptors within 200 feet of Segment 3A (see
21 | Table 4.11-2) include First Baptist Church of Carpinteria, Lion Park, and El Carro Park. These effects
22 | were temporary, transient, and attenuated (i.e., reduced in intensity) over distance; therefore,
23 | impacts during construction were less than significant.

24
25 | Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
26 | the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
27 | Operation and maintenance of subtransmission lines are not considered a significant source of
28 | noise. Therefore, long-term noise impacts associated with operation of the existing subtransmission
29 | line are less than significant.

30 31 | **Impact NS-SB-B: Excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.**

32 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

33
34 | Heavy-duty equipment and vehicles involved in construction of the past work along Segment 3A
35 | generated vibration levels ranging between 58 and 87 vibration decibels (VdB) at 25 feet during
36 | short-term construction activities. All receptors located at a distance of 50 feet or beyond perceived
37 | vibration levels below 80 VdB, which is generally acceptable at residential areas for activities that
38 | involve less than 30 vibration events of the same kind per day (FTA 2006). Construction-related
39 | vibrations only exceeded the human perception threshold (65 VdB) for receptors located within 50
40 | feet from heavy-duty equipment. These effects were transient and attenuated (i.e., reduced in
41 | intensity) over distance. Sensitive receptors within 50 feet of Segment 3A (Chapter 4, Table 4.11-2),
42 | include Lion Park and El Carro Park.

43
44 | Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
45 | those associated with the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
46 | Operation and maintenance procedures of subtransmission lines do not generate excessive levels of
47 | groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Therefore, long-term impacts associated with
48 | operation of the existing subtransmission line are less than significant.

1 | **Impact NS-SB-C: Permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.**

2 | *NO IMPACT*

3 |
4 | Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
5 | the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
6 | Therefore, ambient noise levels in the vicinity of Segment 3A are not materially different than they
7 | were prior to construction of the existing subtransmission line. There is no long-term impact under
8 | this criterion.
9 |

10 | **7.3.12 Population and Housing**

11 | **Impact POP-SB-A: Induce substantial population growth in an area.**

12 | *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

13 |
14 | Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A generated an influx of
15 | approximately 24 construction workers into the area (SCE 2012). However, due to the temporary
16 | nature of the work and likelihood that personnel were largely drawn from existing populations
17 | within or near the project area, the past work did not induce substantial population growth during
18 | construction.
19 |

20 | Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
21 | the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction. No
22 | additional workers relocated to the area on a permanent basis as a result of the past work along
23 | Segment 3A. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.
24 |

25 | **Impact POP-SB-B: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the
26 | construction of replacement housing elsewhere.**

27 | *NO IMPACT*

28 |
29 | No housing units were removed for construction or operation of the existing subtransmission line
30 | along Segment 3A. The reconstruction of the existing 66-kV subtransmission was located within an
31 | existing utility ROW. Therefore, the past work along Segment 3A had no impact under this criterion.
32 |

33 | **Impact POP-SB-C: Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of
34 | replacement housing elsewhere.**

35 | *NO IMPACT*

36 |
37 | As discussed above, no housing units were removed for construction or operation of the existing
38 | subtransmission line along Segment 3A. As a result, no residents within the area were displaced,
39 | and no replacement housing was required. The reconstruction of the existing 66-kV
40 | subtransmission was located within an existing utility ROW. Therefore, there is no impact under
41 | this criterion.
42 |
43 |

1 **7.3.13 Public Services and Utilities**

2
3 | **Impact PS-SB-A: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts on governmental facilities or**
4 **from the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of**
5 **which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable**
6 **service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following: (1)**
7 **fire protection and emergency response, (2) police protection, (3) schools, (4) parks, or (5)**
8 **other public facilities.**

9 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

10
11 As discussed in Section 7.3.12, "Population and Housing," construction of the existing
12 subtransmission line along Segment 3A generated an influx of approximately 24 temporary
13 workers into the area. However, due to the temporary nature of the work and limited number of
14 construction workers, police, fire protection, emergency response, schools, parks, and other public
15 facilities are assumed to have operated at acceptable levels during construction.

16
17 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
18 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
19 Therefore, construction of the existing subtransmission line did not result in significant long-term
20 impacts on police, fire protection, emergency response, schools, parks, and other public facilities.

21
22 | **Impact PS-SB-B: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities**
23 **or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant**
24 **environmental effects.**

25 *NO IMPACT*

26
27 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A did not include the new
28 stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, there are no long-
29 term impacts under this criterion.

30
31 | **Impact PS-SB-C: Insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing**
32 **entitlements and resources or new or expanded entitlements required.**

33 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

34
35 The source of the water and the amount of water used during construction of the existing
36 subtransmission line was unrecorded; however, the applicant did state that all water was obtained
37 from existing entitlements (SCE 2012).

38
39 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
40 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
41 Further, operation and maintenance procedures associated with subtransmission lines do not
42 require large quantities of water. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than
43 significant.

1 | **Impact PS-SB-D: Served by a landfill without sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate**
2 **the project's solid waste disposal needs.**

3 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

4
5 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A generated solid waste;
6 however, the amount of solid waste generated, the disposal facilities used, and the capacity of the
7 solid waste disposal facilities used during construction were unrecorded. Therefore, impacts on
8 permitted capacity of solid waste disposal facilities during construction are undeterminable.
9 However, considering that a number of components remain in place, the partial decommissioning
10 of the previously existing 3.7-mile subtransmission line along Segment 3A is unlikely to have
11 caused an impact under this criterion.
12

13 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
14 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
15 Further, operation and maintenance procedures associated with subtransmission lines do not
16 generate large quantities of solid waste. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less
17 than significant.
18

19 | **Impact PS-SB-E: Noncompliance with federal, state, or local statutes and regulations related**
20 **to solid waste.**

21 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

22
23 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A generated solid waste;
24 however, the amount of solid waste generated, handling procedures, and legal compliance methods
25 were unrecorded. Therefore, whether the disposal of solid waste was in compliance with federal,
26 state, or local statutes is undeterminable. However, considering that a number of components
27 remain in place, the partial decommissioning of the previously existing 3.7-mile subtransmission
28 line along Segment 3A is unlikely to have caused an impact under this criterion.
29

30 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
31 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
32 Further, operation and maintenance procedures associated with subtransmission lines do not
33 generate large quantities of solid waste. The applicant currently follows federal, state, and local
34 statutes related to solid waste handling. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less
35 than significant.
36

37 | **Impact PS-SB-F: Exceed Santa Barbara County's solid waste thresholds of 350 tons of**
38 **construction and demolition debris.**

39 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

40
41 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A generated solid waste;
42 however, the amount of solid waste generated, the disposal facilities used, and the capacity of the
43 solid waste disposal facilities used during construction were unrecorded. Therefore, short-term
44 impacts that may have resulted due to construction activities are undeterminable.
45

46 Operations and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
47 those associated with the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
48 Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion from operation of the existing subtransmission
49 line are less than significant.
50

1 **7.3.14 Recreation**

2 | **Impact RE-SB-A: Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other**
3 **recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur**
4 **or be accelerated.**

5 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

6
7 As discussed under Section 7.3.12, "Population and Housing," construction of the existing
8 subtransmission line along Segment 3A could have generated an influx of 24 temporary workers
9 into the area. The number and variety of recreational facilities within the area, some of which are
10 shown in Figure 4.10-1, were adequate to accommodate the potential temporary and minor
11 increase in use of local recreational areas and facilities by construction workers. Therefore, use of
12 recreational facilities during construction did not cause substantial physical deterioration.

13
14 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
15 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
16 While current maintenance personnel may use existing neighborhood and regional parks when
17 working in the area, considering the intermittent nature of subtransmission line maintenance
18 procedures, sporadic use of recreational facilities has not caused any substantial physical
19 deterioration of recreational facilities. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less
20 than significant.

21
22 | **Impact RE-SB-B: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of**
23 **recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.**

24 *NO IMPACT*

25
26 The past work along Segment 3A did not include the construction or expansion of recreation
27 facilities. Therefore, there are no impacts under this criterion.

28
29 | **Impact RE-SB-C: Disrupt access to existing recreation opportunities.**

30 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

31
32 As shown in Table 4.14-1, Segment 3A is within 1 mile of 10 recreational facilities. The past work
33 along Segment 3A did not result in a significant impact related to the accessibility of the 10
34 recreational facilities. Segment 3A does not overlap any recreation facilities. Therefore, there are no
35 impacts under this criterion.

36
37 **7.3.15 Transportation and Traffic**

38 | **Impact TT-SB-A: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures**
39 **of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes**
40 **of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components**
41 **of the circulation system including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and**
42 **freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.**

43 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

44
45 The construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A included the movement of
46 light, medium, and heavy-duty vehicles (including oversize vehicles such as cranes) over US-101,
47 SR-150, SR-192, and local roads maintained by the City of Carpinteria, Santa Barbara County, and
48 Ventura County.

1 Project-related vehicles and equipment generally traveled from a local temporary staging yard (e.g.,
2 SCE's Ventura Service Center) or contractor yards to work sites in the morning, returning to their
3 points of departure in the evening. The applicant estimated that the construction activities in
4 Segment 3A generated a maximum of approximately 72 daily vehicle trips. This figure includes the
5 estimated 24 construction workers making two daily personal vehicle trips (one trip in the morning
6 from home to the staging yard, and one trip in the reverse in the evening).

7
8 The temporary increase in traffic associated with the construction of the existing subtransmission
9 line along Segment 3A accounted for a minimal and temporary increase over average daily volumes
10 along the roadways and at the intersections shown in Tables 4.15-4 and 4.15-5.

11
12 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
13 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
14 Considering the intermittent nature of subtransmission line maintenance procedures, use of
15 occasional maintenance vehicles in the area is not considered a significant impact under this
16 criterion.

17
18 | **Impact TT-SB-B: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but**
19 **not limited to, LOS standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established**
20 **by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.**
21 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

22
23 | Similar to Impact TT-SB-B, the construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A
24 generated a maximum of approximately 72 daily vehicle trips. This temporary increase in traffic
25 associated with the past work along Segment 3A was consistent with applicable congestion
26 management programs.

27
28 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A are similar to
29 the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
30 Considering the intermittent nature of subtransmission line maintenance procedures, use of
31 occasional maintenance vehicles in the area is not considered a significant impact under this
32 criterion.

33
34 | **Impact TT-SB-C: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in**
35 **traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.**
36 *NO IMPACT*

37
38 The past work along Segment 3A did not include the use of helicopters and did not result in a
39 change to air traffic patterns. Therefore, there are no impacts under this criterion.

40
41 | **Impact TT-SB-D: Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or**
42 **dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).**
43 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

44
45 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A required temporary closure of
46 travel lanes on public roadways, private roads, and driveways, and involved the movement of heavy
47 vehicles which could have created road hazards. SCE stated that measures from the WATCH Manual
48 were implemented during construction.

1 The existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A is located in the same ROW as the previous
2 subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction. In addition, the poles are roughly
3 the same diameter, and activities in the area are similar to those performed prior to construction.
4 Therefore, the design of the existing subtransmission line did not result in a design feature hazard
5 or hazard related to an incompatible use. Long-term impacts under this criterion are less than
6 significant.

7
8 | **Impact TT-SB-E: Result in inadequate emergency access.**

9 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

10
11 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A required temporary closure of
12 travel lanes on public roadways, private roads, and driveways and involved the movement of heavy
13 vehicles that could have affected emergency vehicle access to and through work areas. SCE stated
14 that measures from the WATCH Manual were implemented during construction.

15
16 The existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A is located in the same ROW as the previous
17 subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction. Therefore, the presence of the
18 existing subtransmission line has not resulted in any changes to the environment that would have
19 resulted in inadequate emergency access levels. Long-term impacts under this criterion are less
20 than significant.

21
22 | **Impact TT-SB-F: Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit,
23 bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such
24 facilities.**

25 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

26
27 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A did not conflict with any
28 current adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian
29 facilities. Construction activities in any given location occurred over a short time period and were
30 largely conducted in areas with no public transit service or bicycle or pedestrian facilities (although
31 public transit service and bicycle and pedestrian facilities are available in the City of Carpinteria,
32 the route of Segment 3A does not overlap or interfere with any of these). Work in Segment 3A was
33 conducted on SCE-owned property, within existing public utility easements, and in a public ROW.
34 SCE obtained encroachment permits from the local jurisdictions and the California Department of
35 Transportation (Caltrans), as appropriate, for construction activities that encroached upon any
36 public ROW or easement. In cases where construction work required temporary closure of travel
37 lanes or oversize vehicle trips that could disrupt public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian traffic, SCE
38 implemented measures contained in the WATCH Manual, including signage, flaggers, and
39 coordination with relevant agencies, to ensure the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists.

40
41 The existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A is located in the same ROW as the previous
42 subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction. Therefore, the presence of the
43 existing subtransmission line has not resulted in any changes to the environment that would have
44 resulted in a decrease in the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.
45 Public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian activities in the area are similar to pre-2004 construction.
46 Long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

1 **7.4 Option Analysis**

2
3 **7.4.1 Introduction**

4 Due to the past unpermitted work in the project area and its relationship to the proposed project,
5 modifications to the proposed project (referred to henceforth as “options”) have been identified
6 that could reduce the long-term significant impacts of the past work along Segment 3A. Options are
7 similar to alternatives in that they are identified and screened using similar criteria (as described
8 further in Appendix H); however, the term “option” has been used to differentiate them from
9 “alternatives” as defined under CEQA. As discussed in Section 7.1, CEQA does not require the
10 evaluation of existing impacts from past unpermitted activities. However, Section 7.3 evaluates
11 these impacts to facilitate Santa Barbara County’s review process. The EIR will also evaluate
12 methods that would reduce these existing impacts. Though not required to mitigate impacts of the
13 currently proposed project, these options could be implemented at the discretion of the County as
14 part of its CDP issuance. At their discretion, the County may also opt to implement the proposed
15 project without exercising any of the options described below.
16

17 **7.4.2 Options Development and Screening Process**

18
19 The option screening analysis that was conducted to determine the range of options for
20 consideration in the EIR is detailed in the Screening Report (Appendix H). The options reviewed
21 included painting existing structures, replacing existing structures, reviewing engineering plans for
22 existing structures, relocating structures, and undergrounding the subtransmission line. The
23 Screening Report details the methodology used to evaluate and select options for further analysis,
24 including their feasibility and the extent to which they would meet most of the basic objectives of
25 the proposed project, as well as Santa Barbara County’s objective of reducing a long-term
26 significant impact⁴ that resulted from the past work along Segment 3A. The Screening Report
27 provides a complete description of each option, including figures and a discussion to support why
28 each option was eliminated or retained for consideration in this EIR.
29

30 **7.4.3 Long-term Significant Impacts that Resulted from the Past Work Along Segment 3A**

31
32 The CPUC’s analysis provided under Section 7.3, above, identifies two long-term significant impacts
33 that resulted from the past work along Segment 3A, which are listed in Table 7-2.
34

Table 7-2 Long-term Significant Effects of Past Work Along Segment 3A

Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Replacement of five wood poles within the viewshed of SR 150 with four LWS poles and one TSP resulted in a significant long-term impact on the scenic resources within an eligible state scenic highway from the color and size of the new poles. ● Replacement of 49 wood poles with 49 LWS poles and one TSP resulted in a significant long-term impact on the visual character of the site and its surroundings and from the color and size of the new poles.
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Construction and operation of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 3A conflicts with Santa Barbara County Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance because applicable approvals and permits were not obtained at the time of construction prior to 2004.

35
⁴ Long-term significant impacts based on an independent assessment using CEQA criteria.

1 **7.4.4 Options Evaluated in this Section**

2 Project options retained for consideration in this EIR are described in this section and are shown in
3 Appendix H. The screening process determined that these options would meet most of the CPUC
4 project objectives, would be feasible, and would meet the County’s objective of reducing a long-
5 term significant impact that resulted from the past work along Segment 3A.
6

7 **7.4.4.1 Option A – Paint Existing LWS Poles and TSP Along Segment 3A**

8 The CPUC identified Option A. Under this option, the existing LWS poles and TSP along Segment 3A
9 would be painted to reduce contrast with the surrounding environmental setting.
10

11 **7.4.4.2 Option B – Replace Existing LWS Poles and TSP with Wood Poles Along Segment 3A**

12 The CPUC identified Option B. Under this option, the existing LWS poles along Segment 3A would be
13 replaced one-for-one with similar sized, new wood poles, similar to the poles that existed prior to
14 the past work between 1999 and 2004. The TSP constructed between 1999 and 2004 would not be
15 replaced because a wood pole could not accommodate the weight of the current conductor.
16

17 **7.4.4.3 Option C – Relocate the Portion of Segment 3A that Traverses Agricultural Land in the**
18 **Shepard Mesa Community to Underground Conduit**

19 The CPUC, Santa Barbara County, and the general public identified Option C. Under this option, new
20 underground conduit would replace 0.88 miles of existing LWS poles traversing agricultural land in
21 the Shepard Mesa community ~~within the existing ROW~~ (Figure 2). This option would require that
22 approximately 13 new 55-foot-tall wood poles be constructed near the underground
23 subtransmission line to distribute power to the surrounding Shepard Mesa community. These poles
24 would also contain third-party lines for continued cable and telecommunications services. This
25 Option would require two new TSP riser poles—one at each end of the undergrounded line to
26 transition the line above and below ground. The applicant may need to obtain new encroachment
27 permits, as many of their existing ROWs only provide overhead access, and the current ROW may
28 include existing underground infrastructure that would need to be avoided such as water, sewer,
29 and gas lines. In addition, the distribution poles would need to be offset from the alignment of the
30 underground subtransmission line, which could also require the acquisition of new ROW. No fault
31 return conductor would be required.
32

33 **7.4.4.4 Option D – Relocate Segment 3A to Underground Conduit**

34 The CPUC and Santa Barbara County identified Option D. Under this option, Segment 3A would be
35 rerouted ~~to be entirely located~~ mainly within Caltrans ROW along Foothill Road and Casitas Pass
36 Road and would include the installation of new underground conduit to support the
37 subtransmission line. No underground conduit would be installed ~~within~~ through the center of the
38 Shepard Mesa community; however, due to the existence of overhead electrical facilities as well as
39 possible underground infrastructure, Option D may require deviating outside of Caltrans ROW and
40 acquiring additional easements on private land, as needed. The applicant would need to obtain
41 encroachment permits for new ROW, as their existing easements only provide overhead access and
42 would likely not contain sufficient space to accommodate both a distribution line and an
43 underground subtransmission line. This Option would also require two new TSP riser poles—one
44 at each end of the undergrounded line to transition the line above and below ground. No fault
45 return conductor would be required.
46

47 The existing distribution and third party lines located within Segment 3A would remain within the
48 existing overhead ROW. The existing 49 LWS poles located along Segment 3A would be removed
49 and replaced with 55-foot tall wood distribution poles. The existing 35 wood poles located along

1 Segment 3A would be topped or removed and replaced with wood distribution poles as needed. In
2 the Shepard Mesa community, 13 wood distribution poles would be constructed in the existing
3 ROW.
4

5 **7.4.5 Comparison of Options**
6

7 This section presents an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each option in comparison
8 to the existing conditions. This section also describes the effectiveness of each option in reducing
9 long-term significant impacts that resulted from the past work along Segment 3A. Table 7-3
10 provides a summary of the determinations.
11

Table 7.3 Summary of the Impact Determinations for Each Option

Resource Area	Option A: Paint Existing LWS poles and TSP Along Segment 3A	Option B: Replace Existing LWS Poles with Wood Poles Along Segment 3A	Option C: Relocate the Portion of Segment 3A that in the Shepard Mesa Community to Underground Conduit	Option D: Relocate Segment 3A to Underground Conduit
Aesthetics	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	None	None	Increased	Increased
Air Quality	Increased	Increased	Increased	Increased
Biological Resources	None	None	Reduced	Reduced
Cultural Resources	None	Increased	Increased	Increased
Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources	None	None	None	None
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Increased	Increased	Increased	Increased
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Increased	Increased	Increased	Increased
Hydrology and Water Quality	None	Increased	Increased	Increased
Land Use and Planning	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced
Noise	None	Increased	Increased	Increased
Population and Housing	None	None	None	None
Public Services and Utilities	None	None	None	None
Recreation	None	None	None	None
Transportation and Traffic	None	Increased	Increased	Increased

Note: Resources in bold were found to have long-term significant impacts from the past work that occurred along Segment 3A as analyzed in Section 7.3 and summarized in Table 7-2.

12

1 **7.4.5.1 Option A: Paint Existing LWS Poles and TSP Along Segment 3A**

2 This section compares the long-term environmental impacts that resulted from the past work along
3 Segment 3A with those of Option A. A description of Option A is provided above in Section 7.4.4.1.
4

5 **Aesthetics**

6 The eastern end of Segment 3A crosses over SR 150, which is an eligible state scenic highway
7 (Caltrans 2012), and there are a number of sensitive receptors within the project area that have
8 views of the subtransmission line ROW. Both construction activities and the completed structures
9 would be noticeable to sensitive receptors. However, although additional activities, equipment, and
10 workers would be required to paint the existing LWS structures above what is required for the
11 proposed project, these activities would likely be indistinguishable from the proposed project
12 activities. Further, upon project completion, the painted poles would reduce the contrast of the
13 existing metallic subtransmission poles against the surrounding environmental setting. Therefore,
14 during construction, while implementation of Option A would temporarily cause a small increase in
15 short-term aesthetic impacts compared to the proposed project, Option A would lessen the
16 significant long-term aesthetic impacts that resulted from the past work.
17

18 Periodically during operations, the poles would require repainting, which would result in an
19 additional aesthetic impact above what was described for the proposed project. Damp coastal
20 conditions cause painted poles to peel and flake more frequently than poles in drier conditions.
21 Peeling and flaking paint would be visible to sensitive receptors and would create a more
22 significant aesthetic impact than the proposed project until the poles were repainted. This-Although
23 this impact would occur infrequently over the long term, poles.-and would therefore be less than
24 significant.
25

26 **Agriculture and Forestry**

27 Although painting activities would temporarily interfere with agriculture uses in the project area,
28 including activities on Prime and Unique Farmland and land under Williamson Act contract, the
29 severity of the impact would not be substantively different than the proposed project. For example,
30 although pole painting would require more activity than what is currently proposed, it would not
31 substantially lengthen the construction period or require additional ground disturbance.
32 Implementation of Option A would therefore have a less than significant short-term impact on
33 agriculture.
34

35 Operation and maintenance procedures would periodically require that the poles be repainted,
36 which would result in future interruptions to agricultural production above what was described for
37 the proposed project. This impact would occur infrequently over the long term and would be
38 temporary. Therefore, long-term impacts on agriculture would be less than significant.
39

40 There is no forest land or timberland located along Segment 3A. Therefore, Option A would have no
41 impact on forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned as Timberland Production.
42

43 **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases**

44 Short-term impacts on air quality and from GHGs may result from pole painting activities during
45 construction. Painting would require the use of construction equipment and vehicles above what is
46 required for the proposed project. Additional vehicles and the use of paint equipment would result
47 in increased emissions of criteria pollutants and GHG emissions; however, it is anticipated that the
48 increased emissions that would result from the implementation of Option A would be covered by

1 the conservative emission estimates for the proposed project. In addition, the SBCAPCD and the
2 County of Santa Barbara do not have construction emissions thresholds. Therefore, temporary and
3 transient air emissions resulting from the implementation of Option A during construction would
4 be less than significant.

5
6 Operation and maintenance procedures would periodically require that the poles be repainted,
7 which would result in future emissions above what was described for the proposed project.
8 However, this impact would occur infrequently over the long term and would be temporary.
9 Therefore, long-term impacts related to air quality and GHGs would be less than significant.

10 11 **Biological Resources**

12 Although a variety of species could be present along Segment 3A, this area mainly consists of
13 disturbed agricultural land and residential and commercial activity. Because Option A would not
14 require any ground disturbance above what is required to construct the proposed project, no
15 additional impacts on biological species would be anticipated.

16
17 Operation and maintenance procedures would periodically require that the poles be repainted;
18 however, painting activities would occur infrequently over the long term and would be temporary.
19 In addition, because the poles are located predominantly on disturbed land, it is anticipated that the
20 impact would be minimally invasive with respect to biological resources. Therefore, long-term
21 impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant.

22 23 **Cultural Resources**

24 Option A would not require any ground disturbance above what is required to construct the
25 proposed project; therefore, there would be no additional construction impacts on cultural
26 resources. Operation and maintenance procedures would periodically require that the poles be
27 repainted; however, no ground disturbance would be required, and there would be no potential to
28 impact cultural resources. Therefore, Option A would not result in short-term or long-term cultural
29 resources impacts.

30 31 **Geology**

32 Option A would not require any ground disturbance above what is required to construct the
33 proposed project; therefore, there would be no additional construction impacts on geology.
34 Operation and maintenance procedures would periodically require that the poles be repainted;
35 however, no ground disturbance would be required, and there would be no potential to impact
36 geology. Therefore, Option A would not result in short-term or long-term geologic impacts.

37 38 **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

39 Short-term impacts from hazardous materials may result from the application of paint during pole
40 painting activities. Painting activities would require the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous
41 materials on site similar to what is required for the proposed project; however, Option A would
42 increase the amount of hazardous materials. Compliance with federal and state regulations would
43 minimize the potential impact from hazards by requiring the applicant to prepare and implement a
44 Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) and other measures to prevent the release of
45 hazardous materials. Implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would
46 also reduce potential short-term impacts to less than significant.

1 Operation and maintenance procedures would periodically require that the poles be repainted;
2 however, painting activities would occur infrequently over the long-term and would be temporary.
3 The impact due to the use and transport of paint and other hazardous materials would be greater
4 than what is described for the proposed project, but it would not be significant. The applicant
5 would follow standard best management practices and regulations regarding hazardous materials
6 handling, which would ensure that impacts under this criterion are reduced to an acceptable level.
7 Therefore, long-term impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than
8 significant.
9

10 **Hydrology and Water Quality**

11 Option A would not require any additional ground disturbance above what is required for the
12 proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to drainage patterns, erosion, and other hydrological
13 or water quality impacts related to ground disturbance would be no greater than what is already
14 described for the proposed project. In addition, although pole painting could require a slightly
15 longer construction period along Segment 3A, which could therefore necessitate the use of
16 additional water for dust suppression, it is expected that the amount of water would be minimal,
17 particularly considering that much of the Segment 3A ROW is located along Casitas Pass Road next
18 to a paved roadway. Therefore, additional construction impacts related to hydrology and water for
19 Option A would be less than significant.
20

21 Operation and maintenance procedures would periodically require that the poles be repainted;
22 however, painting activities would occur infrequently over the long term and would be temporary.
23 In addition, no new ground disturbance would be required. Therefore, long-term impacts related to
24 hydrological resources would be less than significant.
25

26 **Land Use and Planning**

27 Implementation of Option A as part of the issuance of a retroactive CDP would reduce the long-term
28 significant impact to land use that resulted from the construction of the past work within the
29 Coastal Zone (along Segment 3A) without a CDP.
30

31 **Noise**

32 Although painting activities would require the use of additional workers and vehicles, it is not
33 expected that these activities would raise the noise level above what is already described for the
34 proposed project during construction. Periodically during operations, the poles would require
35 repainting, which would result in additional noise impacts above what was described for the
36 proposed project. However, such impacts would occur infrequently over the long term and would
37 be less than the estimated noise levels during construction and of lesser duration. Therefore, the
38 impact would be less than significant.
39

40 **Population and Housing**

41 Although painting activities would require the use of additional workers, the number of additional
42 workers would be limited. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be
43 pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the
44 temporary addition of a small number of painting crew workers would not cause a permanent
45 increase in the local population and, as such, would not necessitate additional housing. Although
46 the poles would require periodic repainting during operations and maintenance, painting activities
47 would be infrequent and temporary, with crews consisting of no more than three to four people.

1 Therefore, it is not expected that workers would relocate to the project area during operations, and
2 Option A would not result in short-term or long-term impacts related to population and housing.

3 4 **Public Services and Utilities**

5 Although painting activities would require the use of additional workers, the number of additional
6 workers would be limited. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be
7 pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the
8 temporary addition of a small number of painting crew workers would not cause a permanent
9 increase in the local population, and existing public services and utilities would be adequate to
10 serve demand. No new public services or utilities would be required. Although the poles would
11 require periodic repainting during operations and maintenance, painting activities would be
12 infrequent and temporary, with crews consisting of no more than three to four people. Therefore, it
13 is not expected that workers would relocate to the project area during operations, and Option A
14 would not result in short-term or long-term impacts related to public services and utilities.

15 16 **Recreation**

17 Although painting activities would require the use of additional workers, the number of additional
18 workers would be limited. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be
19 pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the
20 temporary addition of a small number of painting crew workers would not cause a permanent
21 increase in the local population, and the capacity of local parks would not be exceeded. No new
22 recreational facilities or upgrades to existing recreational facilities would be required. Although the
23 poles would require periodic repainting during operations and maintenance, painting activities
24 would be infrequent and temporary, with crews consisting of no more than three to four people.
25 Therefore, it is not expected that workers would relocate to the project area during operations, and
26 Option A would not result in short-term or long-term impacts related to recreational facilities.

27 28 **Traffic and Transportation**

29 Although painting activities would require the use of additional workers and equipment, pole
30 painting activities would not necessitate a large number of additional vehicles. The applicant's
31 projected traffic numbers for the proposed project are sufficiently conservative to include
32 temporary pole painting activities. Although the poles would require periodic repainting during
33 operations and maintenance, painting activities would be infrequent and temporary, with crews
34 consisting of no more than three to four people. Therefore, Option A would not result in an increase
35 in baseline traffic levels in the project area. Therefore, Option A would not result in short-term or
36 long-term impacts related to traffic or transportation.

37 38 **7.4.5.2 Option B: Replace Existing LWS Poles with Wood Poles Along Segment 3A**

39 This section compares the long-term environmental impacts that resulted from the past work along
40 Segment 3A with those of Option B. A description of Option B is provided above in Section 7.4.4.2.

41 42 **Aesthetics**

43 Both construction activities and the completed structures would be noticeable to sensitive
44 receptors. However, although additional activities, equipment, and workers would be required
45 above what is required for the proposed project, these activities would be temporary. Further, upon
46 project completion, the wooden poles would reduce the contrast of the existing metallic
47 subtransmission poles against the surrounding environmental setting. Therefore, while
48 implementation of Option B would temporarily cause an increase in short-term aesthetic impacts

1 compared to the proposed project, Option B would lessen the significant long-term aesthetic
2 impacts that resulted from the past work.

4 **Agriculture and Forestry**

5 Although construction activities would temporarily interfere with agriculture uses in the project
6 area above what is described for the proposed project, including agricultural production on Prime
7 and Unique Farmland and land under Williamson Act contract, activities would be conducted
8 within the existing ROW. Agricultural activities would return to existing conditions post-
9 construction because the new wood poles would result in approximately the same amount of
10 permanent ground disturbance as the existing LWS poles. Implementation of Option ~~A-B~~ would
11 have a less than significant short-term impact on agriculture. Operation and maintenance
12 procedures would be the same as for the proposed project, and there would be no additional
13 permanent disturbance. Therefore, Option ~~A-B~~ would not result in long-term impacts on
14 agriculture.

15
16 There is no forest land or timberland located along Segment 3A. Therefore, Option B would have no
17 impact on forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

19 **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas**

20 Short-term impacts on air quality and from GHGs would result from the removal of the existing
21 LWS poles and construction of wooden poles. Pole replacement would require the use of
22 construction equipment and vehicles, which would result in increased criteria pollutant emissions
23 above what is described for the proposed project. Additional emissions are assumed to be similar to
24 the emissions that resulted from construction of the existing LWS poles during the past work in the
25 project area (Table 7-1). ~~Although the addition of~~ The addition of this small amount of air
26 ~~emissions to the proposed project emissions would not raise the level of emissions, above a~~
27 ~~significance threshold because these~~ emissions would be temporary and transient. In addition, the
28 SBCAPCD does not have an established significance threshold for air pollutant or GHG emissions
29 during construction. Therefore, although the CPUC identified significant air quality impacts for the
30 proposed project as a whole using the SCAQMD's construction thresholds, the project options
31 would be implemented at the sole discretion of Santa Barbara County. Therefore, the SCAQMD
32 thresholds would not apply, and short-term impacts related to air quality and GHGs associated with
33 this project option would be remain less than significant. In addition, operation and maintenance
34 procedures would be the same as those discussed for the proposed project. Therefore, Option B
35 would not result in long-term impacts related to air quality or GHGs.

37 **Biological Resources**

38 Although a variety of species may be present along Segment 3A, the area consists mainly of
39 disturbed agricultural land and residential and commercial activity. Although Option B would
40 require additional ground disturbance above what is required to construct the proposed project,
41 construction would occur within an existing ROW. The applicant would be required to follow all
42 Mitigation Measures (MMs) required for the proposed project and would implement Applicant
43 Proposed Measures (APMs) as described in Chapter 2 "Project Description." Therefore, short-term
44 impacts on biological resources would remain less than significant. In addition, operation and
45 maintenance procedures would be the same as those discussed for the proposed project. Therefore,
46 Option B would not result in long-term biological resources impacts.

1 **Cultural Resources**

2 Ground disturbance during pole replacement would increase the potential to damage a previously
3 unknown cultural or paleontological resource. However, compliance with applicable federal and
4 state regulations and implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would
5 reduce the potential impacts associated with Option B to less than significant.

6
7 **Geology**

8 Ground disturbance during pole replacement would increase the potential for a geologic hazard to
9 occur. However, compliance with applicable federal and state regulations, including GO 95, and
10 implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would reduce the potential
11 impacts associated with Option B to less than significant.

12
13 **Hydrology and Water Quality**

14 Ground disturbance during pole replacement would increase the potential for impacts related to
15 drainage patterns, erosion, and other hydrological or water quality impacts; however, the applicant
16 would comply with applicable federal and state regulations and implement APMs and MMs
17 identified for the proposed project. For example, the applicant would be required to implement a
18 SWPPP, which would include erosion measures and other measures to reduce impacts on
19 surrounding groundwater and hydrological features. In addition, although Option B would require a
20 slightly longer construction period along Segment 3A, which would necessitate the use of additional
21 water for dust suppression, it is expected that the amount of water would be minimal. Therefore,
22 additional construction impacts related to hydrology and water for Option B would be less than
23 significant. No long-term impacts on hydrology or water quality would be anticipated.

24
25 **Hazardous Materials**

26 Short-term impacts from hazardous materials may result from the pole replacements. Pole
27 replacement activities would require the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials on site
28 similar to the proposed project. For example, disposal of the existing LWS poles would be similar to
29 what is proposed for Segments 3B and 4. In addition, the applicant would comply with federal and
30 state regulations, which would minimize the potential impact from hazards by requiring the
31 applicant to prepare and implement a SWPPP, HMBP, and other measures to prevent the release of
32 hazardous materials. Implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would
33 also reduce the potential short-term impacts of Option B. No long-term impacts from hazards and
34 hazardous materials would be anticipated.

35
36 **Land Use and Planning**

37 Implementation of Option B as part of the issuance of a retroactive CDP would reduce the long-term
38 significant impact to land use that resulted from the past work within the Coastal Zone (along
39 Segment 3A) without a CDP.

40
41 **Noise**

42 Short-term impacts related to noise and vibration would result from the implementation of Option
43 B. Additional traffic would be generated in the project area, and the use of additional power tools
44 and equipment during pole removal and replacement activities would temporarily cause an
45 increase in ambient noise levels during construction above what is anticipated for the proposed
46 project.

47

1 Impacts would be generally similar to what occurred during the past work along Segment 3A
2 between 1999 and 2004. Heavy-duty equipment and vehicles would generate vibration levels
3 ranging between 58 and 87 VdB at 25 feet during short-term construction activities. All receptors
4 located at a distance of 50 feet or beyond would perceive vibration levels below 80 VdB, which is
5 generally acceptable at residential areas for activities that involve less than 30 vibration events of
6 the same kind per day (FTA 2006). Construction-related vibrations would exceed the human
7 perception threshold (65 VdB) for receptors located within 50 feet from heavy-duty equipment;
8 however, activities at any one location would be temporary. Noise during pole replacement would
9 be transient and short term, which would result in a less than significant impact.

10
11 Operation and maintenance procedures associated with Option B would the same as the proposed
12 project. Therefore, there would be no long-term significant noise impacts.

13 14 **Population and Housing**

15 It is assumed that construction requirements for Option B would be similar to what was required
16 during the past work along Segment 3A. Therefore, it is assumed that an additional 24 workers
17 would be required above what is anticipated for the proposed project. As described for the
18 proposed project, the majority of workers would be pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa
19 Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the temporary addition of 24 workers would not cause a
20 permanent increase in the local population and would not necessitate additional housing. In
21 addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be the same as for the proposed project.
22 Therefore, Option B would not result in long-term impacts related to population and housing.

23 24 **Public Services and Utilities**

25 As described above, construction of Option B would require an estimated 24 workers above what is
26 anticipated for the proposed project. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers
27 would be pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore,
28 the temporary addition of 24 workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local
29 population, and existing public services and utilities would be adequate to serve demand. No new
30 public services or utilities would be required. In addition, operation and maintenance procedures
31 would be the same as for the proposed project. Therefore, Option B would not result in long-term
32 impacts related to public services and utilities.

33 34 **Recreation**

35 As described above, construction of Option B would require an estimated 24 workers above what is
36 anticipated for the proposed project. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers
37 would be pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore,
38 the temporary addition of 24 workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local
39 population. Although workers may use local parks while working in the construction area, use
40 would be temporary, and the capacity of local parks would not be exceeded. No new recreation
41 facilities would be required. In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be the same
42 as for the proposed project. Therefore, Option B would not result in long-term impacts related to
43 recreational facilities.

44 45 **Traffic and Transportation**

46 As described above, it is assumed that construction requirements for Option B would be similar to
47 what was required during the past work in the project area. Therefore, it is assumed that an
48 additional 24 workers would be required above what is anticipated for the proposed project. The

1 applicant estimated that the past work along Segment 3A generated 72 daily vehicle trips, which is
2 inclusive of the estimated 24 construction workers making two daily personal vehicle trips (one
3 trip in the morning from home to the staging yard, and one trip in the reverse in the evening). As
4 described in Section 4.15, "Traffic and Transportation," the Santa Barbara County Congestion
5 Management Plan is not applicable to traffic associated with construction. Therefore, the temporary
6 addition of 72 daily vehicle trips would be considered a less than significant short-term impact.

7
8 In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be the same as for the proposed project.
9 Therefore, Option B would not result in long-term impacts related to traffic or transportation.

10 11 **7.4.5.3 Option C – Relocate the Portion of Segment 3A that Traverses Agricultural Land in the Shepard 12 Mesa Community to Underground Conduit**

13
14 This section compares the long-term environmental impacts that resulted from the past work along
15 Segment 3A with those of Option C. A description of Option C is provided in Section 7.4.4.3.

16 17 **Aesthetics**

18 Although construction activities would be noticeable to sensitive receptors and would be in
19 addition to what is required for the proposed project, these activities would be temporary. Further,
20 upon project completion, even though Option C would require the installation of two new TSP riser
21 poles, which would be more noticeable than the current LWS poles, undergrounding a portion of
22 Segment 3A would reduce the visual impact in the Shepard Mesa area. A smaller distribution line
23 would be installed adjacent to the existing ROW to distribute power to the Shepard Mesa area;
24 however, the new wood pole distribution line would be 55 feet tall, which is considerably shorter
25 than the existing LWS poles. Therefore, while implementation of Option C would temporarily cause
26 an increase in short-term aesthetic impacts compared to the proposed project, Option C would
27 lessen the significant long-term aesthetic impacts that resulted from the past work.

28 29 **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas**

30 Short-term impacts on air quality and from GHGs would result from the undergrounding of the
31 subtransmission line and installation of new wooden distribution poles. The additional use of
32 construction equipment and vehicles, such as trenching equipment, would result in increased
33 criteria pollutant emissions and GHGs. Additional emissions would be greater than the emissions
34 that resulted from construction of the existing LWS poles during the past work in the project area
35 (Table 7-1). For example, removal of the existing subtransmission line and construction of a new
36 wooden distribution line that would be offset from the underground conduit would result in similar
37 emissions to the past work in the project area. However, additional earthwork required for
38 trenching activities would result in a further increase in air pollutants and GHG emissions. Table 7-
39 4 depicts a conservative estimate of the total emissions that would result from implementation of
40 Option C (see Appendix C).

41
42 The emissions depicted in Table 7-4 would be temporary and transient, representing a small
43 increase in emissions in Santa Barbara County as depicted in Table 7-5. The SBCAPCD does not
44 have an established significance threshold for air pollutant emissions during construction;
45 therefore, this increase would not be significant. Therefore, although the CPUC identified
46 significant air quality impacts for the proposed project as a whole using the SCAQMD's construction
47 thresholds, the project options would be implemented at the sole discretion of Santa Barbara

1 | County. Therefore, the SCAQMD thresholds would not apply, and short-term impacts related to air
 2 | quality associated with this project option would be less than significant.
 3 |

Table 7-4 Option C Estimated Daily Emissions (Shepard Mesa Undergrounding)

Activity	ROG (lbs./day)	CO (lbs./day)	NO _x (lbs./day)	SO _x (lbs./day)	PM ₁₀ (lbs./day)	PM _{2.5} (lbs./day)
Vault Installation	10.85	41.83	83.07	0.14	66.83	9.95
Duct Bank Installation	3.08	19.35	19.20	0.04	62.69	7.09
Install Underground Cable	11.53	40.00	86.61	0.15	4.24	2.88
Distribution Relocation - Cable and Civil	6.92	33.36	54.60	0.09	24.82	4.53
TOTAL Peak Daily Emissions	32.37	134.55	243.47	0.42	158.58	24.46
TOTAL Underground Construction Emissions (tons)¹	0.49	2.02	3.65	0.006	2.38	0.37

Source: E & E 2014

Note: ¹Total Option C emissions over a 30-day installation period.

4 |
 5 | Similarly, for GHGs, the implementation of Option C would result in a temporary increase in
 6 | emissions over the proposed project as depicted in Table 7-6.

Table 7-5 Total Santa Barbara County Emissions Including Option C Emissions

Emission Sources	Air Pollutant Emissions (tons per day)					
	ROG	CO	NO _x	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Total Emissions in Santa Barbara County from the Proposed Project ¹	37.0	164.9	91.6	36.5	27.9	13.4
Additional Option C Emissions	0.49	2.02	3.65	0.006	2.38	0.37
Total Emissions in Santa Barbara County from the Proposed Project with Option C ²	37.49	166.92	95.25	36.51	30.28	13.77
Percent Increase	1.3%	1.2%	3.9%	0	8.5%	2.7%

Notes:

¹ Because CEQA does not require review of improperly completed past work and the information is provided for Santa Barbara County's consideration only, the Option C emissions were conservatively added to the Santa Barbara County emissions as opposed to the total project emissions.

² Emissions include Segment 3A emissions, such as the installation of fault return conductor, which would no longer be conducted if Option C is implemented. Therefore, total emissions estimates are considered to be conservative.

7 |
Table 7-6 Option C: Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Phase	MTCO _{2e}
Vault Installation	52.02
Duct Bank Installation	3.57
Install Underground Cable	54.64
Distribution Relocation - Cable and Civil	37.97
TOTAL	148

8 |
 9 | The addition of 148 MTCO_{2e} to proposed project emissions would increase GHG emissions to 3,970
 10 | MTCO_{2e} in 2015 (3.8 percent increase). Therefore, Option C would result in a less than significant
 11 | short-term impact related to GHGs during construction.
 12 |

1 Operation and maintenance of the undergrounded subtransmission line would require fewer
2 vehicle inspections, which would reduce current emissions associated with a small number of truck
3 trips during operations and maintenance procedures. Therefore, Option C would have no long-term
4 impacts related to air quality or GHGs.

6 **Agriculture**

7 In order to place the subtransmission line in underground conduit, SCE would likely have to obtain
8 new ROW easements. The new ROW easements may or may not be located within the existing ROW.
9 For example, the current third-party services such as cable and telephone services, that use the
10 existing topped wooden poles along Segment 3A would require a new distribution line to be offset
11 from the underground line. In addition, while some agricultural activities may be permitted to
12 continue on the surface, agricultural production would be limited above the underground conduit
13 and underneath the distribution line. Because the exact location of the new easements is unknown,
14 Option C could also result in the conversion of land zoned for agriculture and possibly Important
15 Farmland land to a non-agricultural use.

16
17 According to the applicant, in order to place underground conduit, a 30-foot-wide path would be
18 required, as well as a permanent access road for line maintenance. This could result in
19 approximately 140,000 square feet of land converted from agricultural uses (approximately 3.2
20 acres), rendering the land unavailable to most agricultural uses. Therefore, Option C would result in
21 long-term impacts on agriculture. Although these impacts would not be considered significant in
22 the context of County-wide agriculture, the impact in the context of the Shepard Mesa community
23 could be considered significant because it would hinder local agricultural activity and reduce the
24 amount of production within this small community.

25
26 Operation and maintenance would require fewer vehicle inspections to maintain the underground
27 subtransmission line; however, in circumstances where maintenance is necessary, earthwork
28 would be required to locate the new underground infrastructure. This could periodically result in
29 interruptions to agricultural production over the long term; however, such activities would be
30 infrequent and therefore less than significant.

31
32 There is no forest land or timberland located along Segment 3A. Therefore, Option C would have no
33 impact on forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

35 **Biological Resources**

36 Although a variety of species may be present along Segment 3A, the area mainly consists of
37 disturbed agricultural land and residential and commercial activity. Therefore, although Option C.B
38 would require additional ground disturbance, such as trenching, the applicant would be required to
39 follow all MMs required for the proposed project and would implement APMs as described in
40 Chapter 2, "Project Description." For example, a number of oak trees are present in the area.
41 Acquiring new ROW in order to offset the new wooden distribution poles could result in additional
42 tree trimming and biological impacts above what is required for the proposed project; however,
43 MMs and APMs would reduce the impact to less than significant. In addition, undergrounding the
44 subtransmission line could result in a beneficial impact on avian species because risks associated
45 with electrocution and collision with the overhead conductors would be reduced.

46
47 Operation and maintenance would require fewer vehicle inspections to maintain the underground
48 subtransmission line; however, in circumstances where maintenance is necessary, earthwork
49 would be required to locate the new underground infrastructure. This could result in temporary

1 impacts to biological species periodically over the long term; however, such activities would be
2 infrequent and therefore less than significant.

3
4 **Cultural Resources**

5 Ground disturbance during trenching and distribution pole construction would be greater than
6 required for the proposed project, which would increase the likelihood of damaging a previously
7 unknown cultural or paleontological resource. Compliance with applicable federal and state
8 regulations and implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would reduce
9 the potential impacts associated with this project option to less than significant.

10
11 Operation and maintenance could require earthwork, as necessary, to locate the new underground
12 infrastructure. This could result in further impacts on buried archaeological or paleontological
13 resources in the future; however, the applicant would continue to follow applicable federal and
14 state regulations, which would reduce impacts. Therefore, long-term impacts related to Option C
15 maintenance would be less than significant.

16
17 **Geology**

18 Ground disturbance during pole replacement would increase the potential for a geologic hazard to
19 occur. However, compliance with applicable federal and state regulations, including GO 95 and
20 implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would reduce the potential
21 impacts associated with Option C to less than significant.

22
23 **Hydrology and Water Quality**

24 Ground disturbance during trenching would increase the potential for impacts related to drainage
25 patterns, erosion, and other hydrological or water quality impacts; however, the applicant would
26 comply with applicable federal and state regulations and implement APMs and MMs identified for
27 the proposed project. For example, the applicant would be required to implement a SWPPP, which
28 would include erosion measures and other measures to reduce impacts on surrounding
29 groundwater and hydrological features. In addition, although Option C would require a longer
30 construction period, which would necessitate the use of additional water for dust suppression, it is
31 expected that the amount of water would be minimal. As a result, construction impacts related to
32 hydrology and water for Option C would be less than significant. No long-term impacts on
33 hydrology or water quality would be anticipated.

34
35 **Hazardous Materials**

36 Short-term impacts from hazardous materials may result from pole removal. Pole removal activities
37 would require the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials on site. For example, disposal
38 of the existing LWS poles would be similar to what is proposed for Segments 3B and 4. Hazardous
39 materials would include fuel, oil, and other lubricants from construction equipment and vehicles.
40 Compliance with federal and state regulations would minimize the potential impact from hazards
41 by requiring the applicant to prepare and implement a SWPPP, HMBP, and other measures to
42 prevent the release of hazardous materials. Implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the
43 proposed project would also reduce potential short-term impacts. No long-term impacts from
44 hazards and hazardous materials would be anticipated.

1 **Land Use and Planning**

2 Implementation of this option as part of the issuance of a retroactive CDP would reduce the long-
3 term significant impact to land use that resulted from the construction of the past work within the
4 Coastal Zone (along Segment 3A) without a CDP.

5
6 **Noise**

7 Short-term impacts related to noise and vibration would result from the implementation of Option
8 C. For example, additional traffic generated in the project area and the use of additional power tools
9 and equipment would temporarily cause an increase in ambient noise levels during construction
10 above what is anticipated for the proposed project.

11
12 Although Option C involves trenching activities, noise impacts would nonetheless be generally
13 similar to what occurred during the previous construction period between 1999 and 2004. Heavy-
14 duty equipment and vehicles would generate vibration levels ranging between 58 and 87 VdB at 25
15 feet during short-term construction activities. All receptors located at a distance of 50 feet or
16 beyond would perceive vibration levels below 80 VdB, which is generally acceptable at residential
17 areas for activities that involve fewer than 30 vibration events of the same kind per day (FTA
18 2006). Construction-related vibrations would exceed the human perception threshold (65 VdB) for
19 receptors located within 50 feet of heavy-duty equipment; however, activities at any one location
20 would be temporary. Undergrounding activities would be completed within 30 days, and noise
21 would be transient and short term.

22
23 Operation and maintenance could require earthwork, as necessary, to locate the new underground
24 infrastructure. This could result in further impacts related to noise in the future; however, the
25 applicant would continue to follow noise ordinances, which would reduce impacts. In addition,
26 operation and maintenance activities would occur with less frequency than what is expected for the
27 proposed project. Therefore, while noise would be greater during infrequent operation and
28 maintenance activities than what was described for the proposed project, the long-term noise
29 impacts related to Option C would still be less than significant.

30
31 **Population and Housing**

32 While additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and place the line in
33 new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 30-day construction
34 period. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be pulled from the
35 existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the temporary addition
36 workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local population and, as such, would not
37 necessitate additional housing. In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less
38 frequent than for the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no long-term impacts related to
39 population and housing.

40
41 **Public Services and Utilities**

42 As described above, while additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and
43 place the line in new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 30-
44 day construction period. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be
45 pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the
46 temporary addition of workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local population, and
47 existing public services and utilities would be adequate to serve demand. No new public services or
48 utilities would be required. In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less

1 frequent than for the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no long-term impacts related to
2 public services and utilities.

3
4 **Recreation**

5 As described above, while additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and
6 place the line in new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 30-
7 day construction period. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be
8 pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the
9 temporary addition of 24 workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local population,
10 and the capacity of local parks would not be exceeded. No new recreation facilities would be
11 required. In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less frequent than for the
12 proposed project. Therefore, there would be no long-term impacts related to recreational facilities.

13
14 **Traffic and Transportation**

15 As described above, while additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and
16 place the line in new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 30-
17 day construction period. Even if the number of workers and vehicle trips were increased by half
18 over what the applicant estimated for the past work in the area (36 workers and 108 daily vehicle
19 trips), given the short duration of activities, the increase would not be considered a significant
20 impact.

21
22 In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less frequent than for the proposed
23 project. Therefore, Option C would not result in long-term impacts related to traffic or
24 transportation.

25
26 **7.4.5.4 Option D – Relocate Segment 3A to Underground Conduit**

27
28 This section compares the long-term environmental impacts that resulted from the past work along
29 Segment 3A with those of Option D. A description of Option D is provided above in Section 7.4.4.4.

30
31 **Aesthetics**

32 Although construction activities would be noticeable to sensitive receptors and would be in
33 addition to what is required for the proposed project, these activities would be temporary. Further,
34 upon project completion, even though Option D would require the installation of two new TSP riser
35 poles, which would be more noticeable than the current LWS poles, undergrounding Segment 3A
36 would reduce the visual impact in the Shepard Mesa area ~~and along an eligible state scenic highway.~~
37 A smaller distribution line would be constructed within the Shepard Mesa area; however, the new
38 wood pole distribution line would be 55 feet tall, which is considerably less than the existing LWS
39 poles. Therefore, while implementation of Option D would temporarily cause an increase in short-
40 term aesthetic impacts compared to the proposed project, Option D would lessen the significant
41 long-term aesthetic impacts that resulted from the past work.

42
43 **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas**

44 Short-term impacts on air quality and from GHGs would result from the undergrounding of the
45 subtransmission line and construction of new wooden distribution poles. The additional use of
46 construction equipment and vehicles, such as trenching equipment, would result in increased
47 criteria pollutant emissions and GHGs. Additional emissions would be greater than the emissions
48 that resulted from construction of the existing LWS poles during the past work in the project area

1 (Table 7-1). For example, removal of the existing subtransmission line and construction of a new
2 wooden distribution line in the Shepard Mesa community would result in similar emissions to the
3 past work in the project area. However, additional earthwork required for trenching activities along
4 the length of Foothill Road and Casitas Pass Road would result in a further increase in air pollutants
5 and GHG emissions. Table 7-7 depicts an estimate of the total emissions that would result from
6 implementation of Option D (see Appendix C).
7

Table 7-7 Option D Estimated Daily Emissions (Segment 3A Undergrounding)

Activity	ROG (lbs./day)	CO (lbs./day)	NO _x (lbs./day)	SO _x (lbs./day)	PM ₁₀ (lbs./day)	PM _{2.5} (lbs./day)
Vault Installation	10.85	41.83	83.07	0.14	66.83	9.95
Duct Bank Installation	3.08	19.35	19.20	0.04	62.69	7.09
Install Underground Cable	11.53	40.00	86.61	0.15	4.24	2.88
Distribution Relocation - Cable and Civil	6.92	33.36	54.60	0.09	24.82	4.53
TOTAL Peak Daily Emissions	32.37	134.55	243.47	0.42	158.58	24.46
TOTAL Underground Construction Emissions (tons)¹	1.47	6.12	11.08	0.02	7.22	1.11

Source: E & E 2014

Note: ¹Total Option D emissions over a 91-day installation period.

8
9 The emissions depicted in Table 7-6 would be temporary and transient, representing a small to
10 moderate increase in emissions in Santa Barbara County relative to the proposed project (Table 7-
11 8), particularly for PM₁₀ emissions. Regardless, the SBCAPCD does not have an established
12 significance threshold for air pollutant emissions during construction; ~~therefore, this increase~~
13 ~~would not be significant.~~ Therefore, although the CPUC identified significant air quality impacts for
14 the proposed project as a whole using the SCAQMD's construction thresholds, the project options
15 would be implemented at the sole discretion of Santa Barbara County. Therefore, the SCAQMD
16 thresholds would not apply, and short-term impacts related to air quality associated with this
17 project option would be less than significant.
18

Table 7-8 Total Santa Barbara County Emissions Including Option D Emissions

Emission Sources	Air Pollutant Emissions (tons per day)					
	ROG	CO	NO _x	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Total Emissions in Santa Barbara County from the Proposed Project ¹	37.0	164.9	91.6	36.5	27.9	13.4
Additional Option D Emissions	1.47	6.12	11.08	0.02	7.22	1.11
Total Emissions in Santa Barbara County from the Proposed Project With Option D ²	38.47	176.02	102.68	36.52	35.12	14.51
Percent Increase	3.9%	3.7%	12.0%	0	25.8%	8.2%

Notes:

¹ Because CEQA does not require review of improperly completed past work and the information is provided for Santa Barbara County's consideration only, the Option D emissions were conservatively added to the Santa Barbara County emissions as opposed to the total project emissions.

² Emissions include Segment 3A emissions, such as the installation of fault return conductor, which would no longer be conducted if Option D is implemented. Therefore, total emissions estimates are considered to be conservative.

19
20 Similarly, for GHGs, the implementation of Option D would result in a temporary increase in
21 emissions over the proposed project as depicted in Table 7-9.
22

Table 7-9 Option D: Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Phase	MTCO ₂ e
Vault Installation	182.08
Duct Bank Installation	76.27
Install Underground Cable	54.64
Distribution Relocation - Cable and Civil	37.97
TOTAL	351

1
2 The addition of 351 MTCO₂e to proposed project emissions would increase GHG emissions to 4,173
3 MT CO₂e in 2015 (9.2 percent increase). Although a 9.2 percent increase could be considered a
4 moderate increase over the proposed project emissions, the increase would not exceed any GHG
5 emissions thresholds. Therefore, Option D would result in a less than significant short-term impact
6 related to GHGs during construction.

7
8 Operation and maintenance of the undergrounded subtransmission line would require fewer
9 vehicle inspections, which would reduce current emissions associated with a small number of truck
10 trips during operation and maintenance procedures. Therefore, Option D would have no long-term
11 impacts related to air quality or GHGs.

12
13 **Agriculture**

14 In order to place the subtransmission line in underground conduit, SCE would have to obtain new
15 ROW easements. The new easements would likely not be located within the existing ROW. For
16 example, the current third-party services, such as cable and telephone services, that use the existing
17 topped wooden poles along Segment 3A generally follow the same path as the subtransmission line.
18 The new underground conduit would be offset from the distribution line along the roadway, which
19 could include new ROW acquisitions consisting of Unique Farmland, Prime Farmland, Farmland of
20 Statewide Importance, and land under Williamson Act contract. While some agricultural activities
21 may be permitted to continue on the surface, agricultural production would be limited above the
22 underground conduit and underneath the distribution line. Because the exact location of the new
23 easements is unknown, Option D could also result in the conversion of land zoned for agriculture
24 and possibly Important Farmland land, to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, Option D would likely
25 result in long-term impacts on agriculture above what are described for the proposed project.

26
27 The distribution line that would be constructed in the Shepard Mesa community within the existing
28 ROW would have temporary impacts during construction, but during operations and maintenance,
29 agricultural production would return to baseline levels.

30
31 Operation and maintenance would require less vehicle inspection to maintain the underground
32 subtransmission line; however, in circumstances where maintenance is necessary, earthwork
33 would be required to locate the new underground infrastructure. This could periodically result in
34 interruptions to agricultural production over the long term; however, such activities would be
35 infrequent and therefore less than significant.

36
37 | There is no forest land or timberland located along Segment 3A. Therefore, Option D would have
38 no impact on forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

39

1 **Biological Resources**

2 Although a variety of species may be present along Segment 3A, the new underground
3 subtransmission line would be located along an existing roadway. Therefore, although Option D
4 would require additional ground disturbance, such as trenching, the applicant would be required to
5 follow all MMs required for the proposed project and would implement APMs as described in
6 Chapter 2, "Project Description." For example, a number of oak trees are present in the area.
7 Acquiring new ROW in order to offset the new underground subtransmission line could result in
8 additional tree trimming and biological impacts above what is required for the proposed project;
9 however, MMs and APMs would reduce the impact to less than significant. In addition,
10 undergrounding the subtransmission line could result in a beneficial impact on avian species
11 because risks associated with electrocution and collision with the overhead conductors would be
12 reduced.

13
14 Operation and maintenance would require fewer vehicle inspections to maintain the underground
15 subtransmission line; however, in circumstances where maintenance is necessary, earthwork
16 would be required to locate the new underground infrastructure. This could result in temporary
17 impacts to biological species periodically over the long term; however, such activities would be
18 infrequent and therefore less than significant.

19
20 **Cultural Resources**

21 Ground disturbance during trenching and distribution pole construction would be greater than
22 required for the proposed project, which would increase the likelihood of damaging a previously
23 unknown cultural or paleontological resource. Compliance with applicable federal and state
24 regulations and implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would reduce
25 the potential impacts associated with this project option to less than significant.

26
27 Operation and maintenance could require earthwork, as necessary, to locate the new underground
28 infrastructure. This could result in further impacts on buried archaeological or paleontological
29 resources in the future; however, the applicant would continue to follow applicable federal and
30 state regulations, which would reduce impacts. Therefore, long-term impacts related to Option D
31 maintenance would be less than significant.

32
33 **Geology**

34 Ground disturbance during pole replacement would increase the potential for a geologic hazard to
35 occur. However, compliance with applicable federal and state regulations, including GO 95 and
36 implementation of APMs and MMs identified for the proposed project would reduce the potential
37 impacts associated with Option D to less than significant.

38
39 **Hydrology and Water Quality**

40 Ground disturbance during trenching would increase the potential for impacts related to drainage
41 patterns, erosion, and other hydrological or water quality impacts; however, the applicant would
42 comply with applicable federal and state regulations and implement APMs and MMs identified for
43 the proposed project. For example, the applicant would be required to implement a SWPPP, which
44 would include erosion measures and other measures to reduce impacts on surrounding
45 groundwater and hydrological features. In addition, although Option D would require a longer
46 construction period, which would necessitate the use of additional water for dust suppression, it is
47 expected that the amount of water would be minimal. As a result, construction impacts related to

1 hydrology and water for Option D would be less than significant. No long-term impacts on
2 hydrology or water quality would be anticipated.

3
4 **Hazardous Materials**

5 Short-term impacts from hazardous materials may result from pole removal. Pole removal activities
6 would require the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials on site. For example, disposal
7 of the existing LWS poles would be similar to what is proposed for Segments 3B and 4. Hazardous
8 materials would include fuel, oil, and other lubricants from construction equipment and vehicles.
9 Compliance with federal and state regulations would minimize the potential impact from hazards
10 by requiring the applicant to prepare and implement a SWPPP, HMBP, and other measures to
11 prevent the release of hazardous materials. Implementation of APM and MM identified for the
12 proposed project would also reduce potential short-term impacts.

13
14 Option D would require more work along the Caltrans roadway, which would increase health and
15 safety risks for workers due to vehicle collisions. The applicant would be required to implement the
16 APMs and MMs described for the proposed project, which include preparation of a traffic
17 management plan. Implementation of these measures would reduce this short-term impacts to less
18 than significant.

19
20 No long-term impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would be anticipated.

21
22 **Land Use and Planning**

23 Implementation of this option as part of the issuance of a retroactive CDP would reduce the long-
24 term significant impact to land use that resulted from the construction of the past work within the
25 Coastal Zone (along Segment 3A) without a CDP.

26
27 **Noise**

28 Short-term impacts related to noise and vibration would result from the implementation of Option
29 D. For example, additional traffic generated in the project area and the use of additional power tools
30 and equipment would temporarily cause an increase in ambient noise levels during construction
31 above what is anticipated for the proposed project.

32
33 Although Option D involves trenching activities, noise impacts would nonetheless be generally
34 similar to what occurred during the previous construction period between 1999 and 2004,
35 although spread out over a larger area. Heavy-duty equipment and vehicles would generate
36 vibration levels ranging between 58 and 87 VdB at 25 feet during short-term construction
37 activities. All receptors located at a distance of 50 feet or beyond would perceive vibration levels
38 below 80 VdB, which is generally acceptable at residential areas for activities that involve less than
39 30 vibration events of the same kind per day (FTA 2006). Construction-related vibrations would
40 exceed the human perception threshold (65 VdB) for receptors located within 50 feet from heavy-
41 duty equipment; however, activities at any one location would be temporary. Undergrounding
42 activities would be completed within 91 days, and noise would be transient and short-term.

43
44 Operation and maintenance could require earthwork to locate the new underground infrastructure.
45 This could result in further impacts related to noise in the future; however, the applicant would
46 adhere to noise ordinance requirements, which would reduce impacts. In addition, operation and
47 maintenance activities would occur with less frequency than what is expected for the proposed
48 project. Therefore, while noise would be greater during infrequent operation and maintenance

1 activities than what was described for the proposed project, the long-term noise impacts related to
2 Option D would nonetheless be less than significant.

3 4 **Population and Housing**

5 While additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and place the line in
6 new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 91-day construction
7 period. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be pulled from the
8 existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the temporary additional
9 workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local population and, as such, would not
10 necessitate additional housing. In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less
11 frequent than for the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no long-term impacts related to
12 population and housing.

13 14 **Public Services and Utilities**

15 As described above, while additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and
16 place the line in new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 91-
17 day construction period. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be
18 pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the
19 temporary addition of workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local population, and
20 existing public services and utilities would be adequate to serve demand. No new public services or
21 utilities would be required. In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less
22 frequent than for the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no long-term impacts related to
23 public services and utilities.

24 25 **Recreation**

26 As described above, while additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and
27 place the line in new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 91-
28 day construction period. As described for the proposed project, the majority of workers would be
29 pulled from the existing labor pool within Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. Therefore, the
30 temporary addition of workers would not cause a permanent increase in the local population, and
31 the capacity of local parks would not be exceeded. No new recreation facilities would be required.
32 In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less frequent than for the proposed
33 project. Therefore, there would be no long-term impacts related to recreational facilities.

34 35 **Traffic and Transportation**

36 As described above, while additional workers would be required to conduct trenching activities and
37 place the line in new underground conduit, the increase would be temporary over an estimated 91-
38 day construction period. Even if the number of workers and vehicle trips were increased by half
39 over what the applicant estimated for the past work in the area (36 workers and 108 daily vehicle
40 trips), given the short duration of activities, the increase would not be considered a significant
41 impact. However, additional road closures would be required to conduct trenching activities along
42 Casitas Pass Road and Foothill Road. Considering the proximity of Segment 3A to Carpinteria High
43 School, road closures could cause traffic delays during fall or spring semesters; however, road
44 closures would be temporary. Road closures would be temporary, and the applicant would comply
45 with APMs and MMs. MM TT-1 includes, including the implementation of a traffic control plan
46 during construction. Santa Barbara County would have the opportunity to review the traffic control
47 plan prior to its implementation. Therefore, there would be no long-term impacts related to traffic
48 and transportation. ~~short-term traffic impacts during construction would be less than significant.~~

1
2 In addition, operation and maintenance procedures would be less frequent than for the proposed
3 project. Therefore, Option D would not result in long-term impacts related to traffic or
4 transportation.
5
6

This page intentionally left blank.