

8.0 Environmental Impacts of the Past Work Along Segments 1 and 2

8.1 Background

As discussed in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Chapter 6, “Cumulative Impacts,” and Chapter 7 “Environmental Impacts of the Past Work Along Segment 3A,” 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). Santa Barbara County requested that the past work along Segment 3A be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project and is therefore included in Chapter 7 of this EIR.

Environmental impacts of the unpermitted past work along Segments 1 and 2 were not included in the Draft EIR as it is not considered part of the proposed project before the CPUC, and no regulatory agencies requested analysis of the impacts. However, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has decided to include discussion of environmental impacts of the past work along Segments 1 and 2 to support the Administrative Law Judge’s decisionmaking process. Inclusion of this information in the Final EIR does not require recirculation of the document because it does not change the EIR in a way that discloses a substantial adverse effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the project proponents have declined to implement (See CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5(a).)

This chapter analyzes the nature and extent of the environmental impacts from the past work along Segments 1 and 2 (Ventura County) 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 identify any significant long-term impacts that may have resulted from the past work along Segments 1 and 2. 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. 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). In such cases, the impact conclusion is identified as “undeterminable.”

Similar to Chapter 7, 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 CPUC process.

8.2 Description of Past Work along Segments 1 and 2

8.2.1 Segment 1

Segment 1 originates at Santa Clara Substation and terminated at Casitas Substation. The Getty Tap is located in Segment 1 and is discussed further below. The linear length of Segment 1 is approximately 9 miles. The past construction activities along Segment 1 included the following components:

- Forty lattice steel towers (LSTs) and one wood H-frame structure were removed, although foundation materials for 15 of the previous LSTs were not removed and remain in place;
- Thirty-seven tubular steel poles (TSPs) and 3 LSTs were constructed in line with the removed structures; and
- Two new 66-kV subtransmission lines were installed, each totaling approximately 47,500 feet in length of 954 stranded aluminum conductor (SAC), replacing 653 aluminum conductor steel-reinforced (ACSR) conductor.

The Getty Tap is located approximately in the middle of Segment 1. The Getty Tap provides service to the Getty Substation from the existing Santa Clara-Getty 66-kV Subtransmission line. The past construction activities at the Getty Tap included installation of two footings for TSPs, two lightweight steel (LWS) H-frames, one LWS pole, and two switches and removal of two wood H-frames and one wood pole.

8.2.2 Segment 2

Segment 2 originates at Casitas Substation and terminates at the 'Y' split which commences at the eastern terminuses of Segments 4 and 3B. The 'Y' is located south-southwest of Lake Casitas near Casitas Pass. The linear length of Segment 2 is approximately 4.1 miles. The past construction activities along Segment 2 included the following components:

- Twenty LSTs were removed, although foundation materials for 15 of the LSTs were not removed and remains in place;
- Sixteen TSPs and 2 new LSTs were constructed within the alignment of the removed structures; and
- Two new 66-kV subtransmission lines, each totaling approximately 21,500 feet in length, of 954 SAC were installed, replacing 653 ACSR conductor.

8.2.3 Construction Methods

Construction methods along Segments 1 and 2 were similar to the pole and conductor replacement for the proposed project, as described in Section 2.3, "Construction." The work required the establishment of four temporary staging areas in previously disturbed areas, per Table 8-1, which were used as reporting locations for workers, vehicle and equipment parking, and material storage.

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

1 Operation and maintenance activities associated with the existing subtransmission along Segments
 2 1 and 2 are similar to the operation and maintenance activities that were performed for the
 3 subtransmission structures and conductors that existed prior to 1999 and to the operation and
 4 maintenance activities described for the proposed project in Section 2.5, "Operation and
 5 Maintenance." Routine inspections, access road maintenance, tree trimming, and insulator washing
 6 were conducted on an annual or as needed basis, similar to current operations. The
 7 subtransmission lines were and continue to be maintained in a manner consistent with CPUC
 8 General Order (GO) 95.

9
10 **Table 8-1 Segments 1 and 2 Staging Yards c. 1999 to 2005**

<u>Yard Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Approximate Acreage</u>	<u>Project Component</u>
<u>Yard 1</u>	<u>South of Stanley Avenue, East of Hwy 33, Ventura County</u>	<u>Disturbed</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>Existing Pole Storage Yard</u>
<u>Yard 2</u>	<u>Santa Clara Substation, Elizabeth Rd, north of Foothill Rd, Ventura</u>	<u>Disturbed (paved and rocked areas)</u>	<u><0.25</u>	<u>Material & Hardware Storage</u>
<u>Yard 3</u>	<u>N/O intersection of Canet Rd & Ventura Ave, Ventura County</u>	<u>Disturbed (old paved parking area)</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>Equipment and Material Staging</u>
<u>Yard 4</u>	<u>Casitas Substation, N. Ventura Avenue, south of Parkview Dr, Ventura County</u>	<u>Disturbed (paved & rocked areas)</u>	<u><0.25</u>	<u>Material Staging</u>

11 Source: SCE 2012

12
13 **8.3 Environmental Impacts**

14
15 **8.3.1 Aesthetics**

16 **Impact AE-VC-A: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.**
 17 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

18
19 As stated in Section 4.1.1.5., the Ventura County General Plan designates the viewshed of Lake
 20 Casitas, including the area south and west of the lake crossed by a Segment 2 as a Scenic Resource
 21 Area (Ventura County 2011a, 2011b). In addition, the Ojai Valley Area Plan (Ventura County 2008)
 22 identifies ridgelines and other sensitive landscape features in the plan area as important scenic
 23 features requiring special consideration and protection and has mapped these within a designated
 24 Scenic Resource Protection Overlay zone.

25
26 Activities associated with construction of the existing structures along Segment 2 may have
 27 temporarily affected the viewshed of Lake Casitas and the ridgelines and other sensitive landscape
 28 features surrounding Lake Casitas area because construction activities were visible to sensitive
 29 viewers. However, this impact was short-term and less than significant.

30
31 The past work along Segment 2 resulted in two less structures. The existing TSP structures are
 32 slightly taller and have a more solid form than the LSTs that they replaced. However, as shown in
 33 KOPs 7a and 7b (Figures 4.1-8a and 4.1-8b), the existing TSPs are barely visible from Lake Casitas
 34 due to the distance, and details such as slight differences in structure height and width are not
 35 perceptible at this distance. Therefore, the long-term impact of the existing structures on scenic
 36 vistas is considered less than significant.

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

3 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

4
5 The western terminus of Segment 1 crosses over State Route (SR) 33, which is an eligible state
6 scenic highway (Caltrans 2012). Casitas Substation is located on the west side of SR 33. Activities
7 associated with construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segment 1 temporarily
8 damaged scenic resources within viewsheds of SR 33 because construction activities were visible to
9 sensitive viewers. However, this impact was short-term and less than significant.

10
11 Only one of the existing TSPs along Segment 1 is briefly visible to motorists on SR 33. Motorists
12 would not generally notice the TSP as it is partially screened from view by the existing topography
13 and vegetation and is located among several other transmission structures. Therefore, this long-
14 term aesthetic impact is less than significant.

15
16 **Impact AE-VC-C: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and**
17 **its surroundings.**

18 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

19
20 Activities associated with construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2
21 were visible to the public. However, these impacts were short-term and less than significant.

22
23 Segments 1 and 2 are located within rural areas of Ventura County. Only a few public roads are in
24 the vicinity of the segments. Public views of Segments 1 and 2 are limited because views are often
25 partially or fully blocked by existing topography and vegetation. When structures along Segments 1
26 and 2 are visible, they are often in the middleground or background of local viewsheds. The existing
27 TSP structures are slightly taller and have a more solid form than the LSTs that they replaced.
28 However, due to the distance and limited views of these structures, details such as slight differences
29 in structure height and width are not perceptible. The existing structures have not substantially
30 reduced the intactness, vividness, and the overall scenic quality of the area. Therefore, long-term
31 impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

32
33 **Impact AE-VC-D: Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely**
34 **affect day or nighttime views in the area.**

35 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

36
37 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 primarily occurred during
38 daytime hours, and reflective construction equipment and materials may have generated glare.
39 There is also a possibility that some construction may have occurred at nighttime, and temporary
40 artificial illumination could have been required. Potential impacts from glare or lighting during
41 construction would have been temporary and, therefore, less than significant.

42
43 Operation of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 did not create a new source
44 of lighting. The new conductor was reflective when it was first installed but has weathered to a dull
45 gray finish. The existing structures are non-specular (non-reflective) structures. Therefore, long-
46 term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

1 **8.3.2 Agriculture and Forestry**

2
3 **IMPACT AG-VC-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 Along Segments 1 and 2, only one of the TSPs installed and one of the remaining LST foundations
12 are located on Important Farmland (Farmland of Local Importance; CDC 2010). Because the
13 foundation of the previous tower was not removed, the foundation resulted in the conversion of
14 approximately 0.13 acres of Important Farmland, which is considered less than significant.
15 Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

16
17 **IMPACT AG-VC-B: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act**
18 **Contract**
19 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

20
21 The past work along Segments 1 and 2 occurred within existing right-of ways (ROWs) across lands
22 zoned for agricultural use, traversing land preserved under Williamson Act Contract. As discussed
23 in Section 4.10 “Land Use and Planning,” Section 8105-4 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning
24 Ordinance states that overhead transmission lines are a permitted use, subject to receipt of a
25 “Planning Director-approved Conditional Use Permit.” Approximately half of Segment 1 is located
26 on lands designated as Williamson Act land. The Ventura County Land Conservation Act
27 (Williamson Act) Guidelines identify compatible uses as those that are permitted, or conditionally
28 permitted by the Ventura County Zoning Ordinance in the AE-40 ac or CA zones.” The CPUC has
29 preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the
30 State of California under the CPUC General Order 131(d); therefore, discretionary approval from
31 Ventura County was not necessary.

32
33 Because the lines were constructed within existing ROWs and are compatible with agricultural
34 zoning and Williamson Act Contracts, both short-term and long-term impacts under this criterion
35 are less than significant.

36
37 **IMPACT AG-VC-C: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land,**
38 **timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production**
39 **NO IMPACT**

40
41 As discussed in Chapter 4.2, “Agriculture and Forestry,” Segments 1 and 2 are not located on land
42 designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore,
43 there is no long-term impact under this criterion.
44

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.

1 **IMPACT AG-VC-D: Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to**
2 **non-forest use**
3 *NO IMPACT*

4
5 As discussed in Chapter 4.2, "Agriculture and Forestry," Segments 1 and 2 are not located on land
6 designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore,
7 there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

8
9 **IMPACT AG-VC-E: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their**
10 **location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or**
11 **conversion of forest land to non-forest use**
12 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

13
14 Construction vehicle traffic along private roads, agricultural roads, and access and spur roads may
15 have resulted in a temporary increase in traffic that may have disrupted farming and grazing
16 activities. Although agricultural activities may have been temporarily impacted, the impact would
17 not have resulted in the permanent conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. No other
18 activities involved changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland
19 to nonagricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, long-term impacts under this
20 criterion are less than significant.

21
22 **8.3.3 Air Quality**

23
24 **Impact AQ-VC-A: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.**
25 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

26
27 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 generated emissions from
28 operation of heavy equipment and support vehicles. The applicant estimated annual construction
29 air pollutant emissions for past work along Segments 1 and 2 using the California Emission
30 Estimator Model (CalEEMod) model for both on-road and off-road sources. A summary of estimated
31 emissions for the past work along Segments 1 and 2 are presented in Table 8-2. A complete listing
32 of the calculations and assumptions for the estimated emissions is included in Appendix C. The
33 Ventura County Air Pollution Control District's (VCAPCD's) primary means of implementing air
34 quality plans is the adoption of rules and regulations. The emissions associated with construction of
35 the past work along Segments 1 and 2 were temporary and represented a very small fraction of the
36 regional emission inventory. As a result, construction emissions did not substantially contribute to
37 the regional emissions or obstruct the implementation of the air quality plan.

38
39 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
40 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
41 Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

Table 8-2 Summary of Estimated Annual Past Work Along Segments 1 and 2 Emissions

Year	Project Source	Air Criteria Pollutant Emissions (lbs./day) ¹			
		ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
1999	Construction off-road and on-road equipment and land disturbance	16.71	123.40	8.66	8.16
	Total Emissions for Year 1999	16.71	123.40	8.66	8.16
2000	Construction off-road and on-road equipment and land disturbance	10.58	90.25	4.44	4.11
	Helicopter use ²	0.11	0.38	0.02	0.02
	Total Emissions for Year 2000	10.69	90.63	4.46	4.13

Source: SCE 2012

Notes:

(1) CalEEMod estimated emissions with fugitive dust control measures as required by VCAPCD.

(2) The applicant estimated emissions assuming the use of a Hughes 500 size helicopter.

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

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

4 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

5
6 As discussed in Section 4.3.3.1 of the Draft EIR, VCAPCD has not established quantitative thresholds
7 of significance for short-term construction emissions within their jurisdiction. Therefore, the CPUC
8 has opted to use South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Significance
9 Thresholds for Construction to analyze the proposed project's air emissions. SCAQMD's threshold of
10 significance for each criteria pollutant is provided in Table 4.3-7 in the Draft EIR. The NO_x
11 emissions during construction of Segments 1 and 2 in 1999 (123 lbs./day) exceeded SCAQMD's
12 current threshold (100 lbs./day) (SCAQMD 2011). No other criteria pollutant emissions during the
13 remainder of construction exceeded SCAQMD's thresholds. As a result, construction of Segments 1
14 and 2 may have resulted in a short-term impact to air quality standards in 1999..

15
16 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
17 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction. No
18 stationary emissions sources are associated with the existing subtransmission line. Therefore, long-
19 term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.
20

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

4 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

5
6 Ventura County is designated as nonattainment for NO_x, ROG, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ with respect to
7 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards
8 (CAAQS) Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 resulted in NO_x,
9 ROG, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ emissions associated with fuel combustion from the operation of construction
10 equipment and ground disturbance. As discussed in Impact AQ-B, NO_x emissions in 1999 were
11 above SCAQMD's NO_x significant threshold. As a result, construction of Segments 1 and 2 may have
12 resulted in a cumulatively considerable net increase of NO_x in 1999..

13
14 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
15 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction. The
16 long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

17
18 **Impact AQ-VC-D: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.**

19 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

20
21 Sensitive receptors located within 1 mile of Segment 1 and 2 include single-family residences,
22 places of worship, and local parks (see Section 4.11, "Noise," Table 4.11-2). Similar to the proposed
23 construction discussed in Section 4.3, "Air Quality," sensitive receptors located in proximity to past
24 construction areas could have been exposed to criteria air pollutants and diesel particulate matter.²
25 However, pollutant emissions were short-term, distributed throughout the Segment 1 and 2 ROW,
26 and were not concentrated in any one area.

27
28 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
29 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction. The
30 long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

31
32 **Impact AQ-VC-E: Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.**

33 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

34
35 Vehicle exhaust was the primary odor associated with construction of the existing subtransmission
36 line along Segments 1 and 2. Vehicle exhaust from construction vehicles, when perceptible, was
37 common in the environment, dissipated rapidly as it mixed with the surrounding air, and was of
38 limited duration.

39
40 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
41 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
42 Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

43

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 **8.3.4 Biological Resources**
2

3 **Impact BIO-VC-A: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or**
4 **through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special**
5 **status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?**
6 **UNDETERMINABLE**
7

8 The applicant conducted a preliminary vegetation and special status species survey in May and June
9 1999. This was the only biological survey conducted along Segments 1 and 2 prior to construction
10 of the existing subtransmission line. The survey identified four of the five vegetation types
11 identified throughout the project area as described in Section 4.4.1.2 of the Draft EIR, including
12 chaparral, grassland, coastal sage scrub, and woodland. The survey also identified the presence of
13 the follow special status species:
14

- 15 • Plummer’s baccharis (*Baccharis plummerae plummerae*) –Forest Service Sensitive,
16 California Native Plant Society (CNPS³) 1B.2;
- 17 • Southern California Black Walnut (*Juglans californica californica*) – CNPS 4.2;
- 18 • Fish’s milkwort (*Polygal cornuta var. fishiae*) – CNPS 4.3; and
- 19 • California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) – Federal Threatened, Protected
20 under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, CDFW species of concern. (SCE 2012)
21

22 The applicant stated that no biological monitoring occurred during the construction of the existing
23 subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 (SCE 2012). However, surveys conducted after the
24 subtransmission line was constructed identified National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
25 designated California steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) Distinct Population Segment (DPS) critical
26 habitat at the Cañada Larga stream, which is crossed by a former Segment 1 access road. SCE has
27 historically used this access road to conduct ongoing maintenance of both the previous and existing
28 line. The applicant stated that heavy construction vehicles and equipment used this access road and
29 crossed the stream without the use of a dry crossing structure to access construction sites along
30 Segment 1 (SCE 2012). The use of heavy construction vehicles in DPS critical habitat could have
31 resulted in a substantial adverse effect under this criterion. It should be noted that this access road
32 is located on private land and is also used by the owner and those employed by the owner to
33 conduct ongoing ranch activities; however, critical habitat requirements do not apply to citizens
34 engaged in activities on private land that do not involve a federal agency.
35

36 In December 2013, the CPUC’s environmental consultant, E & E, attended a site visit with SCE,
37 USFWS, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and CDFW to observe a proposed stream
38 crossing location approximately 1,600 feet upstream of the former Cañada Larga stream crossing.
39 At that time, SCE was considering either constructing a dry crossing capable of withstanding a 5- to
40 100-year flood event or removing the proposed access road from the project description and using
41 other existing access roads to construct the project. Even though other access roads in the area are
42 longer, requiring additional driving time to access several towers in the area, CDFW encouraged
43 SCE to consider abandoning the crossing. USACE suggested that a dry crossing capable of
44 withstanding a 20-year flood event might be worth considering, but all agencies agreed that a dry
45 crossing capable of withstanding 100-year flood event was not practical. Although NMFS was
46 unable to attend the site visit, a NMFS representative indicated during a previous site visit in

³ Section 4.4.3.3 of the Draft EIR defines the CNPS ratings.

1 November 2013 and in subsequent conversations that he concurred with the approaches being
2 considered by the other agencies.

3
4 Although the dimensions of the proposed crossing were never defined, a wet crossing would not
5 have received agency approval and was not considered a viable option. Due to the cost of
6 constructing a dry crossing in the area, as well as agency concern about permanent impacts on
7 steelhead habitat and other wildlife, SCE opted to use the alternative access roads that avoided the
8 Cañada Larga stream and DPS critical habitat and requested that the CPUC remove the Cañada
9 Larga stream crossing from the project description of the proposed project. Therefore, the Cañada
10 Larga stream crossing was not analyzed in this EIR.

11
12 Due to insufficient documentation of pre- and post-construction biological resources along
13 Segments 1 and 2, the CPUC cannot fully verify baseline conditions as they existed prior to 1999.
14 Without baseline data related to the presence of biological resources prior to construction or
15 records from biological monitors, the full extent of biological impacts due to construction of the
16 existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 is unknown. However, with respect to the
17 Cañada Larga stream crossing, had the prior work undergone a CEQA review prior to construction,
18 it is reasonable to assume that federal and state agencies would have raised similar issues to those
19 raised in late 2013 for the proposed project, and the CPUC would have required mitigation and
20 construction monitoring with an emphasis on the sensitive location. Therefore, although short- and
21 long-term impacts due to construction activities cannot be quantified and are therefore
22 undeterminable, impacts on DPS critical habitat are likely to have occurred.

23
24 Operation and maintenance procedures associated with the existing subtransmission line along
25 Segments 1 and 2 are similar to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed
26 prior to past construction. With respect to the Cañada Larga stream crossing, had the prior work
27 undergone a CEQA review prior to construction, impacts that have occurred as a result of SCE
28 maintenance activities between 1999 and the present might not have occurred; however, the owner
29 or those employed by the owner would have continued to use the road for ongoing ranch activities.
30 Considering the infrequency of ongoing SCE maintenance activities, the use of SCE maintenance
31 vehicles in the Cañada Larga stream crossing from 1999 through the present has not resulted in a
32 long-term impact. Therefore, impacts under this criterion from operation and maintenance of the
33 existing subtransmission line are less than significant.

34
35 **Impact BIO-VC-B: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat**
36 **or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies,**
37 **regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?**

38 UNDETERMINABLE

39
40 See Impact BIO-VC-A.

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

46 UNDETERMINABLE

47
48 See Impact BIO-VC-A.

1 **Impact BIO-VC-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

5
6 See Impact BIO-VC-A.

7
8 **Impact BIO-VC-E: Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting**
9 **biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

10 UNDETERMINABLE

11
12 The applicant stated that an unrecorded number of trees were trimmed and previously-fallen trees
13 were removed during construction, but no live trees were removed (SCE 2012). Ventura County
14 zoning ordinance (§8107-25), requires that a permit be obtained for substantial pruning of, or
15 other specific disturbance in close proximity to a protected tree, as defined by the ordinance. The
16 applicant did not maintain records on the type of trees trimmed; therefore, a conflict with the local
17 tree preservation ordinance is undeterminable.

18 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
19 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
20 Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

21 **8.3.5 Cultural Resources**

22 **Impact CR-VC-A: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical**
23 **resource as defined in §15064.5.**

24 UNDETERMINABLE

25
26
27 The applicant did not complete cultural surveys along Segments 1 and 2 prior to the start of
28 construction of the existing subtransmission line. As detailed in Chapter 4.5 of the Draft EIR,
29 “Cultural Resources,” cultural surveys were conducted along Segments 1 and 2 in 2012. Six cultural
30 resource sites were identified along Segment 1 and one along Segment 2. With the exception of
31 cultural resource site CA-VEN-58, the surveys indicated that the previously recorded sites along
32 Segments 1 and 2 have either been destroyed, or appear to have been the subject of recording
33 errors such that they are actually outside the project area, or are not archaeological sites but fossil
34 shell sites. CA-VEN-58, which is located along Segment 1, was found to be eligible for the California
35 Register of Historical Resources. SCE construction vehicles crossed through CA-VEN-58 during
36 construction, although no construction monitoring was conducted.

37
38 Without baseline data related to the presence of cultural resources prior to construction or records
39 from cultural monitors, it is unknown to what extent the construction of the existing
40 subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 could have impacted cultural resources, including CA-
41 VEN-58. Therefore, short- and long-term impacts that may have resulted due to construction
42 activities are undeterminable.

43
44 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
45 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
46 Therefore, long-term impacts from operation under this criterion are less than significant.

1 **Impact CR-VC-B: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological**
2 **resource pursuant to §15064.5.**

3 *UNDETERMINABLE*

4
5 See Impact CR-VC-A.

6
7 **Impact CR-VC-C: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or**
8 **unique geologic feature.**

9 *UNDETERMINABLE*

10
11 See Impact CR-VC-A.

12
13 **Impact CR-VC-D: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal**
14 **cemeteries.**

15 *UNDETERMINABLE*

16
17 See Impact CR-VC-A.

18 **8.3.6 Geology and Soils**

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

25 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

26
27
28 As discussed in Section 4.6, "Geology, Soils, and Minerals," Segments 1 and 2 are not within an A-P
29 Zone (see Figure 4.6-1); however, Segments 1 and 2 are located in a seismically active area and
30 could experience moderate to high levels of earthquake-induced ground shaking. Short portions of
31 Segments 1 and 2 along Coyote Creek and within the Ventura River Valley would be located within
32 a State of California Liquefaction Seismic Hazard Zone (CGS 2003). Landslides (seismically induced
33 or otherwise) are a potential hazard throughout most of Segment 1 and a slight hazard along
34 Segment 2. During past geotechnical investigations (see Table 4.6-1), the applicant observed the
35 following evidence of landslides along the project ROW (Appendix F):

- 36
37
- 38 • In the report prepared for Segment 1, the applicant noted that shallow landslides of less
39 than 20-foot depths are common along the ROW. The applicant also noted that the area
40 where the poles would be constructed is historically prone to landsliding and that many of
41 the sites were damaged in 1969, 1978, 1983, and 1998 (SCE 2000).
 - 42 • In the report prepared for Segment 2, the applicant noted that most of the Rincon Shale is
43 very susceptible to landsliding. Most of the structure sites along the ROW were not located
44 in areas that showed evidence of landsliding or slope instability, with the exception of five
45 structure sites. In addition, an area adjacent to one of the structure sites had been noted in
46 prior reports to be an area of major slope instability, but there was no indication that a
landslide in this area would impact the structure site itself (SCE 2001).

1 The applicant incorporated design recommendations from the past geotechnical investigations to
2 minimize potential for risk of loss, injury, or death from strong seismic shaking, liquefaction, and
3 landslides. Therefore, impacts under this criterion would be less than significant.

4
5 **Impact GEO-VC-B: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.**

6 **UNDETERMINABLE**

7
8 Soils along Segments 1 and 2 are generally loamy with varying proportions of clay, silt, sand, and
9 gravel/cobbles/stones (NRCS 2008). The soils along Segments 1 and 2 have an erosion hazard
10 rating that ranges from slight to severe (NRCS 2011). Construction of the past work along
11 Segments 1 and 2 included ground disturbance and grading, and the applicant did not prepare or
12 implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. Without
13 baseline data or data related to a grading plan or the implementation of measures to prevent
14 erosion, it is unknown to what extent the past work along Segments 1 and 2 could have resulted in
15 soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, short- and long-term impacts from the loss of topsoil
16 during construction are undeterminable.

17
18 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
19 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
20 Therefore, long-term impacts from operation under this criterion are less than significant.

21
22 **Impact GEO-VC-C: Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or would become**
23 **unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral**
24 **spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.**

25 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

26
27 The majority of Segments 1 and 2 are located on naturally unstable geologic units and soils.
28 Construction along Segments 1 and 2 included ground disturbance and grading, the applicant did
29 not prepare or implement a SWPPP during construction. However, as described in Impact GEO-VC-
30 A, the applicant did prepare geotechnical reports that documented areas along the route that were
31 prone to landsliding and other geologic hazards.

32
33 Short portions of Segments 1 and 2 along Coyote Creek and within the Ventura River Valley would
34 be located within a State of California Liquefaction Seismic Hazard Zone (CGS 2003). Landslides
35 (seismically induced or otherwise) are a potential hazard throughout most of Segment 1 and a
36 slight hazard along Segment 2. The soils along Segments 1 and 2 have a low to moderate shrink-
37 swell potential. Subsidence has not has not been observed in the vicinity or within the project area.

38
39 Although a SWPPP was not implemented, the applicant incorporated design recommendations from
40 the past geotechnical investigations to minimize impacts from unstable soils. Therefore, short- and
41 long-term impacts from unstable soils during construction are less than significant.

42
43 **Impact GEO-VC-D: Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property.**

44 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

45
46 As discussed in Section 4.6, "Geology and Soils," (see Table 4.6-2), expansive soils along Segments 1
47 and 2 are low to moderate. The applicant incorporated design recommendations from the past
48 geotechnical investigations to minimize impacts from expansive soils. Therefore, long-term impacts
49 under this criterion are less than significant.

50

1 **8.3.7 Greenhouse Gases**

2 **Impact GHG-VC-A: Direct and Indirect GHG Emission Levels**

3 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

4
5 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 directly contributed to
6 local and regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. SCE estimated that approximately 1,921 metric
7 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e) were emitted during the construction of Segments 1
8 and 2 (SCE 2012). As further described in Section 4.7, “Greenhouse Gases,” the Ventura County Air
9 Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) does not have GHG significance thresholds. Therefore, the
10 CPUC has opted to use the SCAQMD’s interim GHG significance thresholds adopted in 2008
11 (SCAQMD 2008). The applicable SCAQMD-recommended GHG emission threshold is 10,000
12 MTCO₂e per year, including construction emissions amortized over 30 years and added to
13 operational GHG emissions. GHG construction emissions from the past work along Segments 1 and
14 2 amortized over 30 years would be approximately 64 MTCO₂e/year. These GHG emissions are
15 well below the applicable thresholds of significance.

16
17 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
18 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
19 Therefore, operations and maintenance procedures along Segments 1 and 2 have not generated
20 GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
21 Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

22
23 **Impact GHG-VC-B: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the**
24 **purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.**

25 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

26
27 As described in Section 4.7, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” Ventura County has not officially adopted
28 Climate Action Plans, policies, or regulations for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions from non-
29 stationary sources. At the state level, a scoping plan, approved by the California Air Resources
30 Board (CARB) on December 12, 2008, provides the outline for actions to reduce California’s GHG
31 emissions. The scoping plan now requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and
32 other initiatives to reduce GHG emissions (CARB 2008). Although the existing subtransmission line
33 along Segments 1 and 2 was constructed prior to approval of the CARB scoping plan, the past work
34 along Segments 1 and 2, as described by the applicant, did not conflict with any of the policies or
35 GHG emission reduction measures outlined in the scoping plan. In addition, operation and
36 maintenance of the existing subtransmission line do not conflict with a federal, state, regional, or
37 local plan, policy, or regulation for reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, long-term impacts under
38 this criterion are less than significant.

39
40 **8.3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

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

43 *NO IMPACT*

44
45 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 involved transport, use,
46 and disposal of hazardous materials. This included the use of hazardous materials typically used by
47 construction vehicles and heavy equipment (e.g., gasoline, diesel fuel, transmission fluid) primarily
48 within the subtransmission line ROW. SCE has stated that all hazardous materials were used,
49 transported, and disposed of in accordance with regulations in force at that time (SCE 2012).

1 However, without records of the procedures that were implemented, it is unknown if the hazardous
2 materials created a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine
3 transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

4
5 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
6 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
7 Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

8
9 **Impact HZ-VC-B: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through**
10 **reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous**
11 **materials into the environment.**

12 *NO IMPACT*

13
14 As described under Impact HZ-A, construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments
15 1 and 2 involved transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. SCE has stated that all
16 hazardous materials were used, transported, and disposed of in accordance with regulations in
17 force at that time (SCE 2012). However, without records of the procedures that were implemented,
18 it is unknown if the hazardous materials created a significant hazard to the public or the
19 environment through the foreseeable upset or accidental conditions involving the release of
20 hazardous materials; however, no accidental spills were recorded during construction in Segment 1
21 and 2.

22
23 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
24 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
25 Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

26
27 **Impact HZ-VC-C: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous**
28 **materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing or proposed school.**

29 *NO IMPACT*

30
31 No schools are located within 0.25 miles of Segments 1 and 2 (see Table 4.8-1). Therefore, there is
32 no impact under this criterion.

33
34 **Impact HZ-VC-D: Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites**
35 **compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a**
36 **significant hazard to the public or the environment.**

37 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

38
39 The applicant did not perform a search of the Cortese List (Government Code Section 65962.5)
40 database prior to construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2.
41 However, the applicant did not report the discovery of any new sites during the construction
42 period, which would be required by federal and state law (see Section 4.8, "Hazards and Hazardous
43 Materials," for further discussion regarding regulatory requirements). As described in Chapter 4.8,
44 the results of a 2012 Cortese List database search did not identify any sites within 1,000 feet of
45 Segments 1 and 2 (DTSC 2012, 2013; SWRCB 2013a,b, 2014). Therefore, there are no significant
46 long-term impacts under this criterion.

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

4 *NO IMPACT*

5
6 As discussed in Chapter 4.8, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," Segments 1 and 2 are not located
7 within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport. Therefore, there are no
8 long-term impacts under this criterion.

9
10 **Impact HZ-VC-F: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project**
11 **result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.**

12 *NO IMPACT*

13
14 As discussed in Chapter 4.8, Segments 1 and 2 are not located within the vicinity of a private
15 airstrip. Therefore, there are no long-term impacts under this criterion.

16
17 **Impact HZ-VC-G: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted**
18 **emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.**

19 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

20
21 Past work along Segments 1 and 2 required the temporary closure of travel lanes on SR 33 and
22 Santa Ana Road to install and remove guard structures. The applicant stated that traffic control
23 measures required by encroachment permits and SCE's traffic controls practices were implemented
24 during construction (SCE 2012). Therefore, impacts to emergency access were temporary.

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

29
30 **Impact HZ-VC-H: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death**
31 **involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or**
32 **where residences are intermixed with wildlands.**

33 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

34
35 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 temporarily increased fire
36 risk during refueling, vehicle and equipment use, welding, vegetation clearing, worker cigarette
37 smoking, and other activities. All of Segment 1 and the eastern end of Segment 2 occur within the Very
38 High Fire Severity Zone (Cal FIRE 2007). However, there were no wildland fires along Segments 1
39 and 2 during construction.

40
41 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
42 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
43 Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

1 **8.3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality**

2 **Impact HY-VC-A: Violate water quality standards**

3 UNDETERMINABLE

4
5 The applicant did not conduct a wetland delineation or prepare or implement a SWPPP for the
6 construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2. The applicant stated that
7 construction vehicles and equipment crossed the Cañada Larga stream without the use of a dry
8 crossing structure during past work to access construction sites along Segment 1 (SCE 2012).
9 Without baseline data or data related to a grading plan or the implementation of measures to
10 prevent erosion, flooding, or water contamination, it is unknown to what extent the past work
11 along Segments 1 and 2 could have impacted hydrology or water quality (see also Impact BIO-VC-
12 A). Therefore, short- and long-term impacts on hydrology and water quality from construction are
13 undeterminable.

14
15 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
16 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction.
17 Therefore, long-term operational impacts under these criteria are less than significant.

18
19 **Impact HY-VC-B: Substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or substantial interference**
20 **with groundwater recharge**

21 LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

22
23 An estimated less than 1 acre-foot of water was used during construction of the past work;
24 however, the applicant stated that the source of the water is unknown (SCE 2012). Therefore, while
25 short- and long-term impacts on water resources from construction activities are undeterminable,
26 they are unlikely to have been significant.

27
28 Thirty foundations remained in place along Segments 1 and 2. Assuming the cumulative area of the
29 four footings for each foundation is approximately 100 square feet, the remaining foundations
30 resulted in a total of approximately 3,000 square feet of impervious surfaces spread out along
31 Segments 1 and 2, which is less than .007 acres. Therefore, the past work did not significantly
32 increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the area and does not substantially interfere with
33 groundwater recharge. Long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

34
35 **Impact HY-VC-C: Substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area**
36 **that results in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site**

37 UNDETERMINABLE

38
39 See Impact HY-VC-A.

40
41 **Impact HY-VC-D: Substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern or rate or amount of**
42 **surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding**

43 UNDETERMINABLE

44
45 See Impact HY-VC-A.

1 **Impact HY-VC-E: Create or contribute to runoff water exceeding the capacity of existing or**
2 **planned storm water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted**
3 **runoff**

4 *UNDETERMINABLE*

5
6 See Impact HY-VC-A.

7
8 **Impact HY-VC-F: Other substantial degradation of water quality**

9 *UNDETERMINABLE*

10
11 See Impact HY-VC-A.

12
13 **Impact HY-VC-G: Project structures would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year**
14 **flood hazard area**

15 *NO IMPACT*

16
17 None of the structures along Segments 1 and 2 are located within a 100-year flood hazard area as
18 mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Therefore, there is no impact under this
19 criterion.

20
21 **Impact HY-VC-H: Risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding**

22 *NO IMPACT*

23
24 None of the structures along Segments 1 and 2 are located within a 100-year flood hazard area as
25 mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Some structures along the eastern
26 terminus of Segment 2 may be located in the Lake Casitas Dam inundation zone; however, no dam
27 failure occurred during construction, and therefore, there was no impact.

28
29 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
30 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
31 Therefore, there is no long-term impact under this criterion.

32
33 **Impact HY-VC-I: Risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or**
34 **mudflow**

35 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

36
37 As discussed in Section 4.9, "Hydrology and Water Quality," Segments 1 and 2 are not located near
38 any water body that could generate a seiche in the event of an earthquake and is well outside of
39 mapped tsunami inundation areas (CDC 2009a,b). Mudflow (seismically induced or otherwise) are
40 a potential hazard throughout most of Segment 1 and a slight hazard along Segment 2. However,
41 the applicant incorporated design recommendations from the past geotechnical investigations to
42 minimize impacts from unstable soils. In addition, the existing subtransmission line along Segments
43 1 and 2 replaced a previous subtransmission line in the same location. Therefore, risks involving
44 seiche, tsunami, or mudflow are similar to risks associated with the previous subtransmission line
45 that existed prior to 1999. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than
46 significant.

1 **8.3.10 Land Use and Planning**

2 **Impact LU-VC-A: Physically divide an established community**

3 *NO IMPACT*

4
5 The existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 replaced a previous subtransmission line
6 within the same ROW. Therefore, the existing subtransmission line did not physically divide an
7 established community.

8
9 **Impact LU-VC-B: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency**
10 **with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific**
11 **plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or**
12 **mitigating an environmental effect.**

13 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

14
15 Pursuant to GO 131-D, the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance,
16 and operation of public utilities in the State of California (Subsection 4.10.2.2, "State"). Similar to
17 the analysis described in Section 4.10, Land Use, the existing subtransmission line that was
18 constructed between 1999 and 2004 replaced a previous subtransmission line, which was located
19 in the same location. The existing subtransmission line is located in an existing utility corridor. The
20 previous subtransmission line was also located in the same utility corridor. Therefore, the conflict
21 with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations is less than significant.

22
23 **8.3.11 Noise**

24 **Impact NS-VC-A: Noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or**
25 **noise ordinance.**

26 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

27
28 Ventura County limits construction noise to 75 dBA Leq for a maximum period of three days
29 (Ventura County 2010). As show in Table 4.11-8, receptors 132 to 204 feet from the construction
30 would have experienced noise levels of 75 dBA during various phases of the construction activities.
31 However, Segments 1 and 2 are located in rural areas of Ventura County and only few receptors,
32 located near Casitas Substation, would have experience noise levels of 75 dBA. These effects were
33 temporary, transient, and attenuated (i.e., reduced in intensity) over distance; therefore, impacts
34 during construction were less than significant.

35
36 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
37 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
38 Operation and maintenance of subtransmission lines are not considered a significant source of
39 noise. Therefore, long-term noise impacts associated with operation of the existing subtransmission
40 line are less than significant.

41
42 **Impact NS-VC-B: Excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.**

43 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

44
45 Heavy-duty equipment and vehicles involved in construction of the past work along Segments 1
46 and 2 generated vibration levels ranging between 58 and 87 vibration decibels (VdB) at 25 feet
47 during short-term construction activities. All receptors located at a distance of 50 feet or beyond
48 perceived vibration levels below 80 VdB, which is generally acceptable at residential areas for
49 activities that involve less than 30 vibration events of the same kind per day (FTA 2006).

1 Construction-related vibrations only exceeded the human perception threshold (65 VdB) for
2 receptors located within 50 feet from heavy-duty equipment. These effects would have been
3 transient and attenuated (i.e., reduced in intensity) over distance. There are no sensitive receptors
4 within 50 feet of Segments 1 and 2 (Table 4.11-2).

5
6 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
7 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
8 Operation and maintenance procedures of subtransmission lines do not generate excessive levels of
9 groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Therefore, long-term impacts associated with
10 operation of the existing subtransmission line are less than significant.

11
12 **Impact NS-VC-C: Permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.**

13 NO IMPACT

14
15 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
16 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
17 Therefore, ambient noise levels in the vicinity of Segments 1 and 2 are not materially different than
18 they were prior to construction of the existing subtransmission line. There is no long-term impact
19 under this criterion.

20
21 **8.3.12 Population and Housing**

22 **Impact POP-VC-A: Induce substantial population growth in an area.**

23 LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

24
25 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 generated an influx of
26 approximately 26 construction workers into the area (SCE 2012). However, due to the temporary
27 nature of the work and likelihood that personnel were largely drawn from existing populations
28 within or near the project area, the past work did not induce substantial population growth during
29 construction.

30
31 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
32 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction. No
33 additional workers relocated to the area on a permanent basis as a result of the past work along
34 Segments 1 and 2. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

35
36 **Impact POP-VC-B: Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the**
37 **construction of replacement housing elsewhere.**

38 NO IMPACT

39
40 No housing units were removed for construction or operation of the existing subtransmission line
41 along Segments 1 and 2. The reconstruction of the existing subtransmission line was located within
42 an existing utility ROW. Therefore, the past work along Segments 1 and 2 had no impact under this
43 criterion.

1 **Impact POP-VC-C: Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of**
2 **replacement housing elsewhere.**

3 *NO IMPACT*

4
5 As discussed above, no housing units were removed for construction or operation of the existing
6 subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2. As a result, no residents within the area were
7 displaced, and no replacement housing was required. The reconstruction of the existing
8 subtransmission line was located within an existing utility ROW. Therefore, there is no impact
9 under this criterion.

10
11 **8.3.13 Public Services and Utilities**

12
13 **Impact PS-VC-A: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts on governmental facilities or**
14 **from the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of**
15 **which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable**
16 **service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following: (1)**
17 **fire protection and emergency response, (2) police protection, (3) schools, (4) parks, or (5)**
18 **other public facilities.**

19
20 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

21
22 As discussed in Section 8.3.12, "Population and Housing," construction of the existing
23 subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 generated an influx of approximately 26 temporary
24 workers into the area. However, due to the temporary nature of the work and limited number of
25 construction workers, police, fire protection, emergency response, schools, parks, and other public
26 facilities are assumed to have operated at acceptable levels during construction.

27
28 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
29 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
30 Therefore, the existing subtransmission line did not affect service ratios for police, fire protection,
31 emergency response, schools, parks, and other public facilities.

32
33 **Impact PS-VC-B: Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities**
34 **or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant**
35 **environmental effects.**

36 *NO IMPACT*

37
38 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 did not include the new
39 stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, there are no long-
40 term impacts under this criterion.

41
42 **Impact PS-VC-C: Insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing**
43 **entitlements and resources or new or expanded entitlements required.**

44 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

45
46 An estimated less than 1 acre-foot of water was used during construction of the existing Segment 1
47 and 2 subtransmission lines; however, the applicant stated that the source of the water is unknown
48 (SCE 2012). Therefore, while impacts on water supplies from construction activities are
49 undeterminable, they are unlikely to have been significant.

1
2 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
3 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
4 Further, operation and maintenance procedures associated with subtransmission lines do not
5 require large quantities of water. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than
6 significant.

7
8 **Impact PS-VC-D: Served by a landfill without sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate**
9 **the project's solid waste disposal needs.**

10 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

11
12 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 generated approximately
13 263 tons of solid waste; however, approximately 235.3 tons were recycled (89 percent). The solid
14 waste disposal facilities used during construction were unrecorded. Therefore, impacts on
15 permitted capacity of solid waste disposal facilities during construction are undeterminable.
16 However, considering that approximately 89 percent of the solid waste was recycled, the
17 decommissioning of the previously existing subtransmission line components along Segments 1
18 and 2 is unlikely to have caused an impact under this criterion.

19
20 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
21 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
22 Further, operation and maintenance procedures associated with subtransmission lines do not
23 generate large quantities of solid waste. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less
24 than significant.

25
26 **Impact PS-VC-E: Noncompliance with federal, state, or local statutes and regulations related**
27 **to solid waste.**

28 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

29
30 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 generated approximately
31 263 tons of solid waste; however, approximately 235.3 tons (89 percent) of the solid waste was
32 recycled. The applicant has stated that handling procedures were unrecorded (SCE 2012).
33 Therefore, whether the disposal of solid waste was in compliance with federal, state, or local
34 statutes is undeterminable. However, considering that approximately 89 percent of the solid waste
35 was recycled, the partial decommissioning of the previously existing subtransmission line along
36 Segments 1 and 2 is unlikely to have caused an impact under this criterion.

37
38 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
39 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
40 Further, operation and maintenance procedures associated with subtransmission lines do not
41 generate large quantities of solid waste. The applicant currently follows federal, state, and local
42 statutes related to solid waste handling. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less
43 than significant.

1 **8.3.14 Recreation**

2 **Impact RE-VC-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 8.3.12, "Population and Housing," construction of the existing
8 subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 could have generated an influx of 26 temporary
9 workers into the area. The number and variety of recreational facilities within the area, some of
10 which are shown in Figure 4.10-1, were adequate to accommodate the potential temporary and
11 minor increase in use of local recreational areas and facilities by construction workers. Therefore,
12 use of recreational facilities during construction did not cause substantial physical deterioration.

13
14 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
15 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction. While
16 current maintenance personnel may use existing neighborhood and regional parks when working
17 in the area, considering the intermittent nature of subtransmission line maintenance procedures,
18 sporadic use of recreational facilities has not caused any substantial physical deterioration of
19 recreational facilities. Therefore, long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

20
21 **Impact RE-VC-B: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of**
22 **recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.**

23 *NO IMPACT*

24
25 The past work along Segments 1 and 2 did not include the construction or expansion of recreation
26 facilities. Therefore, there are no impacts under this criterion.

27
28 **8.3.15 Transportation and Traffic**

29 **Impact TT-VC-A: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures**
30 **of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes**
31 **of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components**
32 **of the circulation system including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and**
33 **freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.**

34 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

35
36 The construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 included the
37 movement of light, medium, and heavy-duty vehicles (including oversize vehicles such as cranes)
38 over US-101, SR-150, and local roads maintained by Ventura County.

39
40 Project-related vehicles and equipment generally traveled from a local temporary staging yard or
41 contractor yards to work sites in the morning, returning to their points of departure in the evening.
42 The applicant estimated that the construction activities in Segments 1 and 2 generated a maximum
43 of approximately 76 daily vehicle trips. This figure includes the estimated 26 construction workers
44 making two daily personal vehicle trips (one trip in the morning from home to the staging yard, and
45 one trip in the reverse in the evening).

46
47 The temporary increase in traffic associated with the construction of the existing subtransmission
48 line along Segments 1 and 2 accounted for a minimal and temporary increase over average daily
49 volumes along the roadways and at the intersections shown in Tables 4.15-4 and 4.15-5.

1
2 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
3 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
4 Considering the intermittent nature of subtransmission line maintenance procedures, use of
5 occasional maintenance vehicles in the area is not considered a significant impact under this
6 criterion.

7
8 **Impact TT-VC-B: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but**
9 **not limited to, LOS standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established**
10 **by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.**
11 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

12
13 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 generated a maximum of
14 approximately 76 daily vehicle trips and does not meet the 200 trip threshold that would require it
15 to undergo a Project-Level Impacts analysis according to the Ventura County congestion
16 management program (CMP). Therefore, temporary increase in traffic associated with the past
17 work along Segments 1 and 2 did not conflict with the Ventura County CMP.

18
19 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
20 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction.
21 Considering the intermittent nature of subtransmission line maintenance procedures, use of
22 occasional maintenance vehicles in the area is not considered a significant impact under this
23 criterion.

24
25 **Impact TT-VC-C: Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in**
26 **traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.**
27 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*

28
29 A helicopter (Hughes 500 or similar sized aircraft) was used during the past work along Segments 1
30 and 2 for conductor stringing (SCE 2012). The helicopter was staged and refueled at Camarillo
31 Airport (SCE 2012). The applicant has stated that the exact flight path and land locations used
32 during the past work were unrecorded (SCE 2012). Without information on the flight paths and
33 landing locations or coordination with the Federal Aviation Administration, temporary impacts to
34 air traffic patterns are undeterminable.

35
36 Operation and maintenance of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are similar
37 to the operations of the previous subtransmission line that existed prior to past construction. The
38 applicant stated that helicopter inspections have been in use prior to the past construction (SCE
39 2012). Therefore, the existing subtransmission line did not result in significant long-term impacts
40 on air traffic patterns.

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

45
46 Construction of the existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 required temporary
47 closure of travel lanes on SR 33 and Santa Ana Road to install and remove guard structures, and
48 involved the movement of heavy vehicles which could have created road hazards. The applicant
49 stated that traffic control measures required by encroachment permits and SCE's traffic controls
50 practices were implemented during construction (SCE 2012).

1
2 The existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are located in the same ROW as the
3 previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction and are not located along
4 the ROW of any publicly uses roads. Therefore, the design of the existing subtransmission line did
5 not result in a design feature hazard or hazard related to an incompatible use. Long-term impacts
6 under this criterion are less than significant.

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

9 LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

10
11 Past work along Segments 1 and 2 required the temporary closure of travel lanes on SR 33 and
12 Santa Ana Road to install and remove guard structures. The applicant stated that traffic control
13 measures required by encroachment permits and SCE's traffic controls practices were implemented
14 during construction (SCE 2012). Therefore, impacts to emergency access were temporary.

15
16 The existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are located in the same ROW as the
17 previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction. Therefore, the presence of
18 the existing subtransmission line has not resulted in any changes to the environment that would
19 have resulted in inadequate emergency access levels. Long-term impacts under this criterion are
20 less than significant.

21
22 **Impact TT-VC-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 Segments 1 and 2 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. Work in
31 Segments 1 and 2 was conducted on SCE-owned property, within existing public utility easements,
32 and in a public ROW. SCE obtained encroachment permits from the local jurisdictions and the
33 California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), as appropriate, for construction activities that
34 encroached upon any public ROW or easement. In cases where construction work required
35 temporary closure of travel lanes or oversize vehicle trips that could disrupt public transit, bicycle,
36 or pedestrian traffic, SCE implemented measures required by the encroachment permits or SCE's
37 traffic control practices at that time (SCE 2012).

38
39 The existing subtransmission line along Segments 1 and 2 are located in the same ROW as the
40 previous subtransmission line that existed prior to the past construction. Therefore, the presence of
41 the existing subtransmission line has not resulted in any changes to the environment that would
42 have resulted in a decrease in the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian
43 facilities. Public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian activities in the area are similar to pre-2004
44 construction. Long-term impacts under this criterion are less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank.