Re: CA A.15-04-013 RTRP: Southern California Edison Company's Data Request Response to Deficiency Report-SCE-002 Q.02 & Q.03

From: Case Admin
Date: Thu, Mar 24, 2016 at 2:10 PM
Subject: CA A.15-04-013 RTRP: Southern California Edison Company's Data Request Response to Deficiency Report-SCE-002 Q.02 & Q.03
To: Jensen Uchida, Christine Schneider, Laurie Hietter, Jeff Thomas

Data Request Set: Deficiency Report-SCE-002 Q.12 & Q.15
Responses: 2

Enclosed for your review are Southern California Edison Company's ("SCE") responses to the above referenced data request set.

Of note, due to size limitations via email transmittal, Hard copies of responses and attachments are being sent via UPS to the following:

Jensen Uchida - Energy Division
[redacted]

Jeff Thomas, Senior Manager
[redacted]

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Ian Forrest at[redacted]

Data Request Response

(See attached file: A.15-04-013 RTRP-CPUC Deficiency Report-SCE-002 Q.02 Response.pdf)
(See attached file: A.15-04-013 RTRP-CPUC Deficiency Report-SCE-002 Q.03 Response.pdf)

Case Administration
Southern California Edison Company

2 attachments

A.15-04-013 RTRP-CPUC Deficiency Report-SCE-002 Q.02 Response.pdf
65K

A.15-04-013 RTRP-CPUC Deficiency Report-SCE-002 Q.03 Response.pdf
61K

Southern California Edison
RTRP A.15-04-013

DATA REQUEST SET A.15-04-013 RTRP-CPUC Deficiency Report-SCE-002

To: CPUC
Prepared by: Kenneth Spear
Title: Program Manager
Dated: 12/02/2015

Question 02:

Provide additional data for daytime and night-time ambient noise levels in the proposed project area, including the existing homes and development along Wineville Avenue and Landon Drive. Provide noise level measurements at similar 230-kV transmission lines near the project area. Provide noise level planning contours at distances of 50-, 100-, and 200-feet from the proposed project for construction and operation of the proposed RTRP. The planning contours for construction should include cumulative noise generated from multiple pieces of construction equipment operating simultaneously.

SCE Response to the Deficiency Report and the Final EIR both state the following with regard to construction noise, "noise would be short-term, occurring during daylight hours when the ambient noise levels are higher within the [RTRP] area". Further information is needed to define existing ambient noise levels in the project area and calculated noise levels at sensitive receptors along the alignment (i.e., at approved developments along the alignment).

The RTRP EIR Volume 2 at pages 3-282 and 3-285 states that "Although corona noise varies widely with weather conditions and may be audible, no significant corona should be produced by lines energized below 345 kV (EPRI 1987). There would neither be a substantial nor a permanent increase in noise level." The Final EIR for the RTRP defines maximum corona noise levels during wet weather at 28 dBA; however the estimated noise level was not supported by noise measurements at similar 230-kV transmission lines in the area. Corona noise from a transmission line operating at 230-kV was measured at 29 dBA at 100 feet from the 230-kV transmission line during dry weather conditions in San Diego (SDG&E 2014). The maximum corona noise level may exceed 28 dBA at sensitive receptors.
Corona noise impacts would affect a larger number of sensitive receptors than considered in the Final EIR. Sensitive receptors to noise, such as residents of the new Riverbend housing project, were not contemplated in the Final EIR impact analysis, as this housing development was not constructed or approved at the time of the Final EIR.

Response to Question 02:

Please refer to the attached March 2016 report, *Noise Technical Report (CWA #8), Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP)* , prepared by AECOM, Inc. The attached report concludes as follows:

Project construction would be expected to occur, depending on specific location and the applicable local municipal or County noise regulations or general plan policies, within the allowable hours of construction activity (and during which time construction noise limits may not be established or specified) or during periods of time that exempt construction activity noise from otherwise applicable noise level thresholds; hence, with respect to relevant noise standards, this would be a less than significant impact. However, in the event construction activities are necessary on days or hours outside of what is specified by noise ordinance, then this would be a potentially significant impact. Project construction noise levels could result in substantial predicted increases of ambient noise levels during the daytime at some locations; therefore, on the basis of temporary ambient noise level increase, this would also be a potentially significant impact. After the implementation of Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) NOI-1 though NOI-4, Project construction noise levels would be reduced, resulting in less than substantial increases in ambient noise levels during the daytime at residential locations; thus, after APM implementation, temporary ambient noise increase would become a less than significant impact.

In the event construction activities are necessary on days or hours outside of what is specified by noise ordinance, Southern California Edison Co. (SCE) would implement NOI-5 (After-Hours Construction) in order to reduce construction noise impacts to the extent feasible. However, despite the implementation of NOI-5, after-hours construction noise impacts would potentially be significant and unavoidable.

Anticipated vibration from Project construction activities would not result in vibration velocity levels exceeding vibration guidelines for structural damage risk and human annoyance; hence, this would be a less than significant impact. The proposed Project would not generate significant construction and operational traffic and, therefore, would not expose people to current or future transportation noise levels that exceed applicable standards. This is a less than significant impact.

Project operation could generate transmission line corona audible noise (AN) that would, only under “foul” weather conditions (i.e., rain or related conditions that wet the conductor surface), result in short term, temporary instantaneous noise levels in excess of local nighttime residential standards of 45 dBA Leq at some representative receptor locations and a substantial but nondurable ambient noise increase of 5 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or greater at one representative receptor vicinity. However, under “fair” weather conditions that generally typify the Project vicinity, Project corona AN would not exceed the local day and night Leq standards, nor create a substantial permanent ambient CNEL increase. And under both “fair” and “foul” conditions, corona AN is not expected to exceed CNEL-related compatibility guidelines for residential land uses. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact.

Overall, the proposed Project, with appropriate proposed APMs, would not result in a significant impact if construction activity would be, to the extent practical, limited within the allowable hours of construction activity (and during which time construction noise limits may not be established or specified) or during periods of time that exempt construction activity noise from otherwise applicable noise level thresholds.

Southern California Edison
RTRP A.15-04-013

DATA REQUEST SET A.15-04-013 RTRP-CPUC Deficiency Report-SCE-002

To: CPUC
Prepared by: Kenneth Spear
Title: Project Manager
Dated: 12/02/2015

Question 03:

Provide an updated Aesthetics and Visual Resources Technical Report for the 230-kV Transmission Corridor.

The 2010 Aesthetics and Visual Resources Technical Report prepared by Power Engineers needs to be updated to reflect current and future development projects along the proposed 230-kV transmission corridor. This includes updating the inventory results (scenic quality and visual integrity, sensitivity analysis), impact methods (viewshed analysis, number and location of key observation points, and photo-simulations), and impact results.

Response to Question 03:

Please refer to the attached Updated March 2016 report, *Riverside Transmission Reliability Project, Aesthetics and Visual Resources Technical Report* (2016 Report Update), prepared by Power Engineers, Inc. The attached report concludes as follows:

The updated aesthetic and visual resource impacts (as summarized in Table 21 of the 2016 Report Update) are consistent with the findings described in the October 2012 Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP) Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

RTRP's segments located East of Van Buren Boulevard, although located in proximity to the Santa Ana river corridor, skirt the edge of an industrial area that extends the entire distance to the Wildlife Substation. As a result, visual contrasts are reduced at this location and project impacts remain less than significant (FEIR p.3- 40). As shown in Table 21 of the 2016 Report Update, impacts are rated moderate for this segment of the transmission line, an increase from the June 2010 *Aesthetics and Visual Resources Technical Report* (2010 Report) due to a realignment that places the line closer to the Santa Ana river corridor. As stated, however, these impacts remain less than significant.

The FEIR states that the "230kV transmission line would degrade the scenic quality of the Santa Ana River Corridor" and that these impacts on undesignated scenic vistas may "be potentially significant" (FEIR p.3-45). This conclusion remains valid and applies to the line segments located west of Van Buren Boulevard. As stated in the FEIR, these impacts result from the fact that ". . . high sensitivity viewers would have scenic vistas of the Santa Ana River corridor affected by the presence of the transmission line" (FEIR p. 3-40). Both the 2010 Report as well as the 2016 Report Update support this conclusion and rate impacts in this area as high.

North of the Santa Ana River through the Goose Creek Golf Club and along 68th Street, the route would pass "within the immediate foreground of residential views… and Vander Molen Elementary School" (FEIR p.3-41). "Impacts in this area would be potentially significant and immitigable, as they would degrade the visual character and quality of the interface of residential and recreational uses" (FEIR p. 3- 41). New residential construction that may occur prior to construction of the 230 kV component would not generate additional significant visual impact that was not already previously disclosed based on the FEIR conditions. Both the 2010 Report as well as the 2016 Report Update support this conclusion and rate impacts in this area as high.

Although new residential development has occurred or is underway at some locations north of 68th Street, these effects do not rise to the level of significance (FEIR p.3-41 and 3-42). For most of the distance north of 68th Street, impacts are rated as moderate in both the 2010 Report and in the 2016 Report Update. Impacts between 68th Street and Landon Drive would be less than significant as new residences and viewers would naturally orientate their viewing behaviors away from the six-lane I-15 freeway corridor (FEIR p. 3-42). Further, no development applications could be identified on the parcels immediately adjacent to the I-15 freeway between Limonite Avenue and Bellegrade Avenue. No applicable CEQA significance criteria are present at this location and these impacts therefore do not rise to the level of significance, which is consistent with the conclusion stated in the FEIR.

Due to recent and on-going residential development in proximity to the northernmost 0.6 mile of the proposed 230 kV alignment near Windville Road and Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road, impacts are rated low to moderate for this segment of the project. Impacts for this segment were also rated as moderate in the 2010 Report and "low to moderate" in the 2012 FEIR. Although residential receptors typically reflect a high sensitivity rating, in this case the proposed route is "located within a developed industrial complex" (FEIR p.3-42) Therefore any impact would be less than significant as new residences and viewers would naturally orientate their viewing behaviors away from the industrial area (FEIR p.3-42). No applicable CEQA significance criteria are present at this location and these impacts therefore do not rise to the level of significance, which is consistent with the conclusion stated in the FEIR.

At all other locations not specifically discussed above, impacts remain consistent with and as described in the FEIR.