

## D.8 Land Use, Recreation, and Military Operations

### D.8.1 Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project

The Proposed Project is located on the California coast in San Diego County, approximately two miles south of San Clemente. Situated entirely within the boundaries of MCBCP, the Proposed Project site is under a federal easement and lease agreement. The site is characterized by industrial land uses, such as office structures, warehouses, paved equipment yards, and paved parking lots. However, the site is also surrounded by open space and recreational land uses that are managed by California State Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) and MCBCP.

Figures B-6a through B-6d, Section B, displays the transport route for the Proposed Project. The route would originate at the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, which is the offloading site for the RSGs and is south of SONGS 2 & 3. The Proposed Project route would travel north for approximately 15 miles, towards the SONGS site, and would remain within MCBCP with the exception of a short stretch along I-5 to bypass Skull Canyon, and a portion along Old Highway 101 through San Onofre State Beach. Section B (Project Description) provides a detailed description of the Proposed Project route. Land uses that potentially would be impacted by the Proposed Project include the following recreational and military land uses:

- Camp Del Mar Beach and Recreation Area;
- Red Beach;
- Old Highway 101 Bicycle Transit Route; and
- San Onofre State Beach.

See Figure D.8-1 for a map of land uses in the Proposed Project area.

### Recreational Resources

Recreational resources in the Proposed Project area include San Onofre State Beach, facilities at Camp Del Mar, recreational hunting over most areas of MCBCP, and a public bike trail. Recreational resources are often considered sensitive receptors, because they are susceptible to disturbances (e.g., noise, traffic, dust, etc.) that could decrease or eliminate the value of the recreational experience. In general, recreational facilities (including parks, open space, playgrounds, play fields, etc.), recreational activities (bicycling, hiking, boating, etc.), and recreationists are considered to be sensitive receptors for purposes of environmental impact assessment.

#### San Onofre State Beach

San Onofre State Beach is located northwest and southeast of the Proposed Project (see Figure D.8-1). The State Beach provides recreational opportunities such as hiking, camping, swimming, surfing, beach access, and nature viewing. San Onofre State Beach is delineated into four subunits, which include the Cristianitos subunit, the Trestles subunit, the Surf Beach subunit, and the San Onofre Bluffs subunit (CDPR, 1984). The following is a description of the two San Onofre State Beach campgrounds, which are located at the Cristianitos and San Onofre Bluffs subunits, respectively:

- **Bluffs Campground.** The Bluffs Campground is located in the San Onofre Bluffs subunit, situated southeast of the Proposed Project. The campground has approximately 221 campsites with recreational vehicle (RV) parking at each site, in addition to a dump station; there are no sewer hook ups at the sites. Each campground site can serve a maximum of eight campers, and camping is limited to no more than seven consecutive days per season. Reservations can be made as early as seven months in advance or as late as two days in advance. The campground is typically closed from December 1 through March.
- **San Mateo Campground.** The San Mateo Campground is located in the Cristianitos subunit, situated northwest of the Proposed Project. The campground has approximately 157 campsites, with electrical and water RV hook-ups at 67 sites, and a dump station. Each campground site can serve a maximum of eight campers, and camping is limited to 28 days per year per visitor. Reservations can be made as early as seven months in advance or as late as two days in advance.

### Camp Del Mar

MCBCP maintains a number of recreational facilities at Camp Del Mar near the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin (see Figure D.8-1), which are used throughout the year by active and retired military personnel and their families. There are over 100 campground sites for RV and tent camping that are located at the northern end of the beach. At the southern end of the beach, there are approximately 60 cabins that are equipped with kitchens. Additional recreational facilities at the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin include a snack bar, bath houses, laundromat, and volleyball nets (MCBCP, 2004a).

Camp Del Mar has a 70-slip marina, which provides boat and kayak rental services as well as space for private vessels. The marina is also used for sailing and seamanship lessons. Approximately six persons permanently reside on their private boats within the marina (MCBCP, 2004a). Fishing is permitted from the northern Del Mar harbor jetty (INRMP, 2001).

Recreational hunting occurs most of the year, and includes small and upland game, deer, and waterfowl hunting. Hunting is allowed over most areas of MCBCP when not in use for military training, between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 7:30 a.m. on Wednesdays and all day on holidays and weekends. Hunting activities are not permitted in dud-producing impact areas,<sup>1</sup> areas of reduced habitat (e.g., recently burned), and areas with sensitive vegetation and habitat (INRMP, 2001).

Camp Del Mar hosts several major events throughout the year. The weekends that coincide with the Memorial Day and 4th of July holidays are the most popular time of year, and can attract approximately 30,000 to 40,000 visitors. In addition, Camp Del Mar occasionally hosts concerts and provides catering for some events. Most recreational activities and events are limited to weekends and holiday periods to reduce conflicts with military training exercises (INRMP, 2001).

---

<sup>1</sup> Dud-producing impact areas support the delivery of ground-to-ground and air-to-ground ordnance and may contain unexploded (dud) ordnance. Dud-producing impact areas include the Quebec, Whiskey, and Zulu impact areas, often referred to collectively as the Central Impact Area.

Figure D.8-1. Notable Land Uses in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project  
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

*This page intentionally blank.*

## Old Highway 101 Bicycle Transit Route

In addition to the State Beach and Camp Pendleton facilities, there is an existing bicycle transit route that begins in San Clemente, next to the southbound I-5 entrance on Cristianitos Road. The route travels south along Old Highway 101, parallel to the Pacific Ocean and I-5 (see Figure D.8-1). The Old Highway 101 Route is marked by signs for the first mile, until it exits at Las Pulgas Road and enters MCBCP at the Las Pulgas entrance gate. The section of the route on MCBCP continues parallel to I-5 until it exits at the main gate at the southern end of the base, and it is not marked by signs. Access to the MCBCP section of the bicycle transit route is periodically restricted if military training activities are being conducted. Currently, the section of the Old Highway 101 Bicycle Transit Route located within MCBCP is indefinitely closed due to security concerns (MCBCP, 2004b). Recreational biking on MCBCP is permitted only on established roads and trails for active duty military, retired service members, DOD employees, and dependents, and riders must receive authorization prior to entering any training area (INRMP, 2001).

## Agricultural Resources

### California Department of Conservation Agricultural Land Classifications

The California Department of Conservation (DOC) identifies agricultural lands using the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soils Conservation Service soil classifications. Collectively, lands classified as Prime Farmland,<sup>2</sup> Farmland of Statewide Importance,<sup>3</sup> and Unique Farmland<sup>4</sup> are referred to as Farmland. The DOC established the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) in 1982 in response to a critical need for assessing the location and quantity of agricultural lands and conversion of these lands to other uses. Every even numbered year, FMMP issues a Farmland Conversion Report. The FMMP data are used in elements of some county and city general plans, environmental documents, in regional studies on agricultural land conversion as a way of assessing project impacts on Prime Farmland, and in assessing impacts of proposed projects (DOC, 2004a).

There are 644 acres of Prime Farmland on MCBCP, located on the Stuart Mesa on both the east and west sides of I-5 (DOC, 2004b). Although the Proposed Project route would not traverse directly across Farmland, the route would pass to the southwest and adjacent to this agricultural area (see Figure D.8-1).

### Williamson Act Land Designations

The DOC also identifies lands under a Williamson Act contract as important agricultural lands. The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act) is California's primary program for the conservation of private land in agricultural and open space use. It is a voluntary, locally administered program that offers preferential property taxes on lands that have enforceable restrictions on their use via contracts between individual landowners and local governments (DOC, 2004c). The Williamson Act

---

<sup>2</sup> Prime Farmland: Land that has the best combination of physical and chemical properties for the production of crops.

<sup>3</sup> Farmland of Statewide Importance: Similar to Prime Farmland, but with minor shortcomings (e.g., steeper slopes, inability to hold water).

<sup>4</sup> Unique Farmland: Land of lesser quality soils, but recently used for the production of specific high economic value crops.

categorizes lands according to various classifications. No Williamson Act lands occur adjacent to the Proposed Project route or the SONGS site. The nearest property under a Williamson Act contract is located approximately three miles northeast of the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, between MCBCP and San Luis Rey Road (see Figure D.8-1), and is classified as Prime Agricultural Land<sup>5</sup> (DOC, 2004d).

## **Military Operations**

The Proposed Project site is located on MCBCP, which is dedicated to military training and other military uses. MCBCP is an active federal military installation, and has exclusive use of all lands and exclusive control over all land uses on MCBCP. Existing land uses on the MCBCP include offices, housing, personnel support facilities, military support facilities (e.g., airfield, ammunition storage areas, radar and communication facilities, supply warehouses), 31 training areas, 4 amphibious assault landing beaches, 19 obstacle courses, paved and unpaved access roads, and areas of disturbed and undisturbed open space.

A range of training activities and other military operations occur in Camp Pendleton. Potential military activities include amphibious landings, use of tracked vehicles, infantry and vehicle maneuvers, artillery and small arms firing, aerial weapons delivery, engineer support operations, logistics support, field combat service support, communications, airlift support for troops and weapons, equipment maintenance, and field medical treatment (INRMP, 2001).

While MCBCP has more than 17 miles of coastline, less than 10 miles of the coast are used for training activities at four amphibious landing beaches. Amphibious assault training activities primarily occur at Red Beach (INRMP, 2001), which is located northwest of the Stuart Mesa (see Figure D.8-1). Approximately 28,500 acres of MCBCP are allowed for reoccurring use to non-military organizations (i.e., public utilities, transit corridors, public educational agencies, retail agencies, State Parks, and agricultural activities) through leases, easements, and outgrants. SONGS currently holds a long-term easement from MCBCP (INRMP, 2001).

## **D.8.2 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards**

Within each section of the EIR, the plans and policies that are applicable to the respective resource areas are evaluated for consistency. Plans, policies, regulations, and standards that are applicable to land use, recreation, and military operations are listed below and are analyzed for consistency in Table D.8-1.

---

<sup>5</sup> Prime Agricultural Land is enrolled under a California Land Conservation Act contract and meets at least one of the following criteria: Class I or Class II in the Natural Resources Conservation Service land use capability classification system; rates 80 to 100 in the Storie Index Rating system; supports livestock used for the production of food and fiber and has an annual carrying capacity equivalent to at least one animal unit per acre as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; land planted with fruit or nut-bearing trees, vines, bushes or crops which have a nonbearing period of less than five years and will normally return during the commercial bearing period on an annual basis from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant production not less than \$200 per acre; or land which has returned from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant production with an annual gross value of not less than \$200 per acre for three of the previous five years.

## Federal

### MCBCP Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan

The Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) is used to set the agenda for managing natural resources on MCBCP for the years 2002 through 2007. The INRMP lists the goals and objectives for recreation, public access, and land use at Camp Pendleton, with the intention that these objectives do not interfere with the mission of MCBCP to operate as an amphibious training base. The INRMP is reviewed at least every 5 years to assess its effectiveness (INRMP, 2001). Table D.8-1 provides a discussion of the Proposed Project's consistency with the INRMP.

### Coastal Zone Management Act

Federal authority for protection of coastal resources under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) is delegated to the State under the California Coastal Act. No additional federal regulations, plans, or standards related to land use, recreation, or agriculture have been identified that are directly applicable to the Proposed Project.

## State of California

As a California investor-owned utility, SCE is regulated by the CPUC and would need CPUC approval for construction and operation of the Proposed Project, pursuant to Rule 42 of the CPUC's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

### California Coastal Act

The Proposed Project would be located on and traverse California Coastal Zone lands (see Figure D.8-1). The California Coastal Act guides the management of coastal resources within the State's jurisdiction through the establishment of a coastal zone management program as required by the CZMA. The coastal zone management program is administered by the California Coastal Commission (CCC) in partnership with local governments for protection of coastal resources. The CCC governs whether proposed projects within the coastal zone would be consistent with the State's coastal management program and therefore allowable. A Coastal Development Permit (CDP) would then be issued for a given project. As the Proposed Project would be located within the Coastal Zone, it must comply with the CDP requirements of the CCC, which may include requesting a new CDP or an amendment to an existing CDP.

SCE would need to file applications for CDPs, as necessary, with the CCC. These applications will be reviewed by the CCC in accordance with its requirements, and both application review and approval processes are wholly independent of the CPUC's approval process for the Proposed Project (including the CEQA environmental review process and this EIR). Given that the analysis in this EIR addresses alternate RSG transport routes and an alternative for onsite OSG storage, the CCC could utilize the information from this EIR while processing the CDP applications if it deems the information applicable to the CCC's application review process. Detailed analysis of Proposed Project consistency with the coastal zone management program would occur as part of the CCC's own review of SCE's CDP application process, if a CDP is required for any of the Proposed Project activities.

### San Onofre State Beach Revised General Plan

The San Onofre State Beach Revised General Plan describes the existing and planned land uses for the San Onofre State Beach (CDPR, 1984). The Plan delineates the San Onofre State Beach into four sub-

units, and provides recommendations for preserving and protecting the significant natural resources, cultural resources, and agricultural preserves that are located within the subunits. Map 3 (Resource Element: Allowable Use Intensity) of the Revised General Plan delineates the allowable use intensities for the San Onofre State Beach. The following allowable use intensity applies to the San Onofre Bluffs Subunit 4, which is the area that is bordered by I-5 to the north and east, the Pacific Ocean to the south and west, the SONGS site to the northwest, and MCBCP to the southeast (CDPR, 1984):

- **Light-intensity use:** This allowable use intensity is applied to areas of high sensitivity that are characterized by very fragile or valuable cultural resources, very sensitive ecological resources, or by geologic hazards and land instability. Permitted light-intensity uses include birdwatching, hiking, nature study, arts (e.g., painting, photography), and scenic observation.

Table D.8-1 provides a discussion of the Proposed Project's consistency with the San Onofre State Beach Revised General Plan.

## Local Ordinances and Policies

The Proposed Project would traverse lands that lie entirely within the jurisdictions of MCBCP and San Onofre State Beach, and would therefore be subject to the plans and policies of the Department of Defense and the California State Department of Parks and Recreation, respectively. As such, no local plans, policies, or ordinances would apply to the Proposed Project.

No additional local plans, regulations, standards related to land use, recreation, or agriculture would directly apply to the Proposed Project.

## D.8.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

### D.8.3.1 Definition and Use of Significance Criteria

Based on the CEQA Guidelines (Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form), standard CEQA practice, and previous environmental documents analyzing transmission line projects, the significance criteria presented below are used to determine if the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact.

**Policy Consistency Impacts** would be considered significant if the project would:

- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

**Land Use Impacts.** The Proposed Project would result in significant land use impacts if it would:

- Physically divide an established community; or
- Create long-term disturbances that would disrupt an established land use (including military operations).

**Recreational Resource Impacts.** Recreational resources would be significantly impacted if the Proposed Project would:

- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- Disrupt recreational activities, which would adversely affect the recreational value of existing facilities.

**Agricultural Resource Impacts.** The Proposed Project would significantly impact agricultural resources if it would:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use; or
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

### D.8.3.2 Replacement Steam Generator Transport

#### Policy Consistency

**Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.** Table D.8-1 provides an analysis of the Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies discussed in Section D.8.2 (above).

#### Land Use Impacts

**Physically divide an established community.** An example of how a project can physically divide communities is by introducing a substantial linear facility with actual and/or perceived physical barriers to crossing. Because the Proposed Project is a replacement of the existing steam generators at SONGS 2 & 3, the Project would not introduce any barriers within an established community. The transport of the RSGs would occur almost entirely on MCBCP, and would be of a temporary nature. No impacts to established communities would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

#### Impact L-1: Transport would disrupt an established land use

The Proposed Project would transport the RSGs across military and recreational land uses, with a short stretch of the transport route along I-5. The transport would require approximately 8 to 12 days per trip, and would temporarily disrupt land uses at MCBCP, which includes training activities and military operations (e.g., amphibious landings, artillery and small arms firing, and aerial weapons delivery). Land uses at San Onofre State Beach, such as camping, swimming, and beach access would also be temporarily disrupted during RSG transport. I-5 would be closed for approximately one hour for each transport trip.

Due to the temporary nature of the RSG transport, the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts to established land uses (Class III). Potential impacts to military activities and amphibious landing beaches (e.g., Red Beach) would be reduced through coordination with the Commanding Officer at MCBCP, which would include MCBCP approval of transport activities and the issuance of a real estate license (SCE, 2004 – Response 34). See Impact L-2 for a discussion of specific impacts to established recreational activities.

#### Recreational Resource Impacts

**Physical deterioration of a recreational facility.** A project would result in or accelerate the substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities if it increased their use beyond existing capacity. Generally, this increased use is a result of an increase in population local to the recreational resources. As shown in Section D.11, Socioeconomics, the Proposed Project is not expected to induce either short-term or long-term population growth, and is unlikely to draw additional residents or recreationists to the area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not increase demand for recreational resources that would lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities due to increased use. No impacts would occur.

**Table D.8-1. Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans and Policies**

Agency Regulating Land Use	Plan or Policy	Project Consistent?	Method of Consistency
<b>FEDERAL</b>			
U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (2001)	Yes, with the issuance of a real estate license and with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1a, Provide advance notice of transport, and L-2a, Avoid peak recreational usage (see discussion below under Impact L-2)	<p>The mission of MCBCP is to operate an amphibious training Base that promotes the combat readiness of operating forces by providing facilities, services, and support responsive to the needs of Marines, Sailors, and their families (MCB Camp Pendleton 2002, as cited in INRMP, 2001).</p> <p>The INRMP strives to ensure that all real estate agreements are compatible with the MCBCP military mission, natural resources management, and public access policies. According to the INRMP, existing leases and easements potentially restrict military and support activities on MCBCP's beaches during amphibious landings, which severely degrade military readiness capability.</p> <p>The Proposed Project has the potential to temporarily disrupt military activities and recreational facilities at Camp Del Mar. However, all SONGS-related activities on MCBCP are conducted at the sole discretion of MCBCP through its Commanding Officer and chain of command, which are in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. RSG transport activities will occur only with the approval of MCBCP, and once approved, will be part of MCBCP's operations at that time (SCE, 2004 – Response 34).</p> <p>In order to permit the transport of the RSGs across Camp Pendleton, MCBCP must grant SCE a real estate license, which would allow the Proposed Project would be consistent with military activities. To reduce impacts to recreational facilities at Camp del Mar, the Project would implement Mitigation Measures N-1a, Provide advance notice of transport, and L-2a, Avoid peak recreational usage. The implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1a and L-2a and the issuance of a real estate license for RSG transport would allow the Proposed Project to be consistent with the INRMP.</p>
<b>STATE</b>			
California Coastal Commission (CCC)	California Coastal Act (1976)	Yes, with CCC approval	For any activities not covered by existing coastal development permits (CDPs), SCE would have to apply for a new CDP to be approved by the CCC.
California Department of Parks and Recreation	San Onofre State Beach Revised General Plan (1984)	Yes	As discussed in Section D.8.2, the General Plan recommends appropriate land uses for San Onofre State Beach. RSG transport through the State Beach would occur on paved roads, and the Proposed Project would not change existing land uses within the State Beach. The Project would be consistent with the General Plan.
<b>LOCAL</b>			
There are no local planning or policy documents applicable to the Proposed Project.			

## Impact L-2: Transport would disrupt recreational activities

As discussed in the Project Description, Section B, the Proposed Project would pass through recreational facilities at San Onofre State Beach and Camp Del Mar. During the actual transport of the RSGs, vehicular access to recreational facilities at Camp Del Mar may be restricted or rerouted for several hours per transport trip. MCBCP would also restrict special permit camping on beach portions of the transport route if the trip occurred during a weekend or holiday. As transport of the RSGs would temporarily restrict or preclude recreational facilities, impacts on recreational users would be considered potentially significant (Class II). However, implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2a (Avoid peak recreational usage), along with Mitigation Measures N-1a (Provide advance notice of transport) in Section D.9, Noise and Vibration, and V-1a (Request decision on closure of San Onofre State Beach) and V-1b, Provide advance notice of campground closure to prospective park visitors and campers) in Section D.14, Visual Resources, would reduce impacts to recreationists to less than significant levels.

### *Mitigation Measure for Impact L-2, Transport would disrupt recreational activities*

**L-2a Avoid peak recreational usage.** SCE shall not schedule offloading and RSG transport during times of peak usage (as defined by and coordinated with recreational facility operators) at San Onofre State Beach and Camp Del Mar.

Without mitigation, the Proposed Project could significantly disrupt recreational activities during transport. By avoiding peak recreational usage and providing advance notice to recreationists, Mitigation Measures L-2a, N-1a, V-1a, and V-1b would minimize temporary impacts to recreation to a less than significant level.

## Agricultural Resource Impacts

**Conversion of Farmland to Non-Agricultural Use.** Generally, the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use is considered a significant impact due to Farmland's high capacity for agricultural production. As described in Section D.8.1, the Project route would travel approximately 400 feet to the southwest and adjacent to 644 acres of Prime Farmland, located on the Stuart Mesa on both the east and west sides of I-5 (see Figure D.8-1). The RSG transport period would be of a short duration, and would bypass agricultural areas. No Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the Proposed Project, and no impacts to Farmland are expected.

**Conflict with an Existing Agricultural Use or a Williamson Act Contract.** The Proposed Project does not cross or run adjacent to any properties under a Williamson Act contract (DOC, 2004d). The nearest lands under a Williamson Act contract are located approximately three miles northeast of the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, between MCBCP and San Luis Rey Road. Therefore, there would be no project-related conflicts with an existing Williamson Act contract. As discussed in Section D.8.3.2, Agricultural Resource Impacts, the Proposed Project would not affect agricultural lands within the vicinity of the Project route. No impacts to agricultural lands or Williamson Act Contract Lands would occur.

### D.8.3.3 Staging and Preparation

#### Policy Consistency

The Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in detail in Table D.8-1, above.

## Land Use Impacts

As described in Section B.4 (Replacement Steam Generator Staging and Preparation), staging and preparation of the Proposed Project would require the construction of temporary facilities for the following activities: staging, warehouse, training, fabrication, and office space. While the exact location of these facilities has not yet been determined, they would be sited on previously developed or disturbed areas (see Section B.4, Replacement Steam Generator Staging and Preparation). The SONGS site is currently used for utility-related industrial land uses. As the staging activities would not be incompatible with existing onsite industrial uses, no impacts would occur.

## Recreational Resource Impacts

Staging and preparation activities would occur at the SONGS site and would not disrupt adjacent recreational activities, such as those at San Onofre State Beach to the northwest and southeast of the SONGS site, and the Camp Del Mar Beach and Recreation Area to the southeast. Staging and preparation of the Proposed Project would not increase local need for recreational resources, nor would these activities lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities due to increased use. No impacts to recreational resources would occur during staging and preparation of the Proposed Project.

## Agricultural Resource Impacts

The nearest Farmland is located on the Stuart Mesa, approximately 12 miles southeast of the SONGS site; the nearest Williamson Act contract is located approximately three miles northeast of the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, between MCBCP and San Luis Rey Road. As staging and preparation activities would occur at the SONGS site, there would be no impacts to Farmland or other agricultural resources.

### D.8.3.4 Original Steam Generator Removal, Staging, and Disposal

#### Policy Consistency

The Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in detail in Table D.8-1, above.

#### Land Use Impacts

The activities involved in preparing and creating the containment opening, such as de-tensioning and removing tendons, removing concrete, cutting rebar, and cutting and removing a section of the steel liner, would be located at the SONGS 2 & 3 containment buildings. These activities would not introduce any barriers within an established community, and would have no impacts to established land uses.

Preparing the OSGs for disposal would occur in a temporary enclosed facility located on previously developed or disturbed areas at the SONGS site. The OSGs would be transported to a LLRW disposal facility via rail, which utilizes an existing transportation right-of-way (ROW). The disposal process would not introduce any barriers within an established community, nor would it alter existing land uses at the SONGS site. No land use impacts would occur.

#### Recreational Resource Impacts

As the preparation and creation of the containment opening would occur at the SONGS site, these activities would not impact adjacent recreational facilities. The segmentation process for the OSGs would

also occur on previously disturbed land at the SONGS site. Transport of the original OSGs to a disposal facility would utilize an existing transportation ROW, and would not contribute to the physical deterioration of a recreational facility.

As discussed in Section D.11, Socioeconomics, OSG removal, transportation, and storage activities would not permanently increase local population. Consequently, these activities would be unlikely to have a substantial effect on the demand for recreational facilities. No impacts to recreational facilities would occur.

### **Agricultural Resource Impacts**

The nearest Farmland is located on the Stuart Mesa, approximately 12 miles southeast of the SONGS site on MCBCP. The nearest Williamson Act contract is located approximately three miles northeast of the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, between MCBCP and San Luis Rey Road. As the removal and segmentation process for the OSGs would occur at the SONGS site, there would be no impacts to Farmland or lands under a Williamson Act contract.

The OSGs would be transported to an existing LLRW disposal facility via rail. The transport would not result in any conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use, nor would it conflict with an existing Williamson act contract. No impacts would occur during the disposal process.

## **D.8.3.5 Steam Generator Installation and Return to Service**

### **Policy Consistency**

The Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in detail in Table D.8-1, above.

### **Land Use Impacts**

The RSGs would occupy the location vacated by the OSGs, allowing SONGS 2 & 3 to continue operation until at least 2022. No other structures would be constructed during the RSG installation and return to service. The Proposed Project would not create impacts to any established land uses.

### **Recreational Resource Impacts**

As the RSGs would be placed in the same location as the OSGs, there would be no impacts to adjacent recreational facilities. The Proposed Project would not increase local need for recreational resources, nor would it lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities due to increased use. Potential deterioration of recreational facilities resulting from the Proposed Project would not occur.

### **Agricultural Resource Impacts**

As stated in Section D.8.3.4, the nearest Farmland is located approximately 12 miles southeast of the SONGS site on the Stuart Mesa; the nearest Williamson Act contract is located approximately three miles northeast of the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, between MCBCP and San Luis Rey Road. As the RSGs would be installed in the same location as the OSGs, there would be no impacts to Farmland or lands under a Williamson Act contract.

## D.8.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Alternatives

### D.8.4.1 Transportation Route Alternatives

#### I-5/Old Highway 101 Route Alternative

This alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project, except for the transport route. The approximately 14-mile I-5/Old Highway 101 Route Alternative would occur almost entirely on I-5 and west of I-5, except for a 0.8-mile segment east of I-5 on Cockleburr and Stuart Mesa Roads. As it leaves the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, the transporter would travel east through Camp Pendleton on Harbor Road to A Street at the western edge of I-5. The transition to I-5 may require the installation of a temporary on-ramp from MCBCP to the southbound lanes of I-5. The I-5/Old Highway 101 Route Alternative would rejoin the Proposed Project route along I-5, immediately east of Skull Canyon.

**Policy Consistency.** The I-5/Old Highway 101 Route would cross the same jurisdictions as the Proposed Project. As this alternative is similar to the Proposed Project, including the jurisdictions that would be affected by the alternative route, consistency with applicable land use, recreation, and military plans and policies would be similar to those for the Proposed Project (see Table D.8-1). As described for the Proposed Project, the I-5/Old Highway 101 Route Alternative would be consistent with all applicable land use plans, subject to MCBCP approval.

**Land Use Impacts.** Impacts to land uses would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. Transport of the RSGs would cross military and recreational land uses and would temporarily disrupt travel along I-5. Transport activities along this alternative route would require approximately 10 to 15 days per trip, and would occur during non-peak hours along I-5. RSG transport via this route alternative would be short-term, and would not physically divide an established community.

As described for the Proposed Project, this alternative would have less than significant impacts to established land uses due to the temporary nature of the RSG transport (Class III). Impacts to military activities would be reduced through SCE coordination with the Commanding Officer at MCBCP, which would include MCBCP approval of transport activities and the issuance of a real estate license (SCE, 2004 – Response 34). In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1a, Provide advance notice of transport (see Section D.9), would provide established land uses with notice of the RSG transport.

**Recreational Resource Impacts.** Impacts to recreational resources would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. This alternative is not expected to induce either short-term or long-term population growth, and is unlikely to draw additional residents or recreationists to the area. The alternative route would not increase local need for recreational resources, and would not lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities due to increased use.

Since this alternative would not travel along the beach area of Camp Del Mar, it would not require the restrictions of special permit camping or preclusion of beach recreational facilities within Camp Del Mar that would be necessary under the Proposed Project. However, the alternative would pass through the same recreational facilities at San Onofre State Beach as the Proposed Project, and may restrict vehicular access to recreational facilities at Camp Del Mar for several hours during the actual transport of the RSGs. As discussed for the Proposed Project in Section D.8.3.2, Replacement Steam Generator Transport, impacts on recreational users would be considered potentially significant, but would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2a, Avoid peak recreational usage. Mitigation Measures N-1a (Provide advance notice of transport) in Section D.9, Noise

and Vibration, and V-1a (Request decision on closure of San Onofre State Beach) and V-1b (Provide advance notice of campground closure to prospective park visitors and campers) in Section D.14, Visual Resources, would also help to minimize the recreational impact (Class II).

**Agricultural Resource Impacts.** As discussed in Section D.8.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, approximately 644 acres of Prime Farmland are located on the Stuart Mesa on both the east and west sides of I-5. The I-5/Old Highway 101 Route Alternative would pass through this area of Farmland along the I-5 (see Figure D.8-1). Immediately northwest of Stuart Mesa, the alternative would exit I-5 onto Coaster Way and Cockleburr Road, and would travel adjacent to the designated Prime Farmland. The alternative RSG transport period would be of a short duration, and would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use. As with the Proposed Project, impacts to Farmland would not occur.

As with to the Proposed Project, this alternative would not cross or run adjacent to any properties under a Williamson Act contract (DOC, 2004d). The nearest lands under a Williamson Act contract are located approximately three miles northeast of the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, between MCBCP and San Luis Rey Road. As with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not impact lands under a Williamson Act contract.

### MCBCP Inland Route Alternative

This alternative would be similar to the previous alternative and the Proposed Project, except for the transport route. The majority of the approximately 18-mile MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would occur on roads within MCBCP, both east and west of I-5, with a portion of the route occurring on I-5. As it leaves the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, the transporter would travel east through Camp Del Mar on Harbor Road. The transporter would traverse along the San Diego Northern Railroad and Fallbrook Spur tracks to pass under I-5, and would continue north and northwest, along the eastern side of I-5 on MCBCP roads. North of the immigration checkpoint facility, the transporter would enter I-5 from the checkpoint parking lot that is adjacent to I-5. Directly east of the North Road/Old Highway 101 intersection, the transporter would leave I-5 and would enter the SONGS Owner Controlled Area by either the North or South Access Gates.

**Policy Consistency.** The MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would cross the same jurisdictions as the Proposed Project. Consistency with applicable land use, recreation, and military plans and policies would be similar to that for the Proposed Project (see Table D.8-1), and as such, the MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would be consistent with all applicable land use plans, subject to MCBCP approval.

**Land Use Impacts.** Impacts to land uses would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. As described for the Proposed Project, transport of the RSGs would cross military and recreational land uses and would temporarily disrupt travel along I-5. Transport activities along the MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would result in a brief lane closure for the northbound lanes, and an approximate 2-hour lane closure for the southbound lanes. However, the RSG transport along both the Proposed Project route and the alternative routes would be short-term, and would not physically divide an established community or cause any land use incompatibilities.

As described for the Proposed Project, the MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would have less than significant impacts to established land uses due to the temporary nature of the RSG transport (Class III). Issuance of a real estate license by MCBCP would avoid or reduce impacts to military activities.

**Recreational Resource Impacts.** Impacts to recreational resources would be similar to those for the Proposed Project. The MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would not increase local need for recreational resources, and would not lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities due to increased use.

This alternative would not require the restrictions of special permit camping or preclusion of beach recreational facilities within Camp Del Mar that would be necessary under the Proposed Project, because it would not travel along the beach area of Camp Del Mar. The MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would also not traverse the San Onofre State Beach recreational facilities that would be temporarily impacted under the Proposed Project. As any potential impacts to recreational users would likely result from a temporary restriction (less than one day) of vehicular access to recreational facilities at Camp Del Mar, the MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would avoid the potentially significant impact of disrupting recreational activities (Impact L-2) that would otherwise occur under the Proposed Project. By avoiding the beach, impacts to recreational users from this alternative would be less than significant (Class III).

**Agricultural Resource Impacts.** As discussed in Section D.8.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, approximately 644 acres of Prime Farmland are located on the Stuart Mesa on both the east and west sides of I-5. The MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would travel approximately 790 feet northeast and 370 feet north of the Farmland, along Stuart Mesa Road. This alternative RSG transport period would be of a short duration, and would not convert Farmland to non-agricultural use. As with the Proposed Project, impacts to Farmland would not occur.

As with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not cross or run adjacent to any properties under a Williamson Act contract (DOC, 2004d). The nearest lands under a Williamson Act contract are located approximately three miles northeast of the Camp Pendleton Del Mar Boat Basin, between MCBCP and San Luis Rey Road. As with the Proposed Project, MCBCP Inland Route Alternative would not impact lands under a Williamson Act contract.

#### **D.8.4.2 OSG Disposal Alternative**

##### **OSG Onsite Storage Alternative**

With the exception of OSG disposal, the OSG Onsite Storage Alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project. Under this alternative, the OSGs would be transported to an OSG Storage Facility that would be located on the SONGS site. While the exact location of the OSG Storage Facility has not been determined, it would be sited on previously developed or disturbed areas. The SONGS site is currently used for utility-related industrial land uses, including various support and ancillary services such as offices, warehouses, and storage yards. As storage of the OSGs would not be incompatible with existing onsite industrial uses, no land use impacts would occur under this alternative.

Impacts associated with other phases of this alternative would be similar to the impacts described for the Proposed Project.

#### **D.8.5 Environmental Impacts of the No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative would not result in regional land use impacts in the near future. However, development scenarios foreseeable under the No Project Alternative could result in new generation or transmission facilities in San Diego County, or elsewhere in southern California, to compensate for the eventual loss of generation at SONGS. Construction of new or increased use of existing power plants

may create impacts to land use, recreation, or agricultural lands beyond the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Although construction and operation of new power plants and transmission lines would be necessary, their locations and development schedules cannot be predicted at this time. However, some impacts would be typical of electric generation and transmission projects, and can be discussed generally.

Natural gas is the most common fuel for most new generation facilities. According to the California Energy Commission, approximately 25 to 30 acres of land are needed to construct and operate a typical 500 MW combined cycle power plant. Impacts to land use, recreation, and agriculture from new generation facilities can sometimes include the conversion of agriculture lands to industrial uses, and conflicts with Williamson Act contracts. New generation facilities are typically not sited such that they conflict with adjacent land uses or recreational facilities. However, due to proximity to utility corridors and a lower cost of land relative to urban areas, new generation facilities can often be sited in rural areas on agricultural lands, which may include Farmland or lands subject to a Williamson Act contract. This could result in a potentially significant conversion of agricultural lands to industrial uses, which may or may not be mitigable to a less than significant level through the use of land trusts or other preservation mechanisms.

Because of the difficulty of securing new rights-of-way, replacement transmission facilities would likely follow existing major paths. Using existing rights-of-way would reduce the potential for significant land use incompatibilities or impacts to agricultural or recreational lands. During construction, the possibility would exist for temporary impacts to nearby recreational areas. This would include, for example, situations where communities developed after placement of the transmission line right-of-way and have since developed portions of the right-of-way as parkland. Many of these impacts could be reduced through noticing and other public notification efforts.

Alternative energy technologies could be used to make up for generation lost by the decommissioning of SONGS, but most of these alternative technologies would not be feasible for providing the level of generation required to make up the capacity lost by closing SONGS. Wind power, landfill gas, small hydroelectric generation, biomass power, and solar photovoltaics are all feasible means of alternative generating strategies, and San Diego County is currently utilizing landfill gas, small hydroelectric generation (defined as 30 MW or less), and wind power (CEC, 2003). The use of wind turbines allows for dual uses such as for agriculture or ranching in addition to power generation, but would result in the conversion of some agricultural lands, both for the wind turbines as well as for transmission ROWs. While biomass power plants would guarantee a demand for agricultural products and therefore the preservation of agricultural lands, increased use of this energy source could lead to increased crop specialization and subsequent land degradation, as well as general impacts related to plant siting and construction. Hydropower facilities typically require 14 acres per MW of generation, and the building of dams and reservoirs inundates streams and riparian lands, which can change recreational uses of the area from “dispersed forms” (stream fishing, hiking, and whitewater boating) to “concentrated uses” (boating and camping on and around reservoirs). Landfill gas energy facilities capture methane gas, which is a byproduct of the decomposition of organic materials in an oxygen-free environment that migrates out of landfills and can be combusted for energy. As methane is considered a greenhouse gas by the U.S. EPA, the Clean Air Act currently requires many larger landfills to collect and combust landfill gas (U.S. EPA, 2004).

System enhancement options could provide minor offsets to the generation capacity lost by decommissioning SONGS, but would not result in substantial land use, recreation, or agricultural impacts because construction would be limited to relatively small distributed generation facilities.

## D.8.6 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Table

Table D.8-2 shows the mitigation monitoring, compliance, and reporting program for Land Use, Recreation, and Military Operations.

Table D.8-2. Mitigation Monitoring Program – Land Use, Recreation, and Military Operations

<b>IMPACT L-2</b>	<b>Transport would disrupt recreational activities (Class II)</b>
<b>MITIGATION MEASURE</b>	<b>L-2a: Avoid peak recreational usage.</b> SCE shall not schedule offloading and RSG transport during times of peak usage (as defined by and coordinated with recreational facility operators) at San Onofre State Beach and Camp Del Mar.
<b>Location</b>	San Onofre State Beach and Camp Del Mar
<b>Monitoring / Reporting Action</b>	Verification of offloading and transport schedule as compared to peak recreational usage of San Onofre State Beach and Camp Del Mar
<b>Effectiveness Criteria</b>	Offloading and transport occur outside of peak recreational usage of San Onofre State Beach and Camp Del Mar as defined by MCBCP and California State Department of Parks and Recreation
<b>Responsible Agency</b>	CPUC, California State Department of Parks and Recreation, MCBCP
<b>Timing</b>	Pre-transport, Transport

## D.8.7 References

- CEC. 2003. California Energy Commission. Renewable Resources Development Report. November. [http://www.energy.ca.gov/renewables/02-REN-1038/notices/2003-11-24\\_notice\\_avail.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/renewables/02-REN-1038/notices/2003-11-24_notice_avail.html). Accessed January 31, 2005.
- CDPR. 1984. California State Department of Parks and Recreation. *San Onofre State Beach Revised General Plan*. Adopted by the California State Park and Recreation Commission, Resolution 28-84. March 9.
- DOC. 2004a. California Department of Conservation. "Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map Categories, Criteria and Uses: Important Farmland Categories." [http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/mccu/map\\_categories.htm](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/mccu/map_categories.htm). Accessed November 30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004b. California Department of Conservation. Personal communication via email from Patrick Hennessy, Research Analyst 2 (GIS), Division of Land Resource Protection, to Tatiana Inouye of Aspen Environmental Group. November 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004c. California Department of Conservation. Personal communication via email from James Nordstrom, Manager of the Williamson Act Program, Division of Land Resource Protection, to Kathleen Robertson of Aspen Environmental Group. November 30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004d. California Department of Conservation. Personal communication via email from James Nordstrom, Manager of the Williamson Act Program, Division of Land Resource Protection, to Tatiana Inouye of Aspen Environmental Group. November 15.
- INRMP. 2001. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan: Marine Corps Base and Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton, CA. <http://www.pendleton.usmc.mil/base/environmental/inrmp.htm>. Accessed November 11, 2004.
- MCBCP. 2004a. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. Personal communication via phone call from Hugh Cooper, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, Marine Corps Community Services, to Tatiana Inouye of Aspen Environmental Group. November 10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004b. Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. Personal communication via phone call from Agnula Burdan, Real Estate Specialist, to Tatiana Inouye of Aspen Environmental Group. November 10.
- San Diego County. 1972. Part IV, Recreation Element, San Diego County General Plan. Adopted March 1972, Amended October 1993.
- San Diego County. 1982. County of San Diego Local Coastal Program: San Dieguito Land Use Plan. Adopted July 1982, Amended September 1988.
- SCE (Southern California Edison). 2004. Response to April 15, 2004, Deficiency Notice. May 17.
- U.S. EPA. 2004. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Landfill Methane Outreach Program (LMOP): Benefits of LFG Energy. <http://www.epa.gov/lmop/benefits.htm>. Accessed January 31, 2005.