

Comment Set E.12: Applicant – Land Use and Public Recreation

**ANTELOPE-PARDEE 500kV TRANSMISSION PROJECT SEGMENT 1
 SCE COMMENTS & SUGGESTED REVISIONS ON DEIR/DEIS
 C.9 LAND USE AND PUBLIC RECREATION**

October 2006

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve	
1	C.9.1.1	C.9-5	Public Recreational Land Uses	Shouldn't the Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy (deed owner name is Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority) "Ritter Ranch" parkland be discussed here as well?	The DEIR/DEIS should be modified to reflect this correction.	E.12-1
2	C.9.1.2	C.9-6	Line 2	Identifies that the existing Saugus-Del Sur is an utility corridor.		E.12-2
3	C.9.1.3	C.9-10	Paragraph 2	Does not mention McMillin's Meadow Peak development.	The DEIR/DEIS should be modified to reflect this correction.	E.12-3
4	C.9.5	C.9-24	L-3	The proposed Project's restriction of current or future land uses on private property would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact. (Class I).	The DEIR/DEIS should be modified to reflect that the negotiation with the property owner for the grant of easement is the mitigation, whereas the property owner is compensated for the land.	E.12-4
5	C 9.5	C.9-25	L-4	The description of Alternative 4 is different than the proposed reroute that was provided to Aspen by SCE on May 2, 2006. SCE believes that the SCE proposed reroute is superior because it addresses issues that McMillin Land Development raised with SCE about the proposed project. In addition, the SCE proposed reroute locates the newly proposed SCE transmission line adjacent to the existing LADWP transmission lines thereby reducing new visual impacts near the movie ranch as compared to the proposed project.	The DEIR/DEIS should incorporate SCE's proposed reroute.	E.12-5

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
6	C.9.4	C.9-25	L-5	SCE will purchase a Grant of Easement from the affected landowners. This easement is a fair value assessment of the property and will have already compensated the landowner for loss of revenues. When negotiating the Grant of Easement, SCE will develop a construction plan and communicate it with the property owner. This is standard protocol for SCE and does not require an additional "contract".	The DEIR/DEIS should remove Mitigation Measure L-5
7	C.9.4	C.9-26	L-6	Mitigation requires SCE to "avoid diagonal orientations and angular alignments with in agricultural land." While some towers can be adjusted to be on the boundaries of cultivated fields, aligning the tower line parallel with rows would require changes to the existing alignments that have not been reviewed for feasibility. In many cases, the transmission line can span the field and thus minimize impacts.	The DEIR/DEIS should add language stating these measures will be implemented "if feasible".

E.12-6

E.12-7

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
8	C.9.4	C.9-26	L-6	<p>SCE would be willing to consider the use of tubular steel poles rather than lattice steel towers in the portions of the Antelope Valley and City of Santa Clarita as technically feasible. Some of the larger structures (ie. structures at angle points where the transmission line changes direction) may need to be lattice steel towers.</p>	<p>In initial comments and as a result of the scoping process the Brunet Family requested several items in a letter dated July 19, 2005. This letter appears in Appendix D-3 of the Scoping Report for Southern California Edison Company's Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project, prepared by Aspen Environmental Group and released by the CPUC and USDA in August 0f 2005.</p> <p>The letter requests the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reroute of the existing 12kV line from the proposed location in the 500kV R-O-W to a franchise location along existing streets. • Use Tubular Steel Towers (TSP) from Antelope to approximately T-102. • Realignment of the T/L route on their property. <p>SCE does not object to these requests; however there is only vague reference to the revised 12 kV route (in description B.2.1.1 and B.2.2.1) and TSP's (in V-1a and visual simulation KOP2 page 3). There is no mention of the alignment change to avoid the house. SCE requests that the CUPC and USDA consider these requests in the final EIR/EIS.</p>
9	C.9.4	C.9-28	R-1a	<p>Mitigation requires construction coordination with "authorized officers..." of Ritter Ranch.</p>	<p>SCE believes that this "Ritter Ranch" area being affected are the lands under the jurisdiction of the Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy.</p> <p>The DEIR/DEIS should clarify this.</p>

E.12-8

E.12-9

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
	C.9.4	C.9-28	R-1b	Mitigation requires construction coordination with "authorized officers..." of Ritter Ranch. for "alternative recreation sites"	<p>SCE believes that this "Ritter Ranch" area being affected are the lands under the jurisdiction of the Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy and needs clarification as to who is the authorized officer?</p> <p>The DEIR/DEIS should clarify this.</p>

E.12-9
 cont'd

Response to Comment Set E.12: Applicant – Land Use and Public Recreation

- E.12-1 As the Ritter Ranch parkland is affected only by Alternative 5, it is discussed under existing conditions for Alternative 5 in Section C.9.10.1 under Public Recreational Land Uses.
- E.12-2 The location of the proposed Project within the existing Saugus-Del Sur utility corridor has been clarified in Section C.9.1.2 Center Area: Angeles National Forest.
- E.12-3 Although McMillan’s Meadow Peak was not mentioned by name, it was referred to as a site of future development in Haskell Canyon. This paragraph has been revised to include the name of the development.
- E.12-4 Whether or not SCE negotiates with the property owner to obtain an easement, construction of the transmission line would be a change in land use which would restrict current or future land uses. Compensation to the property owner is not mitigation of a change in land use. No change will be made to the analysis.
- E.12-5 Please see the response to Comment E.3-10 regarding the alternative submitted by SCE in May 2006.
- E.12-6 SCE was provided multiple opportunities, both in the application process and through responses to data requests to provide information such as described in the comment. As this was not provided for inclusion in the application or the data responses, this information cannot be considered part of the project’s description and was not analyzed as such. Additionally, this mitigation was designed to minimize impacts to agricultural resources. Nothing in SCE’s construction plan as described in the comment addresses minimizing these impacts. No changes will be made to the analysis or mitigation.
- E.12-7 Modifying mitigation to include the phrase “if feasible” eliminates any enforceability of the mitigation measure. Consequently, a measure with this language included would not necessarily be able to mitigate a significant impact to be less-than-significant. Although designing the transmission line to meet the requirements of the mitigation measure within the parameters of the analyzed route may be difficult, SCE should be able to comply with this measure. No change will be made to the mitigation.
- E.12-8 Please see General Response GR-4 regarding analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives.
- E.12-9 Mitigation Measure R-1a has been clarified to include a total of 12 recreational facilities. It is the responsibility of SCE to determine the authorized officers for each of these facilities as a part of their coordination efforts. No change will be made to this mitigation measure with regard to authorized officers.
- E.12-10 Mitigation Measure R-1b has been clarified to include a total of 12 recreational facilities. It is the responsibility of SCE to determine the authorized officers for each of these facilities as a part of their coordination efforts. No change will be made to this mitigation measure with regard to authorized officers.