

Comment Set E.13: Applicant – Noise

**ANTELOPE-PARDEE 500kV TRANSMISSION PROJECT
 SCE COMMENTS & SUGGESTED REVISIONS ON DEIR/DEIS
 C.10 NOISE**

October 2006

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
1	C.10.2.3 Los Angeles County	C.10-11	Paragraph 3	The description of the Noise Control Ordinance of Los Angeles County is not complete, because it does not discuss that a variance can be obtained to work outside of the allowable construction work hours. This information should be included in the DEIR/DEIS, because there are times when SCE may need to apply for a variance to work outside of the allowable work hours – for example during levels of high load when outages required for cut-overs can only be secured at night.	The DEIR/DEIS should be modified to include language on variances to the Los Angeles County Noise Ordinance.
2	C.10.5 City of Santa Clarita	C.10-12	Paragraph 3	The description of the City of Santa Clarita Noise Ordinance is not complete, because it does not mention that a variance can be obtained to work outside of the allowable construction work hours. This language is included in the City of Santa Clarita Noise Ordinance and reads as follows: "The Planning and Economic Development Department may issue a permit for work to be done "after hours" provided that containment of construction noises is provided. (Ord. 89-29, 1/23/90; Ord. 93-4, 3/9/93; Ord. 00-3, 2/8/00; Ord. 05-1 § 2, 1/25/05)"	The DEIR/DEIS should be modified to include language on variances to the City of Santa Clarita Noise Ordinance.

E.13-1

E.13-2

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
3	C.10.5 City of Santa Clarita	C.10-12	Paragraph 3	<p>The City of Santa Clarita Noise Ordinance (Ordinance) regulates construction work which requires a building permit from the City of Santa Clarita. SCE does not need to obtain a building permit from the City of Santa Clarita and therefore would not be regulated by this section of the Ordinance.</p> <p>The discussion of the City of Santa Clarita noise ordinance limits does not include additional language from the Ordinance that states "It shall be unlawful for any person within the City to produce or cause or allow to be produced noise which is received on property occupied by another person within the designated region, in excess of the following levels."</p>	<p>This section of the DEIR/DEIS should be modified to clarify that the noise limits are applicable where noise is produced that would be heard at an occupied residence.</p>
4	C.10.5	C.10-16	Mitigation Measure N-1a	<p>This mitigation measure should include language stating that construction activities cannot be performed outside the conditions stated without a variance.</p>	<p>Add language to Mitigation Measure that allows for the ability to apply for a variance from the City of Santa Clarita.</p>

E.13-3

E.13-4

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
5	C.10.5	C.10-6	Mitigation Measure N-1b	<p>This mitigation measure is overly burdensome and excessive. Due to weather conditions and other unanticipated events, SCE may not always know specifically where and when construction will occur – especially two to four weeks in advance. The linear aspect of this proposed project would require that multiple mailings be sent out.</p> <p>In addition, the distances for the various mailings (single-family, multi-family and commercial) seem arbitrary and without justification. The requirement that, prior to construction, copies of all notices be submitted to the CPUC and Forest Service is excessive. There would not be enough time for SCE to wait for review and approval before mailing out the notices. Plus since there are no residences on the ANF why is the Forest Service included as a review/approval agency?</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure N-1b should be modified to state that SCE will notify all businesses and residences within 300 feet of the project, of the status of the project, the proposed construction schedule, and tips on reducing noise. SCE will provide to the CPUC and USFS a copy of the fact sheet utilized to notify residents and businesses within 300 feet of the project prior to the start of construction. If any significant changes in scheduling were to occur, SCE would publish an updated notice in the local papers or send an updated Fact Sheet.</p>
6	C.10.5	C.10-17	Mitigation Measure N-1c	<p>This mitigation measure applies to stationary sources that are defined in the Los Angeles County Noise Ordinance as relatively long-term operations – periods of 10 days or more, and that are located in unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.</p> <p>SCE does not anticipate using any stationary equipment for a period of 10 days or more at one location other than at either Pardee or Vincent Substations. Neither of these two substations is in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore this mitigation measure should be deleted.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure N-1c should be removed.</p>

E.13-5

E.13-6

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
7	C.10.5	C.10-17	Impact N-2	<p>SCE had proposed a reroute through Haskell Canyon that was provided to Aspen and not incorporated into the DEIR/DEIS. SCE believes that this SCE proposed reroute would not have any significant impacts on the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch. The SCE proposed reroute locates the proposed SCE transmission line to the west of the existing LADWP transmission lines which are further away from the outdoor sets located on the Veluzat Movie Ranch. The reroute would cross the LADWP lines southwest of the Movie Ranch, and then enter the corridor of the existing Del Sur-Saugus 66 kV line which has been there since the 1920s.</p> <p>In addition, the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch is described several times as a sensitive receptor. Noise sensitive receptor are typically described as hospitals, schools, residential areas, etc. and usually do not include commercial operations.</p>	<p>The DEIR/DEIS should incorporate SCE's proposed reroute and reevaluate any potential impacts.</p>

E.13-7

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
8	C.10.5	C.10-17	Impact N-4	<p>SCE typically patrols transmission lines by driving slowly along an existing access road, usually a dirt road within the ROW. If there is no ground access, then routine inspections must be done using a helicopter. Areas where helicopter patrols are typically conducted are on public lands, such as Forest Service land, where there are few if any residents that would be potentially impacted by noise from the helicopter. Even when patrols are conducted via helicopter, the potential noise impacts are short-term.</p> <p>SCE disagrees that noise level increases related to routine inspection and maintenance would violate local standards.</p>	Impact N-4 should be reclassified as Class III.
9	C.10.5	C.10-18	Impact N-5	<p>SCE had proposed a reroute through Haskell Canyon that was provided to Aspen and not incorporated into the DEIR/DEIS. SCE believes that this SCE proposed reroute would not have any significant impacts on the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch. The SCE proposed reroute locates the proposed SCE transmission line to the west of the existing LADWP transmission lines which are further away from the outdoor sets located on the Veluzat Movie Ranch. The reroute would cross the LADWP lines southwest of the Movie Ranch, and then enter the corridor of the existing Del Sur-Saugus 66 kV line which has been there since the 1920s.</p>	The DEIR/DEIS should incorporate SCE's proposed reroute and reevaluate any potential impacts.

E.13-8

E.13-9

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
11	C.10.5	C.10-18	Impact N-7	<p>SCE had proposed a reroute through Haskell Canyon that was provided to Aspen and not incorporated into the DEIR/DEIS. SCE believes that this SCE proposed reroute would not have any significant impacts on the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch. The SCE proposed reroute locates the proposed SCE transmission line to the west of the existing LADWP transmission lines which are further away from the outdoor sets located on the Veluzat Movie Ranch. The reroute would cross the LADWP lines southwest of the Movie Ranch, and then enter the corridor of the existing Del Sur-Saugus 66 kV line which has been there since the 1920s.</p>	<p>The DEIR/DEIS should incorporate SCE's proposed reroute and reevaluate any potential impacts.</p>

E.13-11

Comment No.	Section	Page	Line	Comment	Remarks/How Suggested to Resolve
12	C.10.5	C.10-19	Impact N-8	<p>This section discusses who the potential sensitive receptors are on NFS lands within the ANF including users along trails in the vicinity of the proposed transmission line. SCE is not aware of any hiking trails other than the Pacific Crest Trail located on the ANF in this area. The majority of the route that would be utilized in the ANF for the proposed Project is a designated OHV route. It is questionable whether a temporary increase in ambient noise levels would be a significant impact to this particular user group. Additional sensitive receptors mentioned are the seasonal residences located along Bouquet Canyon Road. SCE questions whether these are "seasonal" and therefore qualify as recreational users.</p> <p>Also, this Impact is entitled "Temporary increases in ambient noise levels would disturb recreational users within the Angeles National Forest" yet the Los Angeles County noise ordinance is discussed as well as local parks located outside the National Forest.</p>	<p>Modify this impact to remove references to non-Forest sensitive receptors and reclassify it as a Class III impact.</p>

E.13-12

Response to Comment Set E.13: Applicant – Noise

- E.13-1 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section B.2.2, SCE proposes that crews would work Monday through Saturday, 6:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on all SCE-owned properties and approved right-of-ways (as provided by SCE). This assumption was used in assessing potential noise impacts and applying applicable noise regulations.
- E.13-2 Refer to Response to Comment E.13-1, above.
- E.13-3 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.10.2.3, “activities are not allowed to cause noise levels in the receiving zone in excess of stated limits, except as provided elsewhere in the code section”.
- E.13-4 The following text has been added to the end of Draft EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure N-1a:
“...without the approval of a variance from the City of Santa Clarita.”
- E.13-5 Draft EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure N-1b has modified to the following:
“During construction, SCE or its construction contractor shall provide advance notice, between two and four weeks prior to construction, by mail to all ~~single-family residences and businesses that would be within 600 feet of project construction, multi-family residences within 300 feet of construction, and commercial uses within 170 feet of construction.~~ If any significant changes in scheduling were to occur, SCE would publish an updated notice in the local papers or send an updated Fact Sheet. The announcement shall state specifically where and when construction would occur in the area. If construction delays of more than seven days occur, an additional notice shall be made, either in person or by mail. Notices shall provide tips on reducing noise intrusion, for example, by closing windows facing the planned construction. SCE shall also publish a notice of impending construction in local newspapers, stating when and where construction would occur. Prior to construction, copies of all notices will be submitted to the CPUC and Forest Service for review and approval.”
- E.13-6 Draft EIR/EIS Mitigation Measure N-1c is included should stationary construction equipment be used for more than 10-days at one location to ensure compliance with all areas of the right-of-way applicable to the County of Los Angeles construction noise regulations. During construction, should stationary construction equipment not be used in excess of 10-days at one location, the mitigation measure would not be applicable.
- E.13-7 Please see Response to Comment GR-4 regarding the identification, screening, and analysis of proposed Project Alternatives.
- E.13-8 As stated in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.10.5, Impact N-4, this determination is based on the cross-reference with Mitigation Measure V-4b, which would require an increase in helicopter use during maintenance activities.
- E.13-9 Please see Response to Comment GR-4 regarding the identification, screening, and analysis of proposed Project Alternatives.
- E.13-10 Please see Response to Comment GR-4 regarding the identification, screening, and analysis of proposed Project Alternatives.

E.13-11 As stated in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.10.5, Impact N-8, these receptors would only be exposed to noise associated with construction traffic and helicopter use during construction. Draft EIR/EIS Impact N-8 discussion has modified to the following:

“Construction of the proposed Project would result in substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels ~~in excess of the Los Angeles County noise ordinances.~~”