7. Alternative 3 (West Lancaster): Impacts and Mitigation Measures

7.1 Direct and Indirect Effects Analysis

Alternative 3 is described in Section 1.2.3. This alternative remains within the same local air district jurisdictions, air basins, and SCAQMD SRAs; and so does not change the affected regional environment from that of the proposed Project, as described in Section 2.2.

This alternative's construction methods do not change from those described for Alternative 2 (SCE's Proposed Project). The proposed route for this alternative does not change from that of Alternative 2 within the KCAPCD or SCAQMD jurisdictions; therefore, the construction emissions for this alternative are only presented numerically, in Appendix A, for the AVAQMD jurisdiction within the MDAB.

This alternative would cause construction activities similar to those of the proposed Project, except it would:

- Decrease the number of new towers by one and increase the overall line length by 0.4 mile for Segment 4.

The maximum daily construction emissions for this very minor route change are identical to that assumed for the proposed Project. Annual emissions are identical to that estimated for the proposed Project for every year other than 2010. Appendix A provides the emission assumptions and detailed emission calculations for this alternative and shows a comparison with the annual emissions estimated for the proposed Project.

Regional Emission Thresholds (Criterion AIR1)

Construction emissions associated with Alternative 3 would exceed the SCAQMD, AVAQMD, and/or KCAPCD regional emission thresholds (Impact AQ-1) in the same way as Alternative 2, with the exception of a very minor Project route adjustment in the AVAQMD jurisdiction that does not change the construction methods or the construction schedule overlap. Therefore, the AVAQMD, and other jurisdiction, maximum daily emissions are identical to those of Alternative 2 (see Table 6-1). Accordingly, this alternative has significant and unavoidable (Class I) regional air quality impacts for SCAQMD and AVAQMD. The recommended mitigation measures for Impact AQ-1 are identical to those recommended for Alternative 2 (See Section 6.1) that provide maximum feasible mitigation for this Class I impact.

Operating emissions would exceed the SCAQMD, AVAQMD, and/or KCAPCD regional emission thresholds (Impact AQ-2). This alternative would have identical direct and indirect operating emissions as Alternative 2. Therefore, like Alternative 2, due to the Project's indirect emission reductions this alternative's operating emissions would provide a beneficial regional operating emissions impact (Class IV).

SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds (Criterion AIR2)

Construction of Alternative 3 would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Impact AQ-3). Alternative 3 is a minor route adjustment in a sparsely populated area. It will move the route slightly farther from two existing residences than the Alternative 2 route. However, it will not change the route or impacts in the SCAQMD jurisdiction, so the localized emissions presented in Table 6-3 are still valid for this alternative. The mitigation measures recommended for Impact AQ-1 mitigate construction emissions to the maximum feasible extent, so no additional mitigation is recommended for this impact. Therefore, this

alternative, like Alternative 2, will have significant and unavoidable (Class I) temporary air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in SCAQMD jurisdiction.

Operation of Alternative 3 would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Impact AQ-4). This alternative would have identical direct and indirect operating emissions as Alternative 2. Therefore, like Alternative 2, this alternative's operating emissions would have a less-than-significant impact (Class III) to local sensitive receptors.

Air Toxic Contaminant Emissions (Criterion AIR3)

Construction or operation of Alternative 3 would generate toxic air contaminant emissions that would exceed SCAQMD risk thresholds (Impact AQ-5). Alternative 3 does not impact the Project's construction within SCAQMD jurisdiction, and only marginally impacts construction emissions within AVAQMD jurisdiction. Therefore, like Alternative 2, this alternatives construction and operation emissions would not exceed SCAQMD risk thresholds so the Project would have less-than-significant (Class III) health risk impacts.

Federal General Conformity Rule (Criterion AIR4)

The Project would not conform to Federal General Conformity Rules (Impact AQ-6). Alternative 3 does not change the emissions in the ANF. Therefore, the impacts for this alternative are identical to Alternative 2. Like Alternative 2, this alternative would conform to the SIP and would have a less-than-significant impact (Class III).

Odors (Criterion AIR5)

The Project would create objectionable odors (Impact AQ-7). Alternative 3 would have identical construction and operation odor potential as Alternative 2. Therefore, like Alternative 2, this alternative would have less-than-significant (Class III) odor impacts.

Angeles National Forest Strategy Conformance (Criterion AIR6)

The Project would not conform to Angeles National Forest air quality strategies (Impact AQ-8). Alternative 3 does not change the construction requirements and methods within the Angeles National Forest from those in Alternative 2. Therefore, like Alternative 2, with the incorporation of the air quality Mitigation Measures AQ-1a through AQ-1j, the air quality strategy would be compliant with ANF air quality strategies and the Project impacts would be less than significant (Class II).

Conformance with Applicable Air Quality Management Plans (Criterion AIR7)

The Project would not conform with applicable Air Quality Management Plans (Impact AQ-9). Alternative 3 has identical impacts, and recommended mitigation measures, as Alternative 2 in respect to conforming to AQMPs. Therefore, like Alternative 2, with incorporation of mitigation measures AQ-1a, AQ-1b, and AQ-1d. This alternative would be consistent with the currently approved Air Quality Management Plans and would have a less-than-significant impact (Class II).

Climate Change Impacts (Criterion AIR8)

Emissions would contribute to climate change (Impact AQ-10). The GHG emissions estimated for construction and operating activities are essentially the same as those for the proposed Project shown in Tables 6-5, and 6-

6, as is the forecast indirect emission decrease. Therefore, this alternative has essentially the identical impacts as the proposed Project and would provide a beneficial GHG emissions impact (Class IV).

7.2 Cumulative Effects Analysis

Alternative 3 is a minor reroute of Alternative 2 and as such has the same geographic extent, existing cumulative conditions, reasonably foreseeable future projects and changes, and impacts as Alternative 2. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have the same potential cumulative impacts as Alternative 2 (see Section 6.2).