

Other Revisions to EIR

This section includes revisions identified by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) as needed to clarify the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). None of these revisions result in new or more severe environmental impacts.

Changes Needed to Address SCE Revisions to GIS Data

Southern California Edison's (SCE's) comments on the Draft EIR requested updates to project components based on current engineering design. To ensure that all project components were up-to-date, the CPUC/Ecology and Environment, Inc. sent Data Request #8 to SCE on July 22, 2016. Among other things, Data Request #8 requested that SCE provide geographic information system (GIS) data that show updated project components including:

1. All tubular steel poles (TSP), lightweight steel (LWS) poles, lattice steel towers (LSTs), and wood poles
2. 66-kilovolt (kV) subtransmission structures
3. Underground trenches and vaults
4. Manholes
5. Duct banks
6. Existing and proposed driveways at the Mesa Substation
7. Temporary structures and components
8. Permanent and temporary impact areas

SCE provided the CPUC with this information on August 17, 2016. The CPUC revised several parts of the Draft EIR to incorporate the updated project GIS data, as described below.

Figure Updates

To ensure consistency with changes made to the EIR text, updates were incorporated into project figures using the revised GIS provided by SCE. Figures in the following sections have been revised:

- Figure 2-3a: Project Components: Main Project Area – Mesa Substation Site
- Figure 2-3b: Project Components: Main Area – Telecommunications Route 1
- Figure 2-3c: Project Components: Main Area – Telecommunications Routes 2A and 2B
- Figure 2-3d: Project Components: Main Area – Telecommunications Route 3
- Figure 2-3e: Project Components: North Area – Temporary 220-kV Structure
- Figure 2-3f: Project Components: South Area – Proposed 220-kV Structure
- Figure 2-3g: Project Components: South Area – Proposed Distribution Line Conversion
- Figure 2-10: Groundwater Wells Mesa Substation
- Figure 2-11: Proposed Mesa Substation Construction Phases
- Figure 2-13: HDD and Boring Locations

- Figure 3.4-1: One-Transformer-Bank Substation Alternative Footprint – Main Project Area
- Figure 3.4-2: Two-Transformer-Bank Substation Alternative Footprint – Main Project Area
- Figure 3.4-3: Rough Schematic of GIS Alternative Footprint – Main Project Area
- Figure 4.3-1: Vegetation Types
- Figure 4.3-2: Critical Habitat and Occurrences
- Figure 4.5-1: Geology in the Project Area
- Figure 4.5-2: Soils in the Project Area
- Figure 4.5-3: Active Faults, Earthquakes, and Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones in the Project Area
- Figure 4.5-4: Landslide Susceptibility and Liquefaction Potential in the Project Area
- Figure 4.5-5: Oil Fields and Oil and Gas Injection Wells in the Project Area
- Figure 4.5-6: Mineral Deposits, Mines, and Mineral Resources Zones in the Project Areas
- Figure 4.7-1: Cortese Sites and Groundwater Contamination in the Project Area
- Figure 4.7-2: Schools in the Project Area
- Figure 4.7-3: Fire Hazard Severity Zones
- Figure 4.8-1: Groundwater Basins
- Figure 4.8-2: Hydrology
- Figure 4.8-3: FEMA Flood Hazard
- Figure 4.9-1: Existing Land Uses in the Mesa Substation Study Area
- Figure 4.9-2: General Plan Land Uses in the Mesa Substation Study Area
- Figure 4.9-3: Zoning Designation in the Mesa Substation Study Area
- Figure 4.10: Noise Monitoring Locations
- Figure 4.13-1: Recreational Facilities within One Mile of the Proposed Project
- Figure 4.14-1: Highways and Major Roadways in the Project Study Area
- Figure 5-1: Comparison of Alternative Footprints
- Figure 6-1: Cumulative Projects

These updated figures have been inserted in the Final EIR.

Text Updates

Page 2-8-2-9, Table 2-1 was revised based on updated data received from SCE.

| 500/220-kV Transmission Line Features (Overhead) | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Main Project Area | | |
| 500-kV transmission line | One line loop-in | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-align and connect the existing single-circuit Mira Loma-Vincent 500-kV line into the new proposed 500-kV switchrack at Mesa Substation. |
| | Two LSTs; Two Racks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove one three LSTs and relocate up to three <u>construct four</u> 500-kV structures (two LSTs; 2 racks) in the ROW adjacent to Mesa Substation. |
| 220-kV transmission lines | Two line loop-in | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-align and connect the existing Goodrich-Laguna Bell and Laguna Bell-Rio Hondo 220-kV transmission lines into the new 220-kV switchrack at Mesa Substation. |
| | Eight lines relocation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct new overhead getaways to relocate eight existing 220-kV transmission lines into the new proposed 220-kV switchracks at Mesa Substation. |
| | <u>Remove 41 structures</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Remove 41 structures (29 LSTs; 4 poles; 8 racks) in the ROW adjacent to Mesa Substation.</u> |
| | <u>Construct 27 structures</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Construct 23 structures (9 LSTs; 1 pole; 5 TSPs; 8 other structures) in the ROW adjacent to Mesa Substation. Construct four temporary structures in the ROW adjacent to the Mesa Substation.</u> |
| | 17 structure replacements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace existing 220-kV structures in the ROW adjacent to Mesa Substation. |
| | 35 LSTs and 4 TSPs removal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of portions of existing 220-kV transmission lines. |

Table 4.7-1

The following Cortese List Sites no longer fall within 0.25 mile of the proposed project because of changes in the physical location of proposed project components. Table 4.7-1 in the EIR has been updated to reflect this change.

p. 4.7-8:

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| SCE Mesa Substation | LUST, UST and AST Site | 700 Potrero Grande, Monterey Park | Within the proposed Mesa 500-kV Substation. | LUST case closed/historic soil contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons |
| Shell Oil Company Station | LUST and UST Site | 430 Potrero Grande, Monterey Park | 0.02 mile southwest of the proposed Mesa 500-kV Substation boundary. | LUST case closed/soil contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons |
| Chevron Service Station | LUST and UST Site | 2633 Via Campo, Monterey Park | 0.19 mile northwest of Telecommunications Route 2. | LUST case closed/soil contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons |
| Conoco-Phillips | LUST and UST Site | 879 Wilcox, Monterey Park | 0.21 mile northwest of Telecommunications | LUST case closed/soil contaminated with |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| (formerly Unocal) Service Station | | | Route 2. | petroleum hydrocarbons |
| San Gabriel Valley Superfund Site, Whittier Narrows Operable Unit | Groundwater Contamination and NPL Site | Whittier Narrows area in unincorporated Los Angeles County | Contamination underlying the 1.6 miles of the Mesa Telecommunication Route 3. | Open-groundwater monitoring/contaminated with groundwater contaminated with various organic compounds |

Table 4.7-2

The following schools no longer fall within 0.25 mile of the proposed Mesa Substation because of changes in the physical location of proposed project components. Table 4.7-2 in the EIR has been updated to reflect this change.

p. 4.7-11:

Table 4.7-2 Schools within 0.25 Mile of the Proposed Project

| School | Address | Approximate Distance |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Schurr High School | 820 North Wilcox Avenue, Montebello | 0.18 mile south of Staging Yard 2 |
| Schurr Community Adult School | 820 North Wilcox Avenue, Montebello | 0.18 mile south of Staging Yard 2 |
| Wilcox Elementary School | 816 Donna Way, Montebello, | 0.38 mile south of Staging Yard 2 |
| YMCA Montebello School | 2000 W Beverly Blvd, Montebello | 0.20 mile south of Telecommunications Route 2 |
| Kiddy Tyme Child Care Learning Center | 1465 N Montebello Blvd, Montebello | 0.20 mile southeast of the Main Project Area (transmission corridor) |
| The Don Bosco Technical Institute | 1151 San Gabriel, Rosemead | 0.00 mile south of Telecommunications Route 1 |

Table 2-1: Components of the Proposed Project

The acreage of the substation was updated to reflect updated GIS data received from the applicant.

Page 2-7:

Table 2-1 Components of the Proposed Project

| Component | Quantity/Dimensions | Proposed Project Specifications |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Mesa 500-kV Substation | | |
| New 500/220/66/16-kV substation | 69.4 72.1 acres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replaces existing 220/66/16 kV Mesa Substation. Located within applicant-owned property (86.2 acres) in the City of Monterey Park. Staffed, automated substation. Operating capacity: 3,360 MVA at 500/220-kV; 840 MVA at 220/66-kV; and 56 MVA at 66/16-kV. Potential future capacity: 4,800 MVA at 500/220 kV; |

Table 2-1 Components of the Proposed Project

| Component | Quantity/ Dimensions | Proposed Project Specifications |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|
| | | 1,120 at 220/66-kV; and 112 MVA at 66/16 kV. ⁽¹⁾ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction would be conducted in three <u>temporal</u> phases: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase 1: Initial Site Development (33.4 acres) and start of 220/66-kV Switchrack - Phase 2: 220/66-kV Switchrack Expansion (8 acres) - Phase 3: Existing Mesa Substation Decommissioning (40 acres) and build out of 500-kV Switchrack. |

Section 2.2.1.1 Proposed Mesa Substation

Acreage of the new substation was updated to reflect updated GIS data received from the applicant. This change in acreage did not impact the analysis.

Page 2-27:

2.2.1.1 Proposed Mesa Substation

The proposed 500/220/66/16-kV Mesa Substation would require a total area of approximately ~~69.4~~ 72.1 acres to replace the existing 220/66/16-kV Mesa Substation and connect existing 500-kV and 220-kV circuits to the proposed new configuration. The proposed new Mesa Substation would be staffed and automated, operating at 3,360 MVA at 500/220-kV, 840 MVA at 220/66-kV, and 56 MVA at 66/16-kV. The capacity of the proposed substation would be expandable to a maximum of 4,480 MVA at 500/220-kV, 1,120 MVA at 220/66-kV, and 112 MVA at 66/16-kV, depending on future need. The build-out of the proposed Mesa Substation would include the following (Figure 2-3a):

Table 2-8: Approximate Land Disturbance from Implementation of the Proposed Project

Acreage of the new substation was updated to reflect updated GIS data received from the applicant. This change in acreage did not impact the analysis.

Page 2-75:

Table 2-8 Approximate Land Disturbance from Implementation of the Proposed Project

| Proposed Project Component | Permanent Disturbance Area (acres) | Temporary Disturbance Area (acres) | Total Disturbance Area (acres) |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Mesa 500-kV Substation and Staging Areas | <u>69.472.1</u> | 121.2 | 190.6 |

Description of Alternatives

Acreage of the new substation was updated to reflect updated GIS data received from the applicant. This change in acreage did not impact the analysis.

Page 3-14:

Potential to Substantially Reduce or Avoid Significant Environmental Impacts

As an approximate rule, gas-insulated substations are smaller than air-insulated substations because gas is a better insulator than air and therefore requires less space. The gas-insulated switchracks would be roughly one-tenth the size of air-insulated switchracks. The transformer banks and other equipment would not be reduced in size. The substation footprint would be about 54.5 acres under this alternative, rather than the ~~69.4~~ 72.1 acres associated with the proposed project

Minor Clarifications

Impact GEO-3

While the location of the existing Walnut and Pardee Substations within State of California Liquefaction seismic Hazard Zones was discussed in the environmental setting of Section 4.5, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources," these substations were not included in the discussions under Impact GEO-3 due to a scrivener's error. Impacts at Walnut and Pardee Substations would result from conduit installation, which is contemplated under Impact GEO-3. Impacts under this criterion remain less than significant with mitigation after inclusion of the Walnut and Pardee Substations. The following change has been made to correct the analysis under Impact GEO-3.

Page 4.5-29–4.5-30:

None of the proposed project components would be located in an area identified in a city or county general plan as posing a substantial risk of secondary seismic hazards such as ground subsidence or differential settlement. The only proposed project components that would be located within a State of California Liquefaction Seismic Hazard Zone ~~are~~ are a portion of Telecommunications Route 3 and the Walnut and Pardee Substations (USGS 2001). The only ground disturbing activity proposed to occur in a State of California Liquefaction Seismic Hazard Zone is the installation of underground conduit and fiber optic cable at the southeast terminus of Telecommunications Route 3 and inside the perimeters of the Walnut and Pardee Substations. Although the proposed project would not exacerbate existing soil conditions related to probability for liquefaction, liquefaction may result in damage to underground infrastructure at the Walnut and Pardee Substations or along Telecommunications Route 3's underground infrastructure, which would be a significant impact. MM GEO-1 would require that the applicant prepare a geotechnical report, which would include design measures to minimize potential for liquefaction and incorporate ground improvements in liquefiable zones. The applicant would design the project in accordance with any recommendations set forth in the report, which would reduce impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, to less than significant.

Impact GEO-6

While the location of the Walnut Substation in the City of Industry was described as within an area subject to earthquake-induced landslides in the environmental setting of Section 4.5, "Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources," this substation was not discussed under Impact GEO-6 due to a scrivener's error. The revision below was made to include the Walnut Substation in the impact

analysis; however, the determination of impacts under this criterion of less than significant with mitigation remains after inclusion of the Walnut Substation in the analysis.

Page 4.5-31:

Most of the proposed project area is located outside State of California Earthquake-Induced Landslide Hazard Zones; the Walnut Substation in the City of Industry is located within this zone. Landslide impacts would not occur at Walnut Substation because all work would be located in a graded area. These zones are areas where the previous occurrence of seismically induced landslides or geologic, topographic, and seismic conditions that indicate a risk of landslides. The main project area is also mapped by the USGS as having low landslide susceptibility. The city and county general plans (except for the City of Industry) covering areas of proposed ground disturbance indicate that secondary seismic hazards such as lateral spreading, subsidence, collapse, and differential settlement are not significant hazards in the proposed project area.

Impact GEO-7

A scrivener's error was found in Impact GEO-7. The original text referred to seismic impacts, when the preceding discussion described potential impacts from expansive soils. The following correction was made to the discussion.

Page 4.5-32:

A portion of the proposed Main Project Area is underlain by the Altamont Clay Loam, which has a high shrink-swell potential. In addition, other proposed components where ground disturbance is planned, including a portion of the proposed Mesa Substation area, Telecommunications Route 2, work at Pardee and Walnut Substations, and components in the South Area are underlain by soil components which have a moderate shrink-swell potential (Yolo Loam, Ramona Loam, and Chino Loam). If the site soils are not properly engineered, seismic-related impacts resulting in ground failure damage to structures from the swelling and shrinking of expansive soils could occur and impacts would be significant.

Air Quality Impact Determination Notations

During review of the Draft EIR a scrivener's error was found in Impact AQ-2 and Impact AQ-4. The following corrections were made to the description of the level of impact under these two criterion to reflect the analysis and conclusions under Impact AQ-2 and Impact AQ-4. The conclusions in the Draft EIR have not changed.

Page 4.2-13:

Impact AQ-2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE WITH MITIGATION

Page 4.2-19:

Impact AQ-4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE WITH MITIGATION

Vehicle Trips In Project Description

During review of the Draft EIR a discrepancy was found between construction trips presented in Section 2.3, “Construction of the Proposed Project” and construction trips presented in Section 4.14, “Traffic and Transportation.” It was determined that construction trips used in Section 2.3 were from a preliminary estimate that was later revised based on the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Transpogroup for the Draft EIR. The following correction was made to Table 2-7. Note that the impact analysis presented in Draft EIR Section 4.14, “Traffic and Transportation” is accurate and based on the most up-to-date trip estimates; therefore, no revisions to the analysis were made.

Page 2-55-2-56:

Table 2-7 Grading Quantities, Workforce, and Vehicle Trips by Substation Construction Phase

| Mesa Substation Construction Phase ⁽¹⁾ | Grading Quantities by Phase Area (see Figure 2-11) | | | Source/ Destination | Maximum Number of Trips per Day by Temporal Phase | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| | Fill Quantity (CY) | Cut Quantity (CY) | Import/ Export Quantity (CY) | | Grading Medium Truck Trips ⁽²⁾ | Other Large Truck Trips ⁽²⁾ | Workers' Vehicle Trips |
| Phase 1 | 250,000 | 150,000 | 100,000 | Quarry within 45 miles of site | 100 532 | 430 804 | 242 808 |
| Phase 2 | 5,000 | 70,000 | (65,000) | Stockpile for Phase 3 | N/A 140 | 125 168 | 84 481 |
| Phase 3 | 325,000 | 375,000 | (50,000) | Landfill within 45 miles of site | 100 84 | 196 690 | 155 312 |

Key:
CY cubic yards
N/A not applicable
Note:

- ⁽¹⁾ The applicant currently anticipates that the land disturbance per phase breaks down to approximately 36 acres for Phase 1; 7 acres for Phase 2; and 29 acres for Phase 3. At the moment of publication of this environmental impact report, the boundaries for the total disturbance area for each phase are not precise, as some of the activities and grading areas may overlap between construction phases. In addition, the applicant’s construction sequencing plan may result in modifications to what areas are constructed in a particular phase, and therefore the associated acreages.
- ⁽²⁾ A passenger car equivalent (PCE) factor was applied to medium and large truck trips to account for their larger size. A PCE factor of 2.0 was applied to medium trucks (i.e., 2 to 3 axels). A PCE factor of 3.0 was applied to large trucks (i.e. 4 axels or more including single unit and multi-trailer units).

Helicopter Use at Staging Yards 1 through 3

Several revisions were made to correct the EIR’s representation of helicopter use. The Draft EIR stated that helicopters may be used at Staging Yards 1 through 4. However, SCE clarified in its comments on the Draft EIR that helicopters would only be used at Staging Yards 1 through 3. Several revisions were made in response to individual comments; however, the following additional revisions were made to the EIR for consistency throughout the document.

Page 2-73:

Helicopters may use Staging Yards 1 through 3-4, as needed.

Page 2-74:

Helicopters would be used at proposed staging areas (Staging Yards 1 through 3-4), storage and maintenance sites, and ground locations in close proximity to conductor pulling, tensioning, and splice sites, and/or within previously disturbed areas near construction sites. In addition, helicopters could land on access or spur roads within the applicant's ROW. The applicant would only use helicopters for wire stringing operations.

Page 4.10-28:

Helicopters would potentially take off and land at Staging Yards 1 through 3-4. Helicopter use would at most produce 97 dBA at 100 feet.

Page 4.10-28:

Helicopter takeoff and landing activities at staging yards would result in significant impacts on the nearest sensitive receptors for all ~~four~~three staging yards.

Pages 4.10-28 through Page 4.10-29:

Staging yards 4, 5, 6 and 7 would not involve helicopter landing and take-off activities; however, intermittent heavy duty truck use and transportation of heavy duty on-road equipment in and out these yards would cause temporary increases in ambient noise at nearest sensitive receptors. Heavy duty trucks can emit maximum levels of 84 dBA maximum noise level at 50 feet per manufacturers specifications, and heavy duty trucks commonly used during a fraction of 40 percent of the time during one hour (FHWA 2006). The nearest sensitive receptors to Staging Yards 4, 5, 6, and 7 are located 170 to 1,000 feet away, as shown in Table 4.10-20. Assuming the closest sensitive receptor (residences 170 feet from Staging Yard 4) as the worst case for analysis, the increase in the estimated hourly equivalent sound level would be less than the threshold of significance of a 10 dBA increase over existing noise levels. Therefore, temporary noise impacts at Staging Yards 4, 5, 6, and 7 would be less than significant.

Clarification of Construction Phases

SCE's comments on the comparison of alternatives analysis necessitated the clarification of temporal phases and phase areas in the EIR. That is, construction is divided into sequential phases (see Section 2.3.2.2, "Construction Phases," which discusses what construction activities will be undertaken during each phase) and spatial phases (see Figure 2-11, which shows each phase area). The distinction between spatial phases and temporal phases is important for understanding impacts. For example, grading in phase 1 and phase 2 areas shown in Figure 2-11 would take place during construction Phase 1. "Temporal" was added before "phase" to enhance clarity between the temporal, construction phases, and the physical, spatial phases of the project footprint. This adds clarity for the reader and does not change the impact analyses. The following revisions were made to clarify the project description; no changes were made to the environmental analysis:

Page 2-11 and 2-12, Table 2-1:

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Laguna Bell Substation | 220-kV equipment replacement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of 220-kV switchrack equipment and upgrade of line protection for the future Laguna Bell-Mesa No. 1 and No. 2 transmission lines. • Duration: 7 weeks (<u>Temporal</u> Phase 1: 4 weeks; <u>Temporal</u> Phase 2: 3 weeks). • Vehicle use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Temporal</u> Phase 1: 100 trips per week. - <u>Temporal</u> Phase 2: 25 trips per week. • No land disturbance associated with equipment replacement and upgrades. |
| Lighthipe Substation | 220-kV equipment replacement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of 220-kV switchrack equipment and upgrade of line protection for the 220-kV Lighthipe-Mesa transmission line. • Duration: 7 weeks (<u>Temporal</u> Phase 1: 4 weeks; <u>Temporal</u> Phase 2: 3 weeks). • Vehicle use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Temporal</u> Phase 1: 100 trips per week. - <u>Temporal</u> Phase 2: 25 trips per week. • No land disturbance associated with equipment replacement and upgrades. |

Page 2-46, Section 2.2.3.3:

- Replace various 220-kV line termination equipment, including, but not limited to, wave traps, circuit breakers, and disconnect switches at Laguna Bell Substation. The proposed work at the Laguna Bell Substation would not involve ground disturbance and would be performed in two temporal phases: the first phase to remove, replace, and install equipment in the 220-kV switchrack positions to accommodate the proposed Laguna Bell-Mesa No. 1 and No. 2 220-kV transmission lines; and a second phase to upgrade existing distribution and transmission line protection equipment. The proposed work would have a maximum duration of 7 weeks and require 475 vehicle trips in total.
- Replace various 220-kV line termination equipment including, but not limited to, wave traps, circuit breakers, and disconnect switches at Lighthipe Substation. The proposed works at the Lighthipe Substation would not involve ground disturbance and would be performed in two temporal phases: the first phase to remove, replace, and install equipment in one 220-kV switchrack position; and a second phase to upgrade line protection for the Lighthipe-Mesa 220-kV Transmission Line. The proposed work would have a maximum duration of 7 weeks and require 475 vehicle trips in total.

Page 2-55, Section 2.3.2.2 Construction Phases:

Construction of the proposed Mesa Substation would occur in three temporal phases, as shown in Figure 2-11 and described below. Table 2-7 shows grading quantities, workforce, and vehicle trips by substation construction phase.

Revisions to the MMRP

Revisions were made to the text of the MMRP, as was indicated in the text of the Draft EIR on pages 8-1 and 8-26. Refer to Chapter 8.0, "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan," which shows those revisions in ~~striketrough~~ and underline.

Revisions to the Draft EIR to Update to Final EIR

Throughout the document, revisions were made to reflect that the EIR document is the Final EIR. For example, footers were changed to show "Final EIR" rather than "Draft EIR." Language that reflected the Final EIR would be prepared was removed to reflect that the Final EIR has been prepared.

This page intentionally left blank.