4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

4.10.1 Overview

The purpose of this section is to: 1) describe the existing land use, zoning, and general plan land use designations in the Project area; 2) provide an overview of the technical methodology used in collecting baseline conditions and evaluating impacts; 3) present the regulatory framework for the proposed Project area; 4) describe the potential impacts on land use from construction and operation of Segments 4 through 11 of the proposed SCE Tehachapi Transmission Line Project; 5) evaluate the level of significance of potential impacts based upon CEQA significance criteria; and 6) present Applicant Proposed Measures, if needed, to reduce potential impacts.

4.10.2 Technical Methodology

General plan land uses and existing land uses within the proposed Project right-of-way (R-O-W) and adjacent lands were mapped using two primary sources of information:

1. GIS data available for the Kern County General Plan and existing land uses, as mapped by Kern County (Kern County Planning Department, 2006a, Kern County Assessor, 2006b).
2. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) maps and dates of local and county general plan land use designation and existing land uses for Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The choice to use data available from SCAG instead of data from each local jurisdiction was made to ensure and maintain compatibility among the various jurisdictions (Southern California Association of Governments, 2004 and 2005).

In addition, land use information provided by each jurisdiction traversed by the proposed Project, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) maps, and recent aerial photos were also used to help identify land uses adjacent to the proposed facilities.

Plans, policies, ordinances, and regulations that are applicable to local jurisdictions within the R-O-W were reviewed and are listed in Section 4.10.3.

The description of land uses was divided by segment and, within each segment, by jurisdiction and general plan land use within the R-O-W. Existing land uses and zoning were identified within a 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project alignment, in order to present an overview of the land uses near the Project. Figures 4.10-1 and L-1 show the General Plan land use designation within the 0.5 mile buffer. However, since only the General Plan land

use designation within the proposed Project R-O-W is relevant to the discussion of consistency with local land use plans (not the entire 0.5 mile buffer), the description of the existing environment and analysis of impacts, including tables, only refer to General Plan land use designations within the R-O-W. Pertinent airports and airstrips up to 5 miles away from the proposed Project were identified, in order to assess potential height restrictions due to airport approach zones.

This section of the document includes four figures, showing a simplified version of the land use data used in this analysis. Appendix L includes more detailed land use maps. Figure 4.10-1 shows an overview of the General Plan land use designation and Specific Plans within 0.5 mile from the proposed Project alignment, as well as relevant airports within 5 miles of the proposed Project. Figure L-1, included in Appendix L, shows General Plan land use designation and specific plans in more detail. Figure 4.10-2 presents an overview of existing land uses within 0.5 mile from the proposed Project alignment. Figure L-2, included in Appendix L, shows existing land uses in more detail. Figure 4.10-3 shows Habitat Conservation Plans and Sensitive Ecological Areas within 0.5 mile from the proposed Project. Figure 4.10-4 identifies land uses within the ANF relative to the proposed Project, as determined in the ANF Land Management Plan.

Zoning within the 0.5 mile buffer is presented in tabular form, by Segment. In Table L-1, included in Appendix L, presents zoning code description and allowed uses.

Cultural and historic uses near the Project alignment are included in Section 4.3, Cultural Resources. Recreation uses near the Project alignment are addressed in Section 4.15, Recreation. The description of land uses also identifies a general overview of agricultural uses, transportation corridors, and utilities corridors. A detailed description of these uses and analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed Project on agricultural uses, utilities corridors, and transportation corridors are included in Section 4.3, Agricultural Resources, Section 4.14, Public Services and Utilities Systems, and Section 4.16, Transportation and Traffic. Sensitive land uses such as schools, churches, nursing homes, parks, and cemeteries are discussed in Sections 4.13, Noise and 4.15, Recreation.

CEQA significance criteria, as presented in Section 4.10.4, were identified to assess the potential land use impacts of the proposed Project. The potential impacts of the Project on land use were evaluated by considering construction activities (Construction Impacts) and long-term operation (Operation Impacts) of the proposed transmission lines and substations. The evaluation of potential impacts assumes compliance with all applicable regulatory requirements. The Project applicant would be required to consult with local jurisdictions per the CPUC GO 131-D. Coordination with the FAA and compliance with FAA Guidelines Title 14 FAR 77 would also be required. In addition, the proposed project would have to

comply with National Forest Service requirements within the Angeles National Forest. The impact analysis also assumes implementation of the Applicant Proposed Measures identified in this document.

4.10.3 Regulations, Plans, and Standards

4.10.3.1 Federal

4.10.3.1.1 Forest Service Manual. Forest Service Manual Section 2700 (Special Uses Management) provides direction for the administration of special-use authorizations (SUAs) on National Forest Service (NFS) lands (USDA Forest Service, 2005a). As described in Section 2703.2, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) the NFS is instructed to deny a written request for the use of NFS lands according to the following criteria:

- The proposal is inconsistent with Forest land and resource management plans
- The proposal is in conflict with other Forest management objectives, or applicable federal statutes and regulations
- The proposal can be reasonably accommodated on non-NFS lands, provided however, that First Amendment group uses (freedom of assembly and worship) may not be denied on this basis

The USDA NFS may not authorize the use of NFS lands just because it affords the applicant a lower cost and less restrictive location when compared with non-NFS lands (USDA Forest Service, 2005a).

Additional guidance regarding the management of special uses, such as transmission lines across NFS lands, is provided in the Forest Service Manual Region 5 Supplement No. 2700-92-8 (USDA Forest Service, 1992). As stated in Section 2726.43 of the Supplement, the objectives for the management of transmission lines include the following:

- To eliminate or mitigate long-term conflicts between power lines and the management of NFS lands and resources
- To eliminate identified fire and safety hazards

According to the direction provided in Section 2726.43 for the construction of transmission lines over 35 kilovolts (kV), aerial construction of transmission line structures (as opposed to underground construction) may be authorized, except in those areas where the environmental analysis clearly indicates unacceptable effects on NFS resource and environmental values (USDA Forest Service, 1992). The Supplement recognizes that construction costs and

operational problems increase substantially for underground construction of transmission lines over 35 kV, and states that the authorizing officer would consider undergrounding only after a thorough assessment of the situation (USDA Forest Service, 1992).

4.10.3.1.2 Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan (2005). The USDA Forest Service recently completed its update of the 1987 Land and Resources Management Plan. The Angeles National Forest (ANF) Land Management Plan (Forest Plan) was approved in 2005 through a Record of Decision signed September 20, 2005. Due to a technical error in the Record of Decision, the USDA Forest Service reissued it on April 21, 2006, and provided a second 90-day appeal period on the Forest Plan in accordance with the provision of 36 CFR 217. The 2005 ANF Land Management Plan, which has been in effect since October 31, 2005, will remain in effect unless the decision is overturned (USDA Forest Service, 2006a).

The Forest Service Land Management Plan consists of three parts that examine vision, strategy, and design criteria for the ANF. Part 1 of the Forest Plan includes the Forest Service vision of the National Forest serving as an open space, visual backdrop, recreation destination, and natural environment for a diverse urban population.

The USDA Forest Service has incorporated the National Strategic Plan's (USDA Forest Service, 2004) goals into the Forest Service Land Management Plan. The National Strategic Plan Goal 4 states that the nation's forests and grasslands play a significant role in meeting America's need for producing and transmitting energy. Unless otherwise restricted, NFS lands are available for energy exploration, development, and infrastructure (e.g., well sites, pipelines, and transmission lines) (USDA Forest Service, 2004). The ANF Land Management Plan reflects this USDA National Strategic Plan Goal. Goal 4.1b of the Land Management Plan states that the National Forest will support the use of renewable resources to help meet the growing energy needs in southern California while protecting other resources (USDA Forest Service, 2005b). However, the emphasis on non-recreation special-uses (i.e., utility corridors) is to authorize special uses only when they cannot be reasonably accommodated on non-NFS lands. Goal 7.1 of the Land Management Plan states that the USDA Forest Service is to retain natural areas as a core for a regional network of undeveloped areas or landscape linkages while focusing the built environment into the minimum land area needed to support growing public needs (USDA Forest Service, 2005b).

Part 2 of the Forest Plan includes the ANF program emphasis and objectives and strategic management direction which guide the USDA Forest Service to make progress towards its vision presented in Part 1 of the Forest Plan. Within the strategic management direction, land use zones are designated to show allowable uses and opportunities. The 2005 Forest Plan describes the management intent of each land use zone traversed by the proposed Project to be as follows:

- **Developed Area Interface (DAI):** Although this zone may have a broad range of higher intensity uses, the management intent is to limit development to a slow increase of carefully designed facilities to help direct use into the most suitable areas and to concentrate on improving existing facilities before developing new ones. National Forest staff expect that there will be some road construction, but anticipate no more than a 5 percent increase in road mileage (USDA Forest Service, 2005a).
- **Back Country (BC):** This zone generally allows a broad range of uses and the management intent is to retain the inherent natural character and limit the level and type of development. Within the Back Country zone, National Forest staff would expect no increase or a very low level increase in the road system. In general, development would be limited to a slow increase of carefully designed facilities to help direct use into the most suitable areas, and temporary facilities would be removed when they are no longer needed (USDA Forest Service, 2005a).
- **Back Country (Motorized Use Restricted):** Although this zone allows a range of low intensity uses, the management intent is to retain the natural character and limit the level and type of development. Some roads would be constructed and maintained, but the intent is to manage the zone for no increase or a very low increase in system development (USDA Forest Service, 2005a).

Part 1 of the 2005 Land Management Plan includes a discussion of forest goals and desired conditions for resources, which are linked to the USDA Forest Service National Strategic Plan. The following is a list of goals that pertain to development of the proposed Project across ANF lands.

National Strategic Plan Goal 4. Help meet energy resource needs. Consider opportunities for energy development and the supporting infrastructure on forests and grasslands to help meet the nation's energy needs:

- Work with other agencies to identify and designate corridors for energy facilities, improve permit application processing efficiency, and establish appropriate land tenure (including transferability clauses) in easements and other authorizations to provide for long-term project viability (USDA Forest Service, 2004).

Forest Goal 4.1b. Administer Renewable Energy Resource developments while protecting ecosystem health (USDA Forest Service, 2005b).

Forest Goal 7.1. Retain natural areas as a core for a regional network while focusing the built environment into the minimum land area needed to support growing public needs (USDA Forest Service, 2005b).

Part 2 of the 2005 Land Management Plan includes a discussion of trends and expectations as well as anticipated resource improvements planned over the next three to five years. The program emphasis and objectives for non-recreation special uses is to manage infrastructure needs to support communities while preserving open space and natural settings. Special uses are authorized only when they cannot be reasonably accommodated on non-NFS lands. Maintaining open space is given priority over accommodating urban needs. Part 2, Appendix B, of the 2005 Forest Plan includes a list of program strategies that the ANF may choose to emphasize to progress toward achieving the desired conditions and goals of the Plan. The following is a summary of the program strategies that are applicable to land use:

***Lands 2: Non-Recreation Special-use Authorizations*.** Optimize utilization of encumbered NFS land and efficiently administer SUAs:

- Work with SUA holders to better administer NFS land and reduce administrative cost
- Require SUAs to maximize opportunities to co-locate facilities and minimize encumbrance of NFS land
- Where overhead transmission lines occur in California Condor habitat, work with utility companies or authorization holders to install high-visibility or avoidance devices and raptor guards on poles and other structures potentially used as perching sites by California Condors (USDA Forest Service, 2005b)

In addition to the program strategies of the USDA Forest Service's Pacific Southwest Region, Part 2 of the Forest Plan includes a list ANF-specific Design Criteria. The following design criteria would be applicable to land use:

***ANF S1: Pacific Crest Trail*.** Protect scenic integrity of foreground views as well as from designated viewpoints. Where practicable, avoid establishing nonconforming land uses within the viewshed of the trail (USDA Forest Service, 2005b).

4.10.3.1.3 Pacific Crest Trail Management Plan: Angeles National Forest. The Pacific Crest Trail Management Plan (prepared by the USDA Forest Service and adopted in 1980) was developed to provide management direction for the portion of the Pacific Crest Trail that traverses Forest Service System lands within the ANF. Please refer to Sections 4.2, Aesthetic Resources, and 4.15, Recreation for a detailed discussion of the Pacific Crest Trail Management Plan and potential impacts of the proposed Project on aesthetic and recreation resources.

4.10.3.1.4 Farmland Protection and Policy Act. Administered by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)

(Public Law 97-98, 7 U.S.C. 4201) was passed in 1981 in order to minimize the extent to which federal programs convert Farmland to nonagricultural use. Please refer to Section 4.3, Agricultural Resources for a detailed discussion of the FPPA, existing agricultural resources within the Project alignment, and potential impacts of the proposed Project on agriculture.

4.10.3.1.5 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA addresses the need for policy analysis in federal environmental documents. 40 CFR 1502.16(c) (Environmental Consequences) states that federal environmental documents shall include discussions of *"Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian Tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned."*

Additionally, 40CFR 1506.2(d) states: *"To better integrate environmental impact statements into state or local planning processes, statements shall discuss any inconsistency of a proposed action with any approved State or local plan and laws (whether or not federally sanctioned). Where an inconsistency exists, the statement should describe the extent to which the agency would reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law."*

However, the decision maker retains the authority to go forward with a project despite the potential conflict. In addition, the Record of Decision must explain how the decision was made and what mitigation measures are being imposed to reduce impacts (CEQ, 1986). This is applicable only to federal lands (in this case, ANF).

As CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local discretionary permits (e.g., conditional use permits) or local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives. However, local land use plans are evaluated in this report to assist the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service in determining whether the proposed Project would be potentially inconsistent with locally adopted land use plans, goals, and policies. SCE would be required to obtain all applicable ministerial building and encroachment permits from local jurisdictions for the proposed Project.

4.10.3.1.6 Federal Aviation Administration, Regulation FAR Title 14 Part 77. The Federal Aviation Administration regulations included in Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Title 14 Part 77 determine restrictions to obstructions and height limitations for structures taller than 200 feet or within 20,000 feet of an airport. The proposed Project is located near several airports, as detailed in Section 4.10.6 and would have to comply with safety requirements established by Title 14 Part 77 where applicable.

Specifically, FAR Title 14 Part 77 establishes standards and notification requirements for objects that have the potential to affect navigable airspace. These standards are intended to 1) evaluate the effect of the construction or alteration of structures on airport operating procedures; 2) determine if there is a potential hazard to air navigation; and 3) identify measures to enhance safety. The FAA requires notification through the filing of FAA forms 7460-1 Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, and 117–1, Notice of Progress of Construction or Alteration, if any of the following criteria are met with regards to a proposed action (Title 14 Part 77.13):

- Any construction or alteration of more than 200 feet in height
- Any construction or alteration of greater height than an imaginary surface extending outward and upward at one of the following slopes:
    - 100 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 20,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway of each airport with at least one runway more than 3,200 feet in actual length, excluding heliports
    - 50 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 10,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway of each airport specified with its longest runway no more than 3,200 feet in actual length, excluding heliports
    - 25 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 5,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest landing and takeoff area of each heliport
- Any highway, railroad or other traverse way whose prescribed adjusted height would exceed the standards presented above
- When requested by the FAA
- Any construction or alteration located on a public use airport or heliport regardless of height or location

4.10.3.1.7 U.S. Department of the Interior – Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The proposed Project R-O-W would not encroach on BLM lands. However, Segment 5 is located approximately 0.1 mile east of BLM property and the Vincent Substation is located less than 0.5 mile from BLM property. Since the proposed Project would not encroach on BLM lands, no impact is expected with respect to land use, however coordination is recommended due to the proximity to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for further discussion of protection of natural resources within BLM lands.

4.10.3.1.8 U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). The proposed Project traverses DoD lands at Segment 8A MP 15.2 to MP 15.5, on a Southern California Edison easement. All

construction part of the proposed Project would be conducted within SCE's easement. In addition, the proposed Project is located approximately 10 miles west of Edwards Air Force Base Flight/Test Installation Air Force Plant 42 property, a shared military installation approximately 5 miles east of the T/L corridor. Additional facilities under the Department of Defense jurisdiction are located within approximately two to five miles south of Segment 8, within San Bernardino and Riverside counties (e.g., the Naval Warfare Assessment Station near the City of Norco in Riverside County). Coordination with the DoD is recommended due to the proximity to DoD land.

4.10.3.2 State of California

4.10.3.2.1 California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General Order (GO) No. 131-D, Section XIV B. The CPUC GO No. 131-D, Section XIV B states that "*Local jurisdictions acting pursuant to local authority are preempted from regulating electric power line projects, distribution lines, substations, or electric facilities constructed by public utilities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. However in locating such projects, the public utilities shall consult with local agencies regarding land use matters."*

Due to this GO, the public utilities are directed to consider local regulations and consult with local agencies, but the county and city regulations are not applicable as the county and cities do not have jurisdiction over the proposed Project (Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, 1995).

4.10.3.2.2 California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. The California Department of Conservation (CDOC) established the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) in 1982 to continue the Important Farmland mapping efforts of the NRCS. Please refer to Section 4.3, Agricultural Resources, for a detailed discussion of the FMMP, existing agricultural resources within the Project alignment, and potential impacts of the proposed Project on agriculture.

4.10.3.2.3 California Land Conservation Act. The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (commonly referred to as the Williamson Act) is California's primary program for the conservation of private land in agricultural and open space use; please refer to Section 4.3, Agricultural Resources, for a detailed discussion of Williamson Act lands, existing agricultural resources within the Project alignment, and potential impacts of the proposed Project on agriculture.

4.10.3.2.4 California State Lands Commission. The proposed Project is located near California State Lands Commission lands near the Chino Substation in San Bernardino County and along Segment 8. Coordination with the California State Lands Commission is

recommended due to the proximity to State lands. The proposed Project would not be built within state lands commission property.

4.10.3.2.5 California State Parks. The proposed Project does not traverse California State Parks lands. However, coordination with State Parks is recommended as the Antelope Valley Poppy Reserve is located within the 0.5-mile buffer along Segment 4.

4.10.3.3 Local

As CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local discretionary permits (e.g., conditional use permits) or local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives. However, local land use plans are evaluated in this report to assist the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service in determining whether the proposed Project would be potentially inconsistent with locally adopted land use plans, goals, and policies. SCE would be required to obtain all applicable ministerial building and encroachment permits from local jurisdictions for the proposed Project.

The following subsections list the local plans applicable to jurisdictions traversed or within the 0.5 mile buffer of the proposed Project. Figure 3.1-1, General Location Map, shows the jurisdictional boundaries along the Project route.

4.10.3.3.1 General Plans and Zoning. The alignment of the proposed Project and the alternative alignments would traverse numerous cities and counties. The cities and counties have adopted general plans as required by the State (Government Code Section 65300 *et seq*.) to guide local decision-making regarding future land uses, growth, and other local decisions relating to circulation systems, public open space, public facilities (including schools and libraries). In addition to general plans, the State requires cities and counties to adopt a local zoning ordinance (Government Code Section 65800 *et seq.)* to implement their general plan through development standards and regulations. General plans and zoning codes for the following jurisdictions were considered in this evaluation:

- Kern County (Kern County, 2004 and 2006c)
- Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County, 1980, 1981a, 1981b, and 2007)
- San Bernardino County (San Bernardino County, 1997 and 2007)
- Riverside County (Riverside County, 2003)
- City of Arcadia (City of Arcadia, 1986 and 2007)
- City of Azusa (City of Azusa, 2004 and 2006)

- City of Baldwin Park (City of Baldwin Park 1997 and 2002)
- City of Bradbury (City of Bradbury, 1993 and 1998)
- City of Brea (City of Brea, 2003)
- City of Chino (City of Chino, 1981 and 2007)
- City of Chino Hills (City of Chino Hills, 1994 and 2006)
- City of Diamond Bar (City of Diamond Bar, 1995 and 2006)
- City of Duarte (City of Duarte, 2004 and 2006)
- City of El Monte (City of El Monte, 1991 and 2006)
- City of Industry (City of Industry, 2007)
- City of Irwindale (City of Irwindale, 1973 and 2006)
- City of La Cañada Flintridge (City of La Cañada Flintridge, 1986 and 2000)
- City of La Habra Heights (City of La Habra Heights, 2004 and 2006)
- City of Lancaster (City of Lancaster, 1997 and 2004)
- City of Monrovia (City of Monrovia, 2002 and 2007)
- City of Montebello (City of Montebello, 2006)
- City of Monterey Park (City of Monterey Park, 2006 and 2007)
- City of Ontario (City of Ontario, 2002 and 2007)
- City of Palmdale (City of Palmdale, 1993 and 1994)
- City of Pasadena (City of Pasadena, 2004 and 2005)
- City of Pico Rivera (City of Pico Rivera, 2007)
- City of Rosemead (City of Rosemead, 1987 and 1999)
- City of San Gabriel (City of San Gabriel, 2004 and 2007)
- City of San Marino (City of San Marino, 2007)
- City of South El Monte (City of South El Monte, 2000)
- City of Temple City (Temple City, 1987 and 2006)
- City of Whittier (City of Whittier, 2007)

While the Riverside County General Plan was reviewed, the land use area of consideration within this county is minimal, and was therefore deleted from further analysis. In addition, the Antelope Valley Area-wide General Plan (Los Angeles County, 1986), developed and adopted by a consortium of local cities and the County of Los Angeles, is also evaluated in this assessment.

4.10.3.3.2 Specific Plans. As permitted by State planning law and guidelines (Government Code 65450 et seq.), cities and counties are permitted to prepare and adopt specific plans to address both large-scale development proposals and the unique characteristics of sites. Specific plans must be consistent with local general plans but may augment or supplement development standards found in the local zoning ordinance. The following Specific Plans are either traversed by or within the 0.5 mile buffer of the proposed Project alignment and therefore were considered in this study:

- Willow Springs Specific Plan by Kern County, traversed by the proposed Project (Kern County, 1992)
- PdV Windfarm Project by Kern County, traversed by the proposed Project (Kern County, 2006d)
- Del Sur Ranch Development by the City of Lancaster, within the 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project (Robert Bein, William Frost & Associates, 1993)
- Joshua Ranch Specific Plan by the City of Palmdale, within the 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project (City of Palmdale, 2006)
- Ritter Ranch Specific Plan by the City of Palmdale, traversed by the proposed Project (Robert Bein, William Frost & Associates, 1992)
- City Ranch Specific Plan (a.k.a. Anaverde Specific Plan) by the City of Palmdale, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Palmdale, 2006a)
- Quail Valley Planned Development by the City of Palmdale, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Palmdale, 2006b)
- Encanto Parkway Specific Plan by the City of Duarte, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Duarte, 1998)
- Las Brisas Specific Plan by the City of Duarte, within the 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project (City of Duarte, 1994)
- Rancho Verde Specific Plan, by the City of Duarte, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Duarte, 2004)

- Specific Plan 02SP 05-01/TTM 062064, by the City of Bradbury, within the 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project (Bradbury, 2006)
- East Pasadena Specific Plan by the City of Pasadena, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Pasadena, 2006)
- East Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan by the City of Pasadena, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Pasadena, 2003)
- Aera Master Planned Community, by the City of Diamond Bar, traversed by the proposed Project (Diamond Bar, 2007)
- Chino Hills Specific Plan, by the County of San Bernardino, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Chino Hills, 2005)
- Commons Specific Plan by the City of Chino Hills, within the 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project (Chino Hills, 2007)
- Majestic Spectrum Specific Plan by the City of Chino, within the 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project (City of Chino, 1986)
- Eucalyptus Business Park Specific Plan by the City of Chino, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Chino, 1990)
- College Park Specific Plan by the City of Chino, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Chino, 2003b)
- East Chino Specific Plan by the City of Chino, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Chino, 1987)
- New Model Colony Specific Plan by the City of Ontario, traversed by the proposed Project (City of Ontario, 1999)

4.10.3.3.3 Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs). In 1983, the United States Congress adopted Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as a way to promote "creative partnerships between the public and private sectors and among governmental agencies in the interest of species and habitat conservation." Section 10 authorizes states, local governments, and private landowners to apply for an Incidental Take Permit for otherwise lawful activities that may harm listed species or their habitats. To obtain a permit, an applicant must submit a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) outlining what he or she will do to "minimize and mitigate" the impact of the permitted take on the listed species. The principle underlying the Section 10 exemption from the ESA is that some individuals of a species or portions of their habitat may be expendable over the short term, as long as enough protection is provided to ensure the long term recovery of the species. Approved HCPs vary greatly in size, duration, and species covered.

A detailed discussion of HCPs that would be potentially affected by the proposed Project is included in Section 4.5, Biological Resources. HCPs traversed by the proposed Project or located within a 0.5-mile buffer from the proposed Project alignment are as follows (California Department of Fish and Game, 2007):

***West Mojave Plan*.** Segments 4, 5, and 10, and the Windhub, Whirlwind, Antelope, and Vincent substations (which are components of Segment 9) are entirely within the West Mojave Plan (WMP) (BLM, 2006). A portion of Segments 6 and 11 are also within the WMP. However, the WMP is currently applicable to federal lands only. Segments 4, 5, 6, 10, 11 and the Windhub, Whirlwind, Antelope, and Vincent substations would not be located on federal lands within the WMP boundaries. Therefore, the proposed Project would not be required to comply with the provisions included in the WMP. Refer to Section 4.5 Biological Resources for more detailed discussion of the WMP.

***Western Riverside County Multiple Species HCP (MSHCP)*.** A portion of this HCP is located within the 0.5-mile buffer from Mira Loma Substation and Segment 8, but does not intersect Segment 8.

***Final Recovery Plan for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly (Recovery Plan) HCP*.** A portion of this HCP is located within the Mira Loma Substation boundaries, and is discussed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources. Although occupied Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly habitat occurs 1.0 mile north of the Mira Loma Substation, no suitable habitat was observed within the proposed Project area.

4.10.3.3.4 Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs). No NCCPs were identified within the Project R-O-W or within a 0.5-mile buffer from the Project alignment.

4.10.3.3.5 Los Angeles County – Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs). SEAs are areas of the County that have been found to have significant floral and faunal resources that are rare and unique or endangered and threatened. Based on preliminary information provided by Los Angeles County (Los Angeles County, 2000), the proposed Project traverses the following existing and proposed SEAs:

- Joshua Tree Woodland SEA
- Fairmont-Antelope Buttes SEA
- San Andreas Rift Zone SEA
- Ritter Ridge SEA
- Santa Clara River SEA

- Kentucky Springs SEA
- San Gabriel Canyon SEA
- Santa Fe Dam Floodplain SEA
- Whittier Narrows Dam County Recreation Area SEA
- Rio Hondo College Wildlife Sanctuary SEA
- Puente Hills SEA
- Sycamore-Turnbull Canyons SEA
- Powder Canyon-Puente Hills SEA
- Tonner Canyon-Chino Hills SEA

As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives. The proposed Project would not be required to comply with Los Angeles County's provisions regarding SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5 Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of the SEAs.

4.10.3.3.6 Airport Land Use Plans. State Law requires the creation of Airport Land Use Commissions (ALUCs) to coordinate planning for areas surrounding public use airports. The main airport land use compatibility concerns addressed by Airport Land Use Plans are exposure to aircraft noise; land use safety with respect to both people and property on the ground and the occupants of aircraft; protection of airport air space; and general concerns related to aircraft overflights. The Airport Land Use Plans include policies and compatibility criteria that are related to a map with influence zones or planning area boundaries.

Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (2004). In Los Angeles County the Regional Planning Commission has the responsibility for acting as the Airport Land Use Commission and for coordinating the airport planning of public agencies within the county. The Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) was originally adopted in 1991, and was revised in 2004. The ALUP includes the Aqua Dulce Skypark, Brackett Field, Burbank, Catalina, Compton, El Monte, Hawthorne, Los Angeles International (LAX), Long Beach, Palmdale, Santa Monica, Torrance, Van Nuys, and Whiteman Airports. The General William J. Fox Airfield is addressed in a separate document adopted by the ALUC on December 1, 2004.

Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2005). The Kern County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) was adopted in 1996 and has since been amended to comply with Aeronautics Law, Public Utilities Code (Chapter 4, Article 3.5) regarding public airports and surrounding land use planning. As required by that law, proposals for public or private land use developments within defined airport influence areas are subject to compatibility review. The following affected cities have adopted the ALUCP for their respective airports: City of Bakersfield, City of California City, City of Delano, City of Shafter, City of Taft, City of Tehachapi, and City of Wasco.

4.10.4 Significance Criteria

The significance criteria used in this analysis is based on CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G. The relevant CEQA significance criteria from Appendix G are: IX – Land Use and Planning (a), (b), and (c), as presented below. Under these significance criteria, impacts to land use, zoning, and planning could be significant if the Project would:

1. Physically divide an established community (IXa)
2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (IXb)
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (IXc)

4.10.5 Applicant Proposed Measures

There are no suggested Applicant Proposed Measures for this section.

4.10.6 Proposed Project and Alternatives

4.10.6.1 Segment 4

4.10.6.1.1 Environmental Setting.

Jurisdictions. Segment 4 of the proposed Project traverses lands within unincorporated Kern County, unincorporated Los Angeles County, and City of Lancaster (see Figure 3.1.1). Unincorporated Los Angeles County lands traversed are within the boundaries of the County's Antelope Valley Area-Wide General Plan (1986), a component of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

Segment 4 begins at the proposed Cottonwind Substation site located within unincorporated Kern County at S4 MP 0.0 and traverses Kern County lands to the proposed Whirlwind substation, approximately at S4 MP 4.0. There are three proposed alternative sites for the Whirlwind Substation: Alternative A at S4 MP 4.8; and Alternatives B and C, both at S4 MP 4.0. From the Whirlwind Substation, Segment 4 traverses both Kern and Los Angeles County Lands, enters the City of Lancaster at S4 MP 17.4, and ends at the existing Antelope Substation at S4 MP 19.6.

The new Segment 4 200-foot R-O-W parallels two existing transmission lines on the east side from the proposed Cottonwind substation to S4 MP 3.7 where it turns west over the existing transmission lines and then parallels the existing transmission lines until it reaches the Antelope Substation at S4 MP 19.6.

In Table 4.10-1 provides a summary of the jurisdictions, the general plan land use designations, the zoning and existing land uses traversed by Segment 4.

***General Plan Land Use Designations and Existing Land Use*.** General plan land use designations and existing uses along Segment 4 are summarized in Table 4.10-1 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses along the proposed Project alignment, refer to Appendix L, Figures L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

The predominant current land use traversed by the proposed Segment 4 R-O-W located between the Cottonwind Substation and the existing Antelope Substation is undeveloped open space, with a few small sections of scattered irrigated agriculture. No residences are located within the proposed R-O-W.

Segment 4 crosses land designated in the Kern County General Plan as Resource Management, Residential, Intensive Agriculture, and Light Industrial/Comprehensive Plan within the R-O-W. Existing land uses along the Segment 4 0.5 mile buffer include vacant, agricultural, residential, and institutional. At S4 MP 0.0 the PdV Wind Energy Project is within the 0.5-mile buffer. From S4 MP 2.7 to 6.9, Segment 4 is within the Willow Springs Specific Plan boundaries.

From S4 MP 6.9 to 17.4, Segment 4 is within Los Angeles County unincorporated lands and the General Plan land use designation within the R-O-W and within the 0.5-mile buffer is Agriculture, with a very small exception at S4 MP 12.6, where land is also designated Open and Non-developable in the General Plan within the 0.5-mile buffer. The existing land use for that portion of Segment 4 within the 0.5-mile buffer includes vacant, agricultural, rural residential, and electrical power facilities.

The last 2.2 miles of Segment 4 (from S4 MP 17.4 to 19.6) are within the City of Lancaster. The R-O-W is designated Residential in the City of Lancaster's General Plan, although the existing land use is vacant. The 0.5 mile buffer also includes existing agricultural uses within Los Angeles County unincorporated lands. The PdV Wind Energy Project is located within the 0.5-mile buffer from Segment 4 and includes approximately 6,435 acres and plans to generate 300 MW. The PdV Windfarm is bound north and west by the Tehachapi Mountains, and south by the Los Angeles Aqueduct. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the PdV Wind Energy Project EIR was issued by Kern County Planning Department in June 2006.

***Zoning*.** Zoning along Segment 4 R-O-W and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-1. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

Within Kern County (S4 MP 0.0 to 6.9) the Segment 4 R-O-W includes parcels zoned Exclusive Agriculture, Limited Agriculture, Platted Lands/Residential Suburban Combining, and Estate Residential (see Appendix L, Table L-1 for additional zoning detail). Zoning within the 0.5-mile buffer from the R-O-W includes the same zone classifications. Within unincorporated Los Angeles County area of Segment 4, both the R-O-W and the 0.5-mile buffer include parcels zoned Light and Heavy Agricultural. Within the City of Lancaster, zoning within the R-O-W is Rural Residential, and within the 0.5-mile buffer it includes both Rural Residential and Heavy Agricultural.

***Specific Concerns*.** HCPs and SEAs crossed by the proposed Segment 4 alignment are shown on Figure 4.10-3. The entire length of Segment 4 is within the WMP. SEAs within the R-O-W include the existing Joshua Tree Woodland SEA, the existing Fairmont Antelope Buttes SEA, and the proposed San Andreas Rift Zone SEA. The Antelope Valley California Poppy Preserve is within the 0.5-mile buffer. For further discussion of the WMP, Poppy Preserve, and SEAs, refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources.

The FAA establishes height requirements for structures near airports and airfields. Segment 4 has three airports within five-miles of the utility corridor. General William J Fox. Airfield, a 7201-foot airstrip public airport facility is located 4.58 miles east of MP 14.8. The proposed Project is not expected to conflict with approach zones for this airport. Skyotee Airport has a 2,600-foot airstrip and is located approximately 2.5 miles east-northeast of S4 MP 5.9. At S4 MP 5.9 the maximum direct height limit would be 264 feet. The Segment 4 single-circuit

TABLE 4.10-1
SEGMENT 4 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S4 MP 0.0 to 2.7	Kern County	Resource Management (min. 20-acre parcel size)	A, A FP and A GF	A, A FP, A GF, A GH, and PL RS	Vacant, Agricultural, Residential, Institutional
S4 MP 2.7 to 3.0	Kern County	Residential (10 gross acres minimum)	E (10) RS, E (5) RS, E (2 1/2) RS, E 2 1/2 RS FPS, A FPS	E (10) RS, E (5) RS, E (2 1/2) RS, E 2 1/2 RS FPS, A and A FPS	Agriculture, Vacant, Residential, and Light Industrial
S4 MP 3.0 to 3.7	Kern County	Residential (5 gross acres minimum)	E (5) RS, E (2 1/2) RS,	E (5) RS, E (2 1/2) RS, A	Residential (10 gross acres minimum), PdV Windfarm Cottonwood
S4 MP 3.7 to 4.5	Kern County	Residential (2.5 gross acres minimum)	E (5) RS, E (10) RS	E (5) RS, E (10) RS, E (2 ½), A FPS, A	Residential 1, 2.5, 5, and 10 gross acres minimum.
S4 MP 4.5 to 5.1	Kern County	Resource Management	A FPS	A FPS, A, E (2 ½) RS, E (2 ½) RS FPS	Resource Management, Intensive Agriculture, Residential, Residential 2.5 gross acre minimum
S4 MP 5.1 to 6.6	Kern County	Intensive Agriculture	A FPS	A FPS, E (2 ½) RS FPS, A	Intensive Agriculture, Resource Management, Residential 2.5 gross acre minimum
S4 MP 6.6 to 6.9	Kern County	Light Industrial/ Comprehensive Plan Area	A FPS	A FPS, E (2 ½) RS FPS	Light Industrial/Comprehensive Plan Area, Intensive Agriculture
S4 MP 6.9 to 17.4	Los Angeles County	Agriculture	A-1-1, A-1-2, A-2-5, and A-2-2	A-1-1, A-1-2, A-2-5, and A-2-2	Vacant, Agriculture, Electrical Power Facilities, Industrial, Rural Residential, and Habitat Conservation Plan
S4 MP 17.4 to 19.6	City of Lancaster	Residential	RR-2.5	A-2-2, A-2-5, and RR-2.5	Vacant, Rural Residential, Agriculture, Commercial, and Electrical Power Facilities

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

lattice towers would range in height between 113 feet and 188 feet. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project is not expected to conflict with FAA requirements.[1]

Bohunk's Airpark, a dirt runway airport, is located approximately 1.1 miles east-northeast of S4 MP 19.6. Based on aerial photography, this facility has two runway surfaces, the longer runway (1,900 feet) is directly perpendicular to the T/L, due east while the second runway (approximately 1,500 feet) is rotated approximately 25 degrees to the east. The previously approved Segment 3 transmission line corridor is directly west approximately 6072 feet, and has an approximate 150-foot structural height limit. The proposed Segment 4 is west-southwest 4,752 feet, and has a maximum structural height limit of 116 feet. Since the Segment 4 towers would range in height between 113 feet and 188 feet, coordination with FAA would be required to address any potential height conflicts.

S4 MP 4.7 to 6.9 is located within the Antelope Water Bank Project Area. This project and potential impacts on the proposed Project are discussed in Section 4.9 Hydrology.

4.10.6.1.2 Impact Analysis.

Impact Summary. Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 4 transmission line would not divide an established community. Conflicts with applicable local plans or policies would be less than significant. The proposed Project would not be expected to have significant effects due to conflicts with existing SEAs or the WMP. Consultation with the FAA would be required in accordance with FAA Guidelines Title 14 FAR 77, due to the proposed Project's proximity to airports and potential height conflicts. The proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources.

Construction. Construction impacts can result if a project divides an established community, conflicts with applicable plans, or conflicts with habitat conservation plans.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Construction of Segment 4 would require new R-O-W and staging areas. Staging areas would be located near the substation sites, and would require approximately ten acres. The proposed Project assumes that staging areas would be located near the endpoints of the proposed line

[1] Maximum direct height limits were calculated using the nearest distance between the proposed transmission lines and the existing airstrips. These horizontal distances were then multiplied by the most conservative rise to run ratio provided by FAA height regulations, which is 1:50.

route (near the proposed/existing substation sites). In this case, staging areas would be sited on vacant land and would be temporary, and, therefore, would not physically divide an established community.

The new 200-foot R-O-W would be located adjacent to existing R-O-W, where transmission lines currently exist. The proposed Segment 4 would not physically divide an established community, as it traverses mostly vacant and agricultural land, with a few rural residential uses, and would be located adjacent to the existing transmission lines. No potentially significant impacts would occur.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?[2]

Construction of the proposed Project would occur within a new 200-foot R-O-W adjacent to an existing transmission line corridor. Staging areas would most likely be located off the R-O-W near the endpoints of the proposed line route near the proposed substation sites, and would require an area of approximately ten acres each. Approximately 7 miles of new construction spur roads are proposed to expand the existing road network. No new access roads are proposed. Access roads are through roads that run between tower sites and form the main transport route along the major extent of the transmission lines. Spur roads are roads that lead from the access road and dead-end at one or more tower sites. Pulling and splicing sites ("pull sites") will primarily occur within the existing R-O-W. Some of these sites may occur outside the R-O-W and require a clearing area of approximately 400 square feet each.

The new R-O-W for Segment 4 is adjacent to an existing utility corridor identified on land use and zoning maps of Kern County, Los Angeles County, and City of Palmdale. The R-O-W from S4 MP 0.0 to 3.0 follows the existing transmission corridor through land designated as Resource Management in the Kern County General Plan. The primary permitted Resource Management uses include open space lands containing important resource values, such as wildlife habitat, scenic values, or watershed recharge areas.

[2] As CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local discretionary permits (e.g., conditional use permits) or local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives (see GO 131-D, Section XIV B). However, local land use plans are evaluated in this report to assist the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service in determining whether the proposed Project would be potentially consistent with locally adopted land use plans, goals, and policies. SCE would be required to obtain all applicable ministerial building and encroachment permits from local jurisdictions for the proposed Project.

Resource Management Policy 16 states that Kern County shall, "encourage development of alternative energy sources by tailoring its zoning and subdivision ordinance and building standards to reflect Alternative Energy Guidelines published by the California State Energy Commission" (Kern County General Plan, 2004). Therefore, is consistent with this policy. The proposed Project new R-O-W also the proposed Project traverses land designated residential in the general plan. However, the new R-O-W would be located mostly in vacant and agricultural land. Impacts would be less than significant.

Based on preliminary data and calculations, the proposed Segment 4 towers could exceed FAA height requirements for Bohunk Airpark. Additional consultation with the FAA would be required in accordance with FAA Guidelines Title 14 FAR 77, and the proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts due to height limitations are expected.

The Willow Springs Specific Plan includes residential land use designation adjacent to the R-O-W. However, because Segment 4 would be constructed adjacent to an existing transmission line R-O-W, the proposed Project would not additionally impact future development of residential uses. Construction of the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts resulting from conflicts with local land use policies.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Segment 4 is within the WMP, which is an HCP and Federal Land Use Plan, developed to conserve and protect approximately 3.2 million acres of public land and 3.0 million acres of private land within Inyo, Riverside, Kern, and San Bernardino counties. SEAs within the R-O-W include the existing Joshua Tree Woodland SEA, the existing Fairmont Antelope Buttes SEA, and the proposed San Andreas Rift Zone SEA. In addition, the California Poppy Preserve is within the 0.5-mile buffer. There are no NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site.

The proposed Project would not be expected to have any significant impacts due to conflicts with local HCPs and SEAs. The WMP is currently applicable to federal lands within the plan's boundaries only. The proposed Project does not traverse federal lands within the WMP, therefore the proposed Project would not be required to comply with the WMP. Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives and the proposed Project is not required to comply with Los Angeles County's provisions related to

SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of SEAs and the WMP. Less than significant impacts are expected.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not divide any established community, as Segment 4 would be built within expanded R-O-W adjacent to an existing T/L corridor R-O-W. The proposed Project would not physically divide the community beyond the existing baseline conditions. No impact will result from the proposed Project.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Operation of Segment 4 would not have any impact on applicable land use plan, policies, or regulations with jurisdiction over the Project area. The entire new R-O-W for Segment 4 is adjacent to an existing utility corridor, identified in both land use and zoning maps of Kern County, Los Angeles County, and City of Palmdale.

Based on preliminary data and calculations, the proposed Segment 4 towers could have a potential height conflict with the FAA approach zone airspace requirements for Bohunk Airpark. However, the proposed Project will be required to consult and coordinate with FAA prior to construction, per the FAA guidelines Title 14 FAR 77 and the proposed Project will be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts due to height limitations would occur.

The Willow Springs Specific Plan includes residential land use designation adjacent to the R-O-W. However, Segment 4 would be constructed within and adjacent to existing R-O-W where a transmission line already exists, and the proposed Project would not have any additional impacts on future development of residential uses. Operation of the proposed Project would have less than significant impacts resulting from conflicts with land use policies.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

The proposed Project improvements would have no significant impact on applicable HCPs or SEAs (see Section 4.5, Biological Resources).

4.10.6.1.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.1.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant will consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts are expected.

4.10.6.2 Segment 5

4.10.6.2.1 Environmental Setting.

***Jurisdictions*.** Segment 5 extends from the Antelope Substation in the City of Lancaster, approximately 16 miles south of the Kern/Los Angeles County line, to the existing Vincent Substation. The entire length of Segment 5 is within the WMP boundaries. Segment 5 traverses the City of Lancaster, the City of Palmdale, Los Angeles County unincorporated area, and ends at Vincent Substation (see Figure 3.1-1).

Table 4.10-2 shows a summary description of the jurisdictions, the general plan land use designations, the zoning, and existing land uses traversed by Segment 5.

***General Plan Land Use Designations and Existing Land Use*.** General plan land use designations and existing uses along Segment 5 are summarized in Table 4.10-2 and shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses along the proposed Project alignment, refer to Appendix L, Figures L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

The predominant current land use traversed by the proposed Segment 5 R-O-W located between the existing Antelope Substation and the existing Vincent Substation is undeveloped open space, with one small area devoted to agricultural use. No residences are located within the existing R-O-W.

The General Plan land use designation for Segment 5 varies depending on the jurisdiction. Between S5 MP 0.0 and 3.5, Segment 5 traverses parcels designated Residential in the City of Lancaster General Plan within the R-O-W. Within this portion of Segment 5, the existing land use for the R-O-W primarily includes electrical power facilities and some agriculture

TABLE 4.10-2
SEGMENT 5 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S5 MP 0.0 to 3.5	City of Lancaster	Residential	RR-2.5	RR-2.5, R-10,000	Vacant, Residential, Agriculture, Commercial, Electrical Power Facilities, Wildlife Preserves and Sanctuaries, Airports
S5 MP 3.5 to 4.4	City of Palmdale	Residential	R-1-13,000, R-1-20,000, California Aqueduct, Light Agriculture, Quarry and Reclamation	R-1-13,000, R-1-15,000, R-1-20,000, Public Facilities (PF), California Aqueduct, Light Agriculture, Quarry and Reclamation	Electrical Power Facilities, Other Utilities, Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Agriculture, Vacant
S5 MP 4.4 to 4.6	City of Palmdale	California Aqueduct[2]	California Aqueduct	Open Space and Recreation (OR, OS), California Aqueduct, R-1-20,000	Other Utilities, Rural Residential, Commercial, Vacant
S5 MP 4.6 to 5.0	City of Palmdale	Miscellaneous Industry Extraction and Landfills	Quarry and Remediation, Light Agriculture	Quarry and Remediation, Light Agriculture, California Aqueduct	Vacant, Electrical Power Facilities, Industrial, Other Utilities, Materials extraction at MP 4.6 – 5.0, Other institutions Gov. Fire, Church, Clubhouse
S5 MP 5.0 to 5.8	City of Palmdale	Residential	Specific Plan	Light Agriculture	Electrical Power Facilities and Vacant
S5 MP 5.7 to 7.4	Los Angeles County	Agriculture	A-2-2	A-2-2	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Rural Residential, Agriculture
S5 MP 7.4 to 11.1	City of Palmdale	Urban Mixed Categories (Ritter Ranch and City Ranch Specific Plans)	Specific Plan	Specific Plan	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, City Ranch Planned Development, Agriculture,

TABLE 4.10-2 (CONTINUED)
SEGMENT 5 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S5 MP 11.1 to 17.8	Los Angeles County	Agriculture	A-2-1, A-1-1, M-1	A-2-1, A-1-1, M-1, M-1.5, C-3	Electrical Utility Facilities, Vacant, Quail Valley Planned Development, Agriculture, Residential, Other Utilities, Commercial, Transportation, Industrial

1 Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

2 Although this portion of Segment 5 is identified as "no data" on maps 4.10-1 and L-1, the City of Palmdale General Plan land use map shows that this area is designated "California Aqueduct."

uses. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer also include vacant, residential, commercial, wildlife preserves and sanctuaries, and commercial. The growth pattern of the City of Lancaster is characterized by several urbanized residential nodes that extend west towards Los Angeles County unincorporated area and Segment 5.

Segment 5 traverses the City of Palmdale between S5 MP 3.5 and 5.8. General Plan land use designation within the R-O-W is Residential, Miscellaneous Industry, and California Aqueduct. Existing land uses are described in Table 4.10-2. The City of Palmdale is bound on the north by the City of Lancaster, and both cities are located in the Antelope Valley. Large planned residential developments are located in the western portion of Palmdale.

Between S5 MP 5.8 and 7.4, Segment 5 runs through unincorporated Los Angeles County land designated Agriculture within the R-O-W in the County General Plan. Existing uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include rural residential, agriculture, vacant, and electrical power facilities.

The Joshua Ranch Planned Development parallels the T/L corridor mostly outside of the 0.5-mile study corridor starting at S5 MP 6.6. Joshua Ranch was permitted by the City of Palmdale for the development of 539 residential lots on 793 acres. Joshua Ranch is located between 30th and 50th Street East, south of the California Aqueduct and north of Elizabeth Lake Road within the city limits of Palmdale. This residential development is considered an infill development and occurs between developed residential tracts.

The Segment 5 R-O-W transects the Ritter Ranch Specific Plan from S5 MP 7.4 to 9.8. The City of Palmdale's Ritter Ranch Specific Plan is a 10,625-acre development of approximately 7,000 units, currently under construction. Within Ritter Ranch, the T/L R-O-W crosses designated Natural Open Space, according to the Ritter Ranch Specific Plan. This portion of the R-O-W is also recognized as an existing energy utility corridor in the Specific Plan.

Segment 5 R-O-W traverses the City of Palmdale's City Ranch Specific Plan (also known as Anaverde) from S5 MP 9.8 to 11.2. City Ranch is a 1,985 acre Planned Development annexation to the City of Palmdale with a maximum of 5,200 residential units. Within the R-O-W, Specific Plan land uses include Single Family Residential. Other uses within the 0.5-mile buffer of the approved Specific Plan include Natural Open Space, Golf Course, and a proposed elementary school located within a quarter-mile of S5 MP 10.2.

The Segment 5 R-O-W traverses the Quail Valley Planned Development between S5 11.2 and 14.4. The Quail Valley Plan was submitted to the City of Palmdale in November 2006, proposing annexation of approximately 1,263.3 acres of unincorporated Los Angeles

Countyland located within the existing Palmdale Sphere of Influence. Quail Valley is comprised of two project sites, both crossed by an existing SCE utility corridor on their southwest corners.

The southern portion of the Planned Development will be designated as open space and remain undeveloped. The proposed 712 residences will be located approximately 500 feet northeast of the existing R-O-W.

The last approximate 5 miles of Segment 5 continue south to the Vincent Substation, through unincorporated Los Angeles County lands. This portion of Segment 5 transects parcels designated Agriculture in the County General Plan within the R-O-W. The existing land use within the R-O-W is electrical utility facilities. In addition to that use, existing land use within the 0.5-mile buffer also includes agriculture, residential, utilities, commercial, transportation along SR-14 and light rail corridor, and vacant.

***Zoning*.** Zoning along Segment 5 R-O-W and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-2. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

Segment 5 zoning varies depending on the transected jurisdiction, similar to the land use designations described above. Within the City of Lancaster, the zoning within Segment 5 R-O-W includes Rural Residential and Single Family Residential. At S5 MP 4.1 the R-O-W crosses the California Aqueduct and transitions into Light Agriculture zoning. The zoning within the R-O-W at S5 MP 4.7 to 4.9 is Quarry and Reclamation. From S5 MP 4.9 to 5.7 the zoning within the R-O-W is Light Agriculture until Segment 5 enters unincorporated Los Angeles County. The zoning within the 0.5-mile buffer parcels along Segment 5 include Open Space and Recreational, Public Facilities, Quarry and Reclamation, and Single Family Residential.

At S5 MP 5.7 Segment 5 enters unincorporated Los Angeles County parcels zoned Heavy Agriculture within the R-O-W and thereafter passes through the City of Palmdale between S5 MP 7.3 and 11.1. The R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer within the City of Palmdale are zoned Specific Plan, consistent with the Ritter Ranch Specific Plan and the Anaverde Specific Plan.

After leaving Palmdale, the segment re-enters Los Angeles County parcels zoned Heavy Agriculture in both the R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer. From S5 MP 13.0 to 17.8, land within the R-O-W is zoned Heavy Agriculture, Light Agriculture, and Light Manufacturing.

***Specific Concerns*.** HCPs and SEAs crossed by the proposed Segment 5 alignment are shown on Figure 4.10-3. The entire length of Segment 5 is within the WMP. SEAs within the R-O-W include the proposed San Andreas Rift Zone and Santa Clara River SEAs, as well as

the existing Ritter Ridge and Kentucky Springs SEAs. For further discussion of the HCP and SEAs, refer to Section, 4.5, Biological Resources.

Bohunk's Airpark, a dirt runway airport, is located approximately 0.9 miles east of S5 MP 0.0. Segment 5 MP 0.0 is directly west approximately 5,500 feet, and has an approximate 116-foot structural height limit.[3] Since the Segment 5 single-circuit lattice towers would range in height between 113 feet and 188 feet, coordination with FAA would be required to address any potential height conflicts.

Segment 5 crosses the California Aqueduct and is located near, but does not cross, BLM lands.

4.10.6.2.2 Impact Analysis. As with Segment 4, construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 5 transmission line would not divide an established community or conflict with any applicable local plans or policies. The proposed Project would not be expected to have significant effects due to conflicts with existing SEAs and HCPs. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources.

Construction. Construction impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Construction of Segment 5 would occur within the existing transmission line R-O-W. The proposed urban development within the Ritter Ranch, City Ranch (a.k.a. Anaverde), and Quail Valley Specific Plan areas considered the existing transmission line corridor as a baseline condition. The proposed Project would not divide an established community. Refer to Section 4.10.6.1.2 Segment 4 Impact Analysis for analysis of impacts for staging areas. No impacts are expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

[3] Maximum direct height limits were calculated using the nearest distance between the proposed transmission lines and the existing airstrips. These horizontal distances were then multiplied by the most conservative rise to run ratio provided by FAA height regulations, which is 1:50.

Construction of the proposed Project would be within existing R-O-W and would not conflict with land use plans, policies, or regulations of agencies with jurisdiction. The entire R-O-W for Segment 5 is within an existing utility corridor, identified in both land use and zoning maps of Los Angeles County, the City of Lancaster, and the City of Palmdale. Staging areas would most likely be located off the R-O-W near the endpoints of the proposed line route near the proposed substation sites, and would require an area of approximately ten acres each. No new access or spur roads are proposed. Pulling and splicing sites ("pull sites") will primarily occur within the existing R-O-W.

Based on preliminary data and calculations, the proposed Segment 5 towers could exceed FAA height requirements for Bohunk Airpark. Additional consultation with the FAA would be required in accordance with FAA Guidelines Title 14 FAR 77, and the proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts due to height limitations would occur.

The Ritter Ranch, City Ranch, and Quail Valley Specific Plans include residential land use designation adjacent to the R-O-W. The City Ranch Specific Plan (a.k.a. Ana Verde) includes a proposed elementary school within a quarter-mile of MP 10.2. However, because Segment 5 would be constructed within existing transmission line R-O-W, the proposed Project would not affect future residential and school development. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Segment 5 is within the WMP. SEAs within the R-O-W include the existing Ritter Ridge and Kentucky Springs SEAs, as well as the proposed San Andreas Rift Zone and Santa Clara River SEAs. In addition, the proposed Project T/L alignment is located near BLM lands at S5 MP 12.2, however no BLM lands will be traversed by the proposed Project. There are no NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site.

The proposed Project would not be expected to have any significant impacts due to conflicts with local HCPs and SEAs. The WMP is currently applicable to federal lands within the plan's boundaries only. The proposed Project does not traverse federal lands within the WMP, therefore the proposed Project would not be required to comply with the WMP. Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives and the proposed Project would not be required to comply with Los Angeles County's provisions

related to SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of SEAs, HCPs, and BLM lands. Less than significant impacts are expected.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would occur within existing R-O-W and would not divide any established community. No impacts would occur.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Operation of Segment 5 would not have any impact on applicable land use plan, policies, or regulations with jurisdiction over the Project area. The entire R-O-W for Segment 5 is within an existing utility corridor, identified in both land use and zoning maps of Los Angeles County, City of Palmdale, and City of Lancaster.

Based on preliminary data and calculations, the proposed Segment 5 towers could have a height conflict with the FAA approach zone airspace requirements for Bohunk Airpark. However, the proposed Project will be required to consult and coordinate with FAA prior to construction, per the FAA guidelines Title 14 FAR 77, and the proposed Project will be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts due to height limitations are expected.

The Ritter Ranch, City Ranch, and Quail Valley Specific Plans include residential land use designation adjacent to the R-O-W. However, because Segment 5 would be constructed within an existing R-O-W where a transmission line already exists, the proposed Project would not affect future development of residential uses, and no impact would occur.

The proposed Project improvements would not have any impact on land use plans as there are no proposed R-O-W expansions or change of use.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not be expected to conflict with the WMP or SEAs. There are no proposed R-O-W expansions or change of use. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

4.10.6.2.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.2.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant will consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts are expected.

4.10.6.3 Segment 6

4.10.6.3.1 Environmental Setting.

***Jurisdictions*.** Segment 6 traverses lands within Los Angeles County, ANF, and City of Duarte jurisdiction (see Figure 3.1-1). Segment 6 begins at the Vincent Substation site located within Los Angeles County unincorporated area, enters ANF lands at S6 MP 1.4 and stays on federal land until it ends at S6 MP 26.9. Along the way it crosses the Pacific Crest Trail, two isolated "Out Parcels,"[4] State Highway 2, and the cities of Duarte and Monrovia, both of which have boundaries that are within forest boundaries. Segment 6 connects to Segment 7 at the southern boundary of ANF at S6 MP 26.9.

Table 4.10-3 provides a summary of the jurisdictions, general plan land use designations, zoning, and existing land uses traversed by Segment 6.

***General Plan Land Use Designation and Existing Land Use*.** General plan land use designation along Segment 6 are described in Table 4.10-3 and illustrated on Figures 4.10-1 and 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general pan land uses and existing land uses along the proposed Project alignment, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

Existing land use within the proposed Segment 6 R-O-W, located between the existing Vincent Substation and the southern boundary of the ANF, is undeveloped open space.

[4] "Out Parcels," identified on figures as "non-forest land" or "not forest land", are parcels that are within the overall ANF boundaries, but are not part of the Forest and are excluded from USDA Forest Service jurisdiction. These parcels are under Los Angeles County jurisdiction instead.

TABLE 4.10-3
SEGMENT 6 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S6 MP 0.0 to 1.4	Los Angeles County	Agriculture	A-1-1	A-1-1, A-2-1	Vacant and Rural Residential
S6 MP 1.4 to 1.7	USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W, A-2-5	Vacant
S6 MP 1.7 to 2.8	Los Angeles County (out parcel)	Open Space – Not Developable	A-2-5, A-2-2.5	W, A-2-5, A-2-2.5	Vacant and Rural Residential
S6 MP 2.8 to 5.3	USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W	Vacant, Wildlife Preserve and Sanctuaries (near MP 3.5)
S6 MP 5.3 to 5.7	Los Angeles County (out parcel)	Open Space – Not Developable	A-2-5	A-2-5, W	Vacant and Rural Residential
S6 MP 5.7 to 7.3	USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W, A-2-5	Vacant
S6 MP 7.3 to 7.5	USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W	Vacant
S6 MP 7.5 to 17.3	USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W	Vacant, Public Facilities (near MP 16.2), Wildlife Preserve and Sanctuaries (near MP 16.6)
S6 MP 17.3 to 18.9	USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W	Vacant, San Gabriel Wilderness Area boundary is adjacent to the R-O-W on the east side
S6 MP 18.9 to 24.8	USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W	Vacant
S6 MP 24.8 to 25.8	City of Duarte/ USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W	Vacant
S6 MP 25.8 to 26.9	City of Monrovia/ USFS (ANF)	Open Space – Not Developable	W	W	Vacant

1 Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

2 W corresponds to the Los Angeles County Zoning for the Angeles National Forest Area. For detailed information about land use zones as specified in the ANF Management Plan (2005a), refer to section 4.10.6.3.1, "*Angeles National Forest Land Use Zones and Designated Utilities Corridor*"

The Segment 6 R-O-W crosses unincorporated Los Angeles County land with General Plan land use designation Agriculture between S6 MP 0.0 and 1.4. Existing land uses within the R-O-W and the 0.5-mile buffer include electrical power facilities, vacant and rural residential. From S6 MP 1.4 to 26.9, Segment 6 is within the ANF and traverses land designated by the County as Open Space – Not Developable within the R-O-W. Existing land uses are electrical power facilities (primarily within the R-O-W) and vacant within the 0.5-mile buffer. Some existing residential uses are scattered within the "Out Parcels" that are under Los Angeles County jurisdiction; however, there are no residences within the R-O-W.

***Zoning*.** Zoning along Segment 6 R-O-W and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-3. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

Within Los Angeles County (S6 MP 0.0 to 1.4; 1.7 to 2.8; and 5.3 to 5.7) the Segment 6 R-O-W includes parcels zoned Agriculture. Within the ANF, the zoning for the R-O-W and the 0.5-mile buffer is identified as primarily Wilderness in the Los Angeles County zoning map.

***Angeles National Forest Land Use Zones and Designated Utilities Corridor*.** The ANF Management Plan includes land use zones designated to show allowable uses and opportunities within the ANF. The Project area traverses the following land use zones: Back Country, Back Country Motorized Use Restricted, and Developed Area Interface, all of which allow major utility corridors in designated areas (USDA Forest Service, 2005a). The proposed Segment 6 would be constructed entirely within an existing designated utility corridor, as mapped by the USDA Forest Service (Southern California Utility Corridors, USDA Forest Service, 2007[5]). Segment 6 is located near a designated Critical Biological Land Use Zone in Upper Big Tujunga. This area was designated an important area on NFS lands to manage for the protection of species-at-risk. Segment 6 also crosses San Gabriel River West Fork, which the ANF Management Plan identifies as a river eligible to Wild and Scenic River status under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (P.L. 90-542, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1271-1287) (USDA Forest Service, 2005a). Please refer to Sections 4.2, Aesthetic Resources and 4.5, Biological Resources for further discussion of these aesthetic and biological resources.

***Specific Concerns*.** HCPs and SEAs crossed by the proposed Segment 6 alignment are shown on Figure 4.10-3 and include the existing Kentucky Springs SEA and the proposed Santa

[5] Southern California Utility Corridors, USDA Forest Service - Pacific Southwest Region - Remote Sensing Lab, 2006, retrieved from http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/rsl/clearinghouse/gis-download.shtml on April 7, 2007.

Clara River and San Gabriel Canyon SEAs. From S6 MP 0.0 to 1.4, Segment 6 is within the WMP boundaries.

No airports or helipads were identified that would restrict the height of Segment 6 structures.

4.10.6.3.2 Impact Analysis.

***Impact Summary*.** Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 6 transmission line would not divide an established community. Conflicts with applicable local plans or policies would be less than significant. Segment 6 would traverse lands within the ANF which are designated Back Country and Back Country Motorized Use Restricted, both of which are considered suitable for utility corridors use in designated utility corridors, per the ANF Management Plan (2005). Segment 6 is located entirely within an existing designated utility corridor and would be built within existing R-O-W, where transmission lines currently exist. Therefore, the proposed Project would not be expected to conflict with the ANF Management Plan. Implementation of mitigation measures and APMs included in Section 4.5 Biological Resources would ensure consistency with the Forest Plan's goals and policies.

The proposed Project would not be expected to have significant effects due to conflicts with existing SEAs and HCPs. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources. The proposed improvements to Segment 6 facilities would not have any impact on land use or planning as there is no proposed expansion of the existing R-O-W or change of use.

***Construction*.** Construction impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Construction of the Segment 6 improvements would occur completely within the existing R-O-W, where transmission lines currently exist. Segment 6 traverses primarily open space, vacant, and agricultural lands. The proposed Project would not divide existing communities. No impacts would occur.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Construction of the proposed Project would occur within an existing R-O-W. Staging areas would most likely be located off the R-O-W near the endpoints of the proposed line route near the proposed substation sites. Where possible, the existing access and spur roads would be reopened and rehabilitated. In a number of structure site locations, access and spur roads would be extended from existing roads to access the existing structure locations adjacent to the existing structures. Where new access or spur roads are impractical or impossible, structures in the most rugged terrain would be constructed using roadless construction techniques. It is estimated that approximately 4 miles of new spur roads will be needed. No impacts are expected to result from construction of additional access and spur roads, staging areas, and pull sites, as those would have to comply with ANF requirements.

The ANF Management Plan includes land use zones designated to show allowable uses and opportunities within the ANF. The Project area traverses the following land use zones: Back Country, Back Country Motorized Use Restricted, and Developed Area Interface, all of which allow major utility corridors in designated areas (USDA Forest Service, 2005a). The proposed Segment 6 would be constructed entirely within an existing designated utility corridor, as mapped by the USDA Forest Service (Southern California Utility Corridors, USDA Forest Service, 2007[6]) where transmission lines already exist. The proposed improvements would not require additional R-O-W and would not involve change in current land uses. No impacts are expected.

Segment 6 is located near a designated Critical Biological Land Use Zone in Upper Big Tujunga. This area was designated an important area on NFS lands to manage for the protection of species-at-risk. Segment 6 also crosses San Gabriel River West Fork, which is eligible for Wild and Scenic River status (USDA Forest Service, 2005a). Please refer to Sections 4.2, Aesthetic Resources and 4.5, Biological Resources for further discussion of these aesthetic and biological resources.

The Project would be consistent with the following USDA Forest Service applicable goals, policies, and strategies:

- **National Strategic Goal 4: Help meet energy resource needs.** The Project is consistent with this policy. The Project would occur within a designated utility corridor, within existing R-O-W, and where transmission lines already exist.

[6] Southern California Utility Corridors, USDA Forest Service - Pacific Southwest Region - Remote Sensing Lab, 2006, retrieved from http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/rsl/clearinghouse/gis-download.shtml on April 7, 2007.

- **Goal 4.1b: Support use of renewable resources.** The Project includes improvements to allow for the integration of a proposed wind energy project. The Project is consistent with this policy that encourages the development of alternative energy sources.
- **Goal 7.1: Minimize land area needed to support growing public needs.** This goal states that facilities supporting urban infrastructure needs should be clustered on existing sites or within designated corridors to minimize the number of acres encumbered by special-use authorizations. The Project would occur within an existing utility corridor in the ANF. In addition, implementation of the mitigation measures and APMs included in Section 4.5, Biological Resources would also contribute to ensure consistency with this goal.
- **Lands 2: Non- Recreation Special Use Authorizations.** The Project is proposed within the designated Vincent-Rio Hondo utility corridor. The corridor is wide enough to provide the opportunity to collocate other utility facilities. In order to ensure that the Project would minimize encumbrance of NFS land and minimize impacts on raptors, including the California Condor, mitigation measures and APMs included in Section 4.5, Biological Resources would be implemented.
- **ANF S1: Pacific Crest Trail.** The Project's impact to visual resources is discussed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources, of this report.

Based on the above, Segment 6 would have less-than-significant impacts on applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations applicable to the Project site.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

The northern portion of Segment 6 would be within the WMP (S6 MP 0.0 to 1.4). SEAs within the R-O-W include the existing Kentucky Springs SEA and the proposed Santa Clara River and San Gabriel Canyon SEAs. There are no NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site.

The proposed Project would not be expected to have any significant impacts due to conflicts with local HCPs and SEAs. The WMP is currently applicable to federal lands within the plan's boundaries only. The proposed Project does not traverse federal lands within the WMP, therefore the proposed Project would not be required to comply with the WMP. Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives and the proposed Project would not be required to comply with Los Angeles County's provisions

related to SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of SEAs and HCPs. Less than significant impacts are expected.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Construction of Segment 6 would occur completely within the existing R-O-W, where transmission lines currently exist. The proposed Project would not divide existing communities. No impacts are expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Operation and maintenance of Segment 6 would not have any impact on applicable land use plan, policies, or regulations with jurisdiction over the Project area. The entire R-O-W for Segment 6 within the ANF is within a designated existing utility corridor, as mapped by the USDA Forest Service. No impacts are expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not be expected to have a significant impact on applicable HCPs and SEAs, as detailed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources.

4.10.6.3.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.3.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant will consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts are expected.

4.10.6.4 Segment 7

4.10.6.4.1 Environmental Setting.

***Jurisdictions*.** Segment 7 traverses federal and local jurisdictions, including: USDA Forest Service, County of Los Angeles, City of Duarte, City of Irwindale, City of Baldwin Park, City of Industry, South El Monte, City of Montebello, and City of Monterey Park (see Figure 3.1-1). These jurisdictions, general plan land use designations, zoning, and existing land uses are summarized in Table 4.10-4.

Segment 7 begins at the border of the ANF and the northernmost portion of the City of Duarte. From S7 MP 0.0 to 1.9, the Segment 7 route runs directly south on existing SCE R-O-W within the City of Duarte. At S7 MP 1.9, the Project leaves the City of Duarte and enters the City of Irwindale. At S7 MP 2.4, the Project route crosses over the 210 Freeway and sweeps over to the southbound side of the 605 Freeway. Closely following the alignment of the 605 Freeway, the Segment 7 route continues through the City of Irwindale until S7 MP 7.3, where it enters the City of Baldwin Park. Segment 7 runs through the City of Baldwin Park from S7 MP 7.3 to 8.8. From S7 MP 8.8 to 10.5, Segment 7 passes through a small portion of City of Industry. From S7 MP 10.5 to 11.4, the route passes through South El Monte. Between S7 MP 11.4 and 13.9, Segment 7 traverses County of Los Angeles unincorporated lands. The City of Montebello is located between S7 MP 13.9 and 15.4. At S7 MP 15.4, Segment 7 enters the City of Monterey Park, and ends at S7 MP 15.8, at the Mesa Substation.

***General Plan Land Use Designation and Existing Land Use*.** General plan land use designation and existing uses along Segment 7 are summarized in Table 4.10-4 and illustrated on Figures 4.10-1 and 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses along the proposed Project alignment, refer to Appendix L, Figures L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

The proposed Segment 7 R-O-W is located between the southern boundary of the ANF and the existing Mesa Substation. Areas within the R-O-W or flanking it within the northernmost approximate 1.2-mile portion of the segment are used exclusively as undeveloped open space. Areas within the R-O-W or flanking it within the southernmost approximate 14.8-mile portion of the segment are in suburban use. Existing permitted secondary land uses within the R-O-W include the following: plant nurseries, golf course greens, at-grade vehicular parking lots, undeveloped industrial areas, and specialty fruit or vegetable crop production.

TABLE 4.10-4
SEGMENT 7 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S7 MP 0 to 0.6	City of Duarte	Open Not Developable, Electrical Power Facilities	R1F	R1F	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant
S7 MP 0.6 to 1.6	City of Duarte	Residential, Open Not Developable	R-1A, R-1B, R-4	R-1, R-1A, R-1B, R-4, RMH, PUD	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential, Schools, Other Residential
S7 MP 1.6 to 1.9	City of Duarte	Golf Course	PUD	PUD, R-1, R-4, R-3, M-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Golf Course, Single Family Residential, Schools, Other Residential, Industrial
S7 MP 1.9 to 2.4	City of Irwindale	Residential	M-1, M-2	M-1, M-2, A-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential, Schools, Other Residential, Industrial, Commercial
S7 MP 2.4 to 3.4	City of Irwindale	Open Not Developable	M-1, M-2	M-1, M-2, A1	Vacant, Industrial, Public Facilities, Electrical Power Facilities
S7 MP 3.4 to 4.3	City of Irwindale	Open Not Developable, Light Industrial	A-1	M2, A-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Industrial, Public Facilities
S7 MP 4.3 to 5.3	City of Irwindale	Regional Retail, Misc. Commercial, Urban Mixed, Misc. Industry	A-1	M-2, A-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Commercial, Industrial, Schools
S7 MP 5.3 to 7.3	City of Irwindale	Open Not Developable	Q, A-1, M-2	Q, M-2, A-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Commercial, Industrial, Schools, Single Family Residential, Other Residential
S7 MP 7.3 to 8.8	City of Baldwin Park	Other Institutions	PF	PF, I, I-C	Agriculture Commercial, Industrial, Schools, Single Family Residential, Other Residential
S7 MP 8.8 to 10.3	City of Industry	Open Not Developable, General Commercial	I, C	I, C	Electrical Power Facilities, Agriculture, Commercial, Industrial, Schools, Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Golf Courses, Vacant

TABLE 4.10-4 (CONTINUED)
SEGMENT 7 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S7 MP 10.3 to 10.8	County of Los Angeles	Open Not Developable,	A-1-5	A-1, A-1-5, R-3, R-A-6000, R-A-7500	Other Utilities, Single Family Residential, Commercial, Other Residential,
S7 MP 10.8 to 11.4	City of South El Monte	Open Not Developable, Light Industry	PF	PF, R-1, R-2	Single Family Residential, Industrial, Commercial, Agriculture
S7 MP 11.4 to 13.9	County of Los Angeles	Open Not Developable, Residential	O-S	O-S, M-1-BE, A-1, C-2	Parks, OS, Electrical Power Facilities, Industrial, Agriculture
S7 MP 13.9 to 15.4	City of Montebello	Residential, General Commercial, Parks	R-A, R-A-O, C-2 PD	R-A, R-A-O, C-2 PD, R-4, R-1, R-3 PD, R-4 PD, C-2	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Other Residential, Agriculture
S7 MP 15.4 to 15.8	City of Monterey Park	General Commercial	R-S PD	R-S PD, O-P, C-S, R-3, R-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Other Residential, Agriculture, Commercial, Industrial

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

Segment 7 crosses land designated Open Space Not Developable, Electrical Power Facilities, Residential, and Golf Course in the City of Duarte General Plan, within the Segment 7 R-O-W (S7 MP 0.0 to 1.9).

From S7 MP 1.9 to 7.3 the Project is within the City of Irwindale. The General Plan land use for this portion of Segment 7 within the R-O-W is Open Space, Residential, Regional Retail, Miscellaneous Commercial, Urban Mixed, and Industrial.

From this mid-point the Project traverses more local jurisdictions, but is much closer in proximity to residential and commercial land uses. From S7 MP 7.3 to 8.8 Segment 7 runs through City of Baldwin Park via a R-O-W that is designated in the General Plan as Other Institutions (Government, Fire, Church, Clubhouse, etc.). From S7 MP 8.8 to 10.3 Segment 7 passes through a small portion of City of Industry predominantly designated General Commercial and Open Not Developable. From S7 MP 10.3 to 10.8, the R-O-W General Plan land use designation is Open Space Not Developable in unincorporated Los Angeles County land. From S7 MP 10.8 to 11.4, the route R-O-W passes through land designated Open Space Not Developable and Light Industry in South El Monte.

Unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County are scattered throughout the valley in between incorporated local jurisdictions. Between S7 MP 11.4 and 13.9, this segment traverses a vast unincorporated area designated Open Not Developable. The City of Montebello starts at S7 MP 13.9 and the General Plan land use designation within the R-O-W is Residential, General Commercial, and Parks. At S7 MP 15.4 Segment 7 exits the City of Montebello and enters the City of Monterey Park, the location of the Mesa Substation. General Commercial is the General Plan land use designation within the R-O-W.

The existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer from the Segment 7 alignment reflect the general urban character of this area. Existing land uses generally follow the General Plan land use designation for each jurisdiction and include agriculture, vacant, commercial, industrial, schools, residential, utilities and electrical power facilities, parks, open space, and recreation. Refer to Table 4.10-4 for detailed information on existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer.

Segment 7 traverses the Encanto Parkway Specific Plan and the Rancho Verde Specific Plan areas from MP 1.7 to 1.8.

***Zoning*.** Zoning along Segment 7 R-O-W and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-4. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

The proposed Project traverses lands zoned Residential within Segment 7 R-O-W in the City of Duarte and Manufacturing, Agriculture, and Quarry in the City of Irwindale. In the cities of Baldwin Park and South El Monte, the R-O-W traverses Public Facilities zones. In the City of Industry, zones within the R-O-W include Industrial and Commercial. Unincorporated Los Angeles County zones within the R-O-W include Open Space and Agriculture, and in the City of Montebello the transmission line traverses a Commercial zone. Segment 7 ends in the City of Monterey Park, where the R-O-W crosses lands zoned Regional Specialty Center – Planned Development. Refer to Table 4.10-4 for detailed information on zoning within the 0.5-mile buffer.

***Specific Concerns*.** SEAs crossed by the proposed Segment 7 alignment are shown on Figure 4.10-3. They include the existing Santa Fe Dam Floodplain SEA, the Whittier Narrows Dam County Recreation Area SEA, and the proposed Puente Hills SEA.

The El Monte Airport is located approximately 1.8 miles northwest of S7 MP 6.8.

4.10.6.4.2 Impact Analysis.

***Impact Summary*.** Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 7 transmission line would not divide an established community or conflict with any applicable local plans or policies. The proposed Project would not be expected to have significant effects due to conflicts with existing SEAs. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources.

***Construction*.** Construction impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Construction of Segment 7 would occur within existing R-O-W. The proposed Project assumes that staging areas would be located near the endpoints of the proposed line route near the proposed/existing substation sites. In this case, staging areas would be sited on vacant land and would be temporary. Based on the above, construction of the Project would not divide an established community, and no impact is expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Construction of the proposed Project would occur within existing R-O-W. As noted, staging areas would most likely be located off the R-O-W near the proposed substation sites. Existing access roads would be used for construction and maintenance activities.

General Plan Land Use policies from the Cities of Duarte, Irwindale, Baldwin Park, Industry, South El Monte, Montebello, Monterey Park, and County of Los Angeles are not in conflict with the proposed Project.

The El Monte Airport is located approximately 1.8 miles northwest of S7 MP 6.8 and the landing strip parallels the T/L alignment. The proposed Project would not be expected to conflict with the airport height restrictions. The proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports and FAA consultation requirements. Therefore, no impacts due to height restrictions are expected.

The proposed Project improvements would not have any impact on land use plans as there are no proposed R-O-W expansions or change of use.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

SEAs within the R-O-W include the existing Santa Fe Dam Floodplain and Whittier Narrows Dam County Recreation Area and the proposed Puente Hills SEA. There are no HCPs or NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site.

The proposed Project would not be expected to have any significant impacts due to conflicts with local SEAs. Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives and the proposed Project would not be required to comply with Los Angeles County's provisions regarding SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of SEAs. Less than significant impacts are expected.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not divide any established community, as Segment 7 would be built within an existing T/L R-O-W.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Operation of Segment 7 would not have any impact on applicable land use plan, policies, or regulations with jurisdiction over the Project area. The entire R-O-W for Segment 7 is within an existing utility corridor.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not be expected to have a significant impact related to applicable SEAs, as detailed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources.

4.10.6.4.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.4.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant will consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts are expected.

4.10.6.5 Segment 8

4.10.6.5.1 Environmental Setting.

***Jurisdictions*.** Segment 8 (which includes Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C) traverses many jurisdictions within the Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties (see Figure 3.1-1). These jurisdictions and milepost locations of general plan land use designations, existing land uses, and zoning are summarized in Table 4.10-5.

Segment 8 would pass primarily through the urban, suburban, and rural areas of Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. Approximately 3.25 miles of new R-O-W would need to be acquired.

TABLE 4.10-5
SEGMENT 8 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
Segment 8A					
S8A MP 0.0 to S8A MP 0.3	City of Monterey Park*	General Commercial, Parks	R-S PD	R-S PD, O-P, R-3, R-1	Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Commercial, Public Facilities, Schools, Agriculture, Vacant, Other Utilities, Transportation, Industrial, Electrical Power Facilities, Commercial
S8A MP 0.3 to S8A MP 2.1	City of Montebello*	General Commercial, Residential	R-A, R-A-O, C-2PD	R-A, R-A-O, C-2PD, R-4-D, R-1, R-3 PD, R-4-D PD, C-2	Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Commercial, Public Facilities, Schools, Agriculture, Vacant, Communication Facilities, Transportation, Industrial, Electrical Power Facilities, Commercial
S8A MP 2.1 to S8A MP 3.8	City of South El Monte	Open Not Developable	PF	PF, R-1, C, CM, P, M	Agriculture, Electrical Power Facilities, , Vacant, Other Utilities, Industrial, Water, Golf Courses
S8A MP 3.8 to S8A MP 4.4	City of Pico Rivera	Open Not Developable, Park	I-G, P-F	I-G, P-F	Parks, Electrical Power Facilities
S8A MP 4.4 to S8A MP 4.6	City of Industry	General Industrial	I, C	I, C	Agriculture, Industrial, , Vacant, Electrical Power Facilities, Transportation
S8A MP 4.6 to S8A MP 8.7 and S8A MP 8.9 to S8A MP 9.8 and S8A MP 10 to S8A MP 11.1	County of Los Angeles	Open Not Developable, Other Institutions	A-2-1, A-2-2	A-2-1, A-2-2, R-A-1, R-A-12000, R-A-9000, RPD-15000-3.2U, RPD-1-4U, A-1-6000, A-1-15000	Electrical Power Facilities, Other Utilities, Vacant, Agriculture, Communication Facilities, Higher Education, Industrial, Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Parks, Schools, Commercial
S8A MP 8.7 to S8A MP 8.8	City of Whittier	Open Not Developable	OS	OS	Electrical Power Facilities, Other Utilities, Vacant, Communication Facilities, Golf Courses, Industrial, Single Family Residential, Parks, Schools, Commercial

TABLE 4.10-5 (CONTINUED)
SEGMENT 8 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S8A MP 11.1 to S8A MP 13.4	City of La Habra Heights	Residential	OS	OS	Agriculture, Electrical Power Facilities, Other Utilities, Vacant, Communication Facilities, Golf Courses, Industrial, Single Family Residential, Parks, Schools, Commercial
S8A MP 13.5 to S8A MP 20.6	County of Los Angeles and City of Diamond Bar	Residential, Open Not Developable	A-2-1	A-2-1, A-2-2, R-A-1, R-A-12000, R-A-9000, RPD-15000-3.2U, RPD-1-4U, A-1-6000, A-1-15000	Agriculture, Electrical Power Facilities, Other Utilities, Vacant, Communication Facilities, Public Facilities, Golf Courses, Industrial, Single Family Residential, Parks, Schools, Commercial
S8A MP 20.6 to S8A MP 25.2 and S8A MP 25.4 to S8A MP 25.6	City of Chino Hills	Open Not Developable, Other Institutions, Agriculture, Residential	R-S, R-A, C-N, RM-2, C-0, PD-15-150, PD-2003-01, PD 5-157	PD 5-157, C-R, R-A, PD 18-157, R-S, PD 23-152, PD-15-150, PD-26-149, C-N, RM-2, C-0, PD-2003-01	Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Schools, Vacant, Agriculture, Parks, Golf Courses, Commercial, Public Facilities, Other Utilities, Agriculture
S8A MP 25.2 to S8A MP 25.4 and S8A MP 25.6 to S8A MP 29.9	City of Chino	Residential, Urban Mixed Categories, Open Not Developable, Other Institutions, General Commercial, Miscellaneous Commercial, Light Industry, General Industrial, Utilities	RD 4.5, RD 14, C, BP, M, GI, M2, OS, PD-M2, EE	RD 4.5, RD 14, C, BP, M, GI, M2, OS, PD-M2, EE, OC, RD 2	Single Family Residential, Agriculture, Schools, Other Utilities, Electrical Power Facilities, Public Facilities, Industrial, Transportation, Parks, Vacant, Commercial, Special Use Facilities

TABLE 4.10-5 (CONTINUED)
SEGMENT 8 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S8A MP 29.9 to S8A MP 35.2	City of Ontario	Residential, Urban Mixed Categories, Open Not Developable, Other Institutions, General Commercial, Miscellaneous Commercial, Utilities	SP	SP, R1, R2, OS, PF	Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Rural Residential, Parks, Schools, Public Facilities, Agriculture, Vacant, Industrial, Other Utilities, Water
Segment 8B					
S8B MP 0.0 to S8B MP 1.5	City of Chino	Open Not Developable, General Industrial	RD 4.5, RD 14, C, BP, M, GI, M2,OS, PD-M2, EE	RD 4.5, RD 14, C, BP, M, GI, M2,OS, PD-M2, EE, OC, RD 2	Single Family Residential, Agriculture, Schools, Other Utilities, Electrical Power Facilities, Public Facilities, Industrial, Transportation, Parks, Vacant, Commercial, Special Use Facilities
S8B MP 1.5 to S8B MP 6.8	City of Ontario	Open Not Developable, Residential, General Industrial, Utilities	OS	SP, R1, R2, OS, PF	Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Rural Residential, Parks, Schools, Public Facilities, Agriculture, Vacant, Industrial, Other Utilities, Water
Segment 8C					
S8C MP 0.0 to S8C MP 1.5	City of Chino	Residential, Urban Mixed Categories, Utilities, Open Not Developable, Other Institutions Offices, Other Institutions	RD 4.5, RD 14, C, BP, M, GI, M2, OS, PD-M2, EE	RD 4.5, RD 14, C, BP, M, GI, M2, OS, PD-M2, EE, OC, RD 2	Single Family Residential, Agriculture, Schools, Other Utilities, Electrical Power Facilities, Public Facilities, Industrial, Transportation, Parks, Vacant, Commercial, Special Use Facilities
S8C MP 1.5 to S8C MP 6.4	City of Ontario	Open Not Developable, Residential, General Industrial, Utilities	SP	SP, R1, R2, OS, PF	Single Family Residential, Other Residential, Rural Residential, Parks, Schools, Public Facilities, Agriculture, Vacant, Industrial, Other Utilities, Water

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C of the proposed Project traverse lands within the following jurisdictions: Los Angeles County unincorporated lands (including the Census Defined Places [CDPs] of Avocado Heights, Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights and West Puente Valley), the cities of La Habra Heights, Pico Rivera, South El Monte, Monterey Park, Montebello, Whittier, and Industry within Los Angeles County, and the cities of Chino, Chino Hills, and Ontario within San Bernardino County.

Segment 8A begins at the Mesa Substation at S8A MP 0.0 in the City of Monterey Park, traverses the aforementioned jurisdictions and connects to the Chino Substation in the City of Chino. From the Chino Substation Segment 8A connects to the east at the Mira Loma Substation in the City of Ontario. Most of Segment 8A would be located in urbanized areas and jurisdictions within Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. Exceptions include a portion of Segment 8A as it traverses the northern portion of the City of Whittier and part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and the suburbanizing area between the Chino Substation and the Mira Loma Substation (see Figure 3.1-1 General Location Map).

Segments 8B and 8C start at the Chino Substation and end at the Mira Loma Substation, and generally parallel Segment 8A (see Figure 3.1-1 General Location Map).

***General Plan Land Use Designation*.** General plan land use designation along Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C R-O-W are summarized in Table 4.10-5 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses along the proposed Project R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

For Segment 8A, General Plan land use designations within R-O-W reflect the urban character of the area. General Plan designations include Commercial, Open Space (Not Developable) and Parks, Residential, Utilities, General Industrial, Institutions, and Agriculture. Refer to Table 4.10-5 for detailed information on general plan designation within Segment 8A R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer.

Segment 8A bisects the Chino Hills Specific Plan, the East Chino Specific Plan, the New Model Colony Specific Plan, and the College Park Specific Plan, and the Eucalyptus Business Park Specific Plan. Segment 8A would also traverse the Aera Energy Master Planned Community. The proposed Aera Energy Development is located in unincorporated Los Angeles County lands, adjacent to the east of State Route 57 (Orange Freeway). The development would include approximately 3,600 homes and is proposed to be annexed to the City of Diamond Bar.

Along the western border of the City of Chino (adjacent to the City of Chino Hills) are the Majestic Spectrum and Commons at Chino Hills Specific Plans. These Specific Plans would not be traversed by the proposed Project, but they are located within the 0.5-mile buffer from Segment 8A.

Segments 8B and 8C R-O-W include the following General Plan land use designations: Residential, Urban Mixed Categories, Open Not Developable, Institutions, Industry, and Utilities. Refer to Table 4.10-5 for detailed information on general plan designation within Segment 8A R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer.

Within the City of Chino the proposed routes for Segments 8B, and 8C traverse the East Chino Specific Plan and Chino College Specific Plan. Within the City of Ontario Segments 8B, and 8C traverse the New Model Colony Specific Plan.

***Existing Land Use*.** Existing land uses along Sub-Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C 0.5-mile buffer are shown in Table 4.10-5. For a more detailed view of existing land uses along the proposed Project R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

The proposed approximate 33-mile Segment 8 R-O-W (including 8A, 8B, and 8C) and areas flanking it located between the existing Mesa Substation and the existing Mira Loma Substation are under either an undeveloped open space or a suburban use. Existing permitted secondary land uses include the following types: plant nurseries, specialty fruit or vegetable crop production, park and open space areas, at-grade vehicular parking lots, undeveloped industrial areas.

Predominant existing land uses along the Segment 8A 0.5-mile buffer include agriculture, electrical power facilities/utilities, parks/recreation, and vacant. Some commercial, industrial, and water uses are also located along Segment 8A. Within the eastern portion of Segment 8A, in the Cities of Chino Hills, Chino, and Ontario, existing land uses also include single family residential uses.

Existing land uses along Segment 8B 0.5-mile buffer are single family residential, agriculture, parks, vacant, electrical power facilities/utilities, and industrial in the Cities of Chino and Ontario.

Existing land uses along Segment 8C 0.5-mile buffer are single family residential, agriculture, parks, vacant, electrical power facilities/utilities, and public facilities in the Cities of Chino and Ontario.

***Zoning*.**

***Segment 8A*.** Zoning along Segment 8A R-O-W and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-5. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

Zoning for the proposed Project alignment shows the urbanized character of the area. Segment 8A R-O-W traverses the following zones: Regional Specialty Center, Residential, Agriculture, Commercial, Public Facilities, General Industrial, Open Space, Planned Development, and Agriculture. Refer to Table 4.10-5 for detailed information on zoning.

***Segment 8B and 8C*.** Zoning along Segments 8B and 8C R-O-W and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-5. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

Zoning for the Segments 8B and 8C alignment shows the urbanized character of the area and are similar to Segment 8A, from Chino Substation to Mira Loma Substation. Refer to Table 4.10-5 for detailed information on zoning.

***Specific Concerns*.** HCPs and SEAs crossed by the proposed Segment 8 alignment are shown on Figure 4.10-3. SEAs within the R-O-W include the proposed Puente Hills SEA and the existing Whittier Narrows Dam County Recreation Area, the Rio Hondo College Wildlife Sanctuary, the Powder Canyon-Puente Hills, and Tonner Canyon-Chino Hills SEAs. The Final Recovery Plan for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly (Recovery Plan) HCP is located within an existing transmission line corridor that ends at the Mira Loma Substation. In addition, the Western Riverside County MSHCP is located less than 0.25 mile from the Mira Loma Substation. There are no NCCPs within or near Segment 8.

The Chino Airport and Ontario International Airport are located between 1.2 and 2.6 miles of the Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C.

The proposed Segment 8A crosses DoD lands on an easement from S8A MP 15.2 to 15.5. The easement will be sufficient to construct the proposed facilities.

4.10.6.5.2 Impact Analysis.

***Impact Summary*.** Potential impacts from construction, operation, and maintenance of Segment 8 due to the physical division of an established community or to conflicts with local land use plans would be less than significant. The proposed Segment 8 would not be expected to have significant impacts due to conflicts with an existing HCP or with existing

SEAs. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources.

***Construction*.** Construction impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Construction of Segment 8 would require expanded R-O-W at certain locations and staging areas. The expanded R-O-W would be located adjacent to an existing T/L R-O-W. The proposed Project assumes that staging areas would be located near the endpoints of the proposed line route near the existing substation sites. In this case, staging areas would be sited on vacant land would be temporary, and, therefore, would not divide an established community.

Segment 8 would pass primarily through the urban, suburban and rural areas of Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. Approximately 3.25 miles of new R-O-W would need to be acquired, roughly 10 percent of the entire segment. Segment 8A bisects the Eucalyptus Business Park and the proposed Aera Energy Development Project. However, the proposed new transmission line and construction setup sites would be located within existing R-O-W at these locations; therefore, Segment 8A would not divide and established community in this area.

There are several areas of Segment 8 where acquisition of new R-O-W is proposed. The re-route around Rose Hill Memorial Cemetery would require new 100-foot-wide R-O-W from approximately S8A MP 5.6 to 7.2. This is proposed in unincorporated Los Angeles County and as of this writing no communities are established along that portion of Segment 8A. The area is currently vacant and the land use designation is Open Not Developable; therefore the proposed new R-O-W along this portion of the segment would not divide an established community.

The second area proposed for acquisition begins at S8A at MP 11 and continues to S8A MP 13.1, where an additional 100 feet of R-O-W is proposed in portions of Los Angeles County and La Habra Heights. Beginning at approximately S8A MP 13.1, 2,000 feet of new 100-foot-wide R-O-W would be acquired to accommodate a new transmission line that would spur southward in Los Angeles County and the City of La Habra Heights. The proposed transmission line and new R-O-W traverses an area of the City of La Habra Heights designated as Open Space in the La Habra Heights general plan. The area is currently vacant

and therefore, the proposed Project would not divide an established community in this portion of the segment.

The third area of new R-O-W acquisition is located within the City of Chino's East Chino Specific Plan and the City of Ontario's New Model Colony Specific Plan. An additional 150-foot-wide 2,000-foot-long new R-O-W is proposed for Segment 8B west of Mira Loma Substation. Segment 8C would pass through largely vacant land with some scattered rural residential in the general area. A proposed additional 100 feet of R-O-W is proposed from Segment 8A MP 34.0 to 34.4 and along Segment 8B from S8B MP 5.6 to 6.0. This area is currently vacant and the New Colony Specific Plan shows a designation of Green Belt in the area of the proposed transmission line. The conceptual and specific plan land use plans for this area of the New Model Colony show designations of SCE easement. This area of the New Model Colony includes Subarea 18, the West Haven, and Rich-Haven specific plans. It is not clear whether the dimension for the easement/green belt includes the additional 100 foot R-O-W. Although the potential to divide an established community exists, the Project applicant would be required to consult with local jurisdictions per the CPUC GO 131-D. As the development process moves forward for Segment 8 and for the New Colony Specific Plan, coordination of planning efforts would contribute to address any potential conflicts in this area. Less than significant impacts would be expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Construction for most of the proposed Project involves replacing existing structures and transmission lines within existing R-O-W, and no impacts on land use in these areas are expected.

Existing access and spur roads would be used where possible. In a number of locations access roads and spur roads would be extended from existing roads to access the new structure locations adjacent to the existing structures. Approximately 6 miles of new spur roads would be needed. Drainage structures would be installed. Pull sites would also be needed for construction.

Additional R-O-W would need to be acquired at some locations. One of these locations is within the City of Ontario's New Model Colony Specific Plan, which is designated as Low Density Residential. An additional 100 feet of R-O-W is proposed from Segment 8A MP 34.0 to 34.4 and along Segment 8B from S8B MP 5.6 to 6.0, both within the Specific Plan area. A second area where additional R-O-W would be acquired is the proposed re-route

around vacant portions of the Rose Hill Memorial Cemetery. The acquisition of 240 feet of new R-O-W between S8A MP 5.6 and 7.2 would move the current R-O-W off cemetery property. A third portion of Segment 8A where additional R-O-W would be acquired begins at S8A MP 11.0 and continues to about 13.4. In this area Segment 8A traverses portions of Los Angeles County and La Habra Heights and the acquisition of an additional 100 feet of R-O-W is proposed. At approximately S8A MP 13.1 a segment of existing 200 KV T/L would be realigned southward within a new 100-foot-wide R-O-W. It would connect with the existing Mira Loma-Olinda 220 kV line. This proposed realignment would free up an existing corridor for the eastern portion of Segment 8A.

Although the acquisition of additional R-O-W adjacent to the existing R-O-W may conflict with some land use plans, policies and regulations, potential impacts are less than significant due to the CPUC's jurisdiction over electric power line projects and substations per General Order No. 131-D. The CPUC does require that public utilities consult with local agencies and consider these local regulations in locating these projects. The relevant policies are related to protecting the environment and avoiding impacts. The proposed Project has been designed to minimize or avoid such impacts where possible; therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would be constructed entirely within SCE property or on SCE easements. Therefore, no conflicts with DoD lands and State Land Commission lands are expected.

The Chino Airport (1.2 miles south) and Ontario International Airport (2.6 miles north) are located near Sub-segments 8A, 8B, and 8C. At S8A MP 31 the maximum direct height limit would be 121.65 feet.[7] At Segment 8A MP 34 the maximum direct height limit would be 270.55 feet. It is currently estimated that the double-circuit 500 kV lattice steel towers (which would be the highest structures built in Segment 8A, 8B, and 8C) would range in heights between 147 feet and 255 feet. The proposed Segment 8A towers could exceed FAA height requirements. Additional consultation with the FAA would be required in accordance with FAA Guidelines Title 14 CFR Part 77 Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, and the proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts would result from height restrictions.

[7] Maximum direct height limits were calculated using the nearest distance between the proposed transmission lines and the existing airstrips. These horizontal distances were then multiplied by the most conservative rise to run ratio provided by FAA height regulations, which is 1:50.

Potential visual impacts are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetics, and potential noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.12, Noise. Less than significant impacts are expected to occur due to conflicts with local land use plans.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

SEAs within the R-O-W include the proposed Puente Hills SEA and the existing Whittier Narrows Dam County Recreation Area, the Rio Hondo College Wildlife Sanctuary, the Powder Canyon-Puente Hills, and Tonner Canyon-Chino Hills SEAs. The Final Recovery Plan for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly (Recovery Plan) HCP is located within an existing transmission line corridor that ends at the Mira Loma Substation. In addition, the Western Riverside County MSHCP is located less than 0.25 mile from the Mira Loma Substation. There are no NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site. These HCPs are addressed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources of this document.

The proposed Project would not be expected to have any significant impacts due to conflicts with local SEAs. Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives and the proposed Project would not be required to comply with Los Angeles County's provisions related to SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of SEAs. Less than significant impacts are expected.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project could potentially divide a community, as detailed under Section 4.10.6.5.2 *Construction*. Although the potential to divide a community exists, the Project applicant would be required to consult with local jurisdictions per the CPUC GO 131-D. As the development process moves forward for Segment 8 and for the New Colony Specific Plan, coordination of planning efforts would contribute to address any potential conflicts in this area. Less than significant impacts would be expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The proposed Segment 8A towers could exceed FAA height requirements. Additional consultation with the FAA would be required in accordance with FAA Guidelines Title 14 CFR Part 77 Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace. The proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts due to height restrictions are expected.

Though the proposed Project could potentially conflict with some land use plans, policies, and regulations, the impacts are less than significant due to the CPUC's jurisdiction over electric power line projects and substations per General Order No. 131-D. As noted, the CPUC requires that public utilities consult with local agencies and consider local regulations in locating these projects. The relevant policies are related to protecting the environment and avoiding impacts. The proposed Project has been designed to minimize or avoid impacts where possible. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

The proposed Project improvements would have no significant impact related to SEAs or HCPs, as detailed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources.

4.10.6.5.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.5.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant will consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts are expected.

4.10.6.6 Segment 9

4.10.6.6.1 Environmental Setting.

***Whirlwind Substation*.**

***Jurisdiction*.** The proposed Whirlwind Substation is located within unincorporated Kern County (see Figure 3.1-1). Segments 4 and 10 would connect to this Substation. There are

three alternative sites (A, B, and C) for Whirlwind Substation (see Appendix L, Figure L-1, sheet 2). All three sites are located within the Willow Springs Specific Plan boundaries.

Table 4.10-6 provides a summary description of the jurisdictions, general plan land use designations, zoning, and existing land uses within and near the Whirlwind Substation (Alternative Sites A, B, and C).

General Plan Land Use, Existing Land Use, and Zoning. General plan land use designations and existing uses within and near Whirlwind Substation are summarized in Table 4.10-6 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

Zoning within the Whirlwind Substation area and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-6. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

The proposed Whirlwind Substation sites are currently utilized either as open space or for agricultural use.

The General Plan land use designation for the Alternative A site is Residential and the zoning is Estate Residential, with approximately 0.5 of the site within a Floodplain Secondary Combining Zone. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include residential, vacant, and agricultural uses.

The General Plan land use designation for the Alternative B site is also Residential, and the zoning is Estate Residential. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include residential, vacant, and agricultural uses.

The General Plan land use designation for the Alternative C site is Mineral and Petroleum and the zoning is Exclusive Agriculture, Floodplain Secondary Combining. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include residential, vacant, and agricultural uses.

Specific Concerns. There are no specific concerns.

Antelope Substation.

Jurisdiction. The Antelope Substation and proposed expansion area are located within the City of Lancaster's jurisdiction (see Figure 3.1-1). Segments 4 and 5 would connect to the Antelope Substation.

TABLE 4.10-6
SEGMENT 9 – WHIRLWIND SUBSTATION – JURISDICTION, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Location	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
Whirlwind Substation Alternative A	Kern County	Willow Springs Specific Plan: 5.6 Residential	E (2 ½) RS E (2 ½) RS FPS	E (2 ½) RS E (2 ½) RS FPS, E (5) RS, A	Residential, Vacant, Agriculture
Whirlwind Substation Alternative B	Kern County	Willow Springs Specific Plan: 5.7 Residential	E (2 ½) RS E (5) RS	A FPS, E (2 ½) RS E (2 ½) RS FPS, E (5) RS, A	Residential, Vacant, Agriculture
Whirlwind Substation Alternative C	Kern County	Willow Springs Specific Plan: 8.4 Mineral and Petroleum	A FPS	A FPS, E (2 ½) RS E (2 ½) RS FPS, A	Residential, Vacant, Agriculture

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

General Plan Land Use, Existing Land Use, and Zoning. General plan land use designations and existing uses within and near Antelope Substation are summarized in Table 4.10-7 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

Zoning within the Antelope Substation area and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-7. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

The proposed 18-acre expansion to the existing Antelope Substation is currently exclusively under an undeveloped open space use.

The General Plan land use designation for the Antelope Substation and proposed expansion area is Residential and the zoning is Rural Residential. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include agricultural, commercial, vacant, electrical power facilities, and some scattered residential uses.

Specific Concerns. Bohunk's Airpark airfield is located approximately 0.9 miles east of the Antelope Substation. Although the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use plan does not identify this facility, it is recognized as an airfield by the FAA. The proposed Antelope Substation expansion area could have a potential height conflict with the FAA approach zone airspace requirements for Bohunk Airpark. The General WMJ Fox Airfield is located approximately 4.5 miles from the Antelope Substation and is not a concern.

Alternative A for the proposed Whirlwind site is located within the Antelope Water Bank Project Area. This project and potential impacts on the proposed Project are discussed in Section 4.9 Hydrology.

Vincent Substation.

Jurisdiction. The proposed Vincent Substation is located within unincorporated Los Angeles County lands near the community of Acton (see Figure 3.1-1) and Segments 5, 6, and 11 would connect to it.

General Plan Land Use, Existing Land Use, and Zoning. General plan land use designations and existing uses within and near Vincent Substation are summarized in Table 4.10-8 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

TABLE 4.10-7
SEGMENT 9 – ANTELOPE SUBSTATION – JURISDICTION, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Location	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
Antelope Substation	Lancaster	Residential	RR-2.5	RR-2.5	Vacant, Residential, Commercial, Agriculture

1 Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

TABLE 4.10-8
SEGMENT 9 – VINCENT SUBSTATION – JURISDICTION, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Location	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
Vincent Substation	Los Angeles County	Agriculture	A-1-1	A-1-1	Vacant, Residential

1 Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

Zoning within the Vincent Substation area and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-8. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses. The proposed expansion to the existing Vincent Substation to be acquired is currently exclusively under an undeveloped open space use.

The General Plan land use designation for the Vincent Substation and proposed expansion area is Agriculture and the zoning is Agriculture (A-1-1). Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer include vacant, electrical power facilities, and some scattered residential uses.

***Specific Concerns*.** SEAs within the Vincent Substation proposed expansion area include the existing Kentucky Springs and proposed Santa Clara River SEAs. BLM lands are located within a 0.5-mile of the proposed expansion area. No impacts to BLM lands are expected, as the proposed Project does not traverse such lands.

***Gould Substation*.**

***Jurisdiction*.** The existing Gould Substation is located within the City of La Canada Flintridge (see Figure 3.1-1). Segment 11 would connect to this substation.

***General Plan Land Use, Existing Land Use, and Zoning*.** General plan land use designations and existing uses within and near Gould Substation are summarized in Table 4.10-9 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

Zoning within the Gould Substation area and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-9. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

The General Plan land use designation and the zoning for the Gould Substation are Open Space (Public). Existing land uses within the site are identified as electrical power facilities, and existing uses within the 0.5-mile buffer also include residential, vacant, golf course, electrical power facility uses. See Section 4.15, Recreation, for information on trails in this area.

***Specific Concerns*.** No specific concerns were identified.

TABLE 4.10-9
SEGMENT 9 – GOULD SUBSTATION – JURISDICTION, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Location	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
Gould Substation	City of La Cañada Flintridge	Open space	OS	OS, R-1, PS (Public/Semi Public)	Residential, vacant, golf course, electrical power facility

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

***Mesa Substation*.**

***Jurisdiction*.** The existing Mesa Substation is located within the City of Monterey Park (see Figure 3.1-1). Segments 8 and 11 would connect to the Mesa Substation.

***General Plan Land Use, Existing Land Use, and Zoning*.** General plan land use designations and existing uses within and near the Mesa Substation are summarized in Table 4.10-10 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

Zoning within the Mesa Substation area and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-10. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

The General Plan land use designation for the Mesa Substation is General Commercial and the zoning is Regional Specialty Center Planned Development. Existing land uses within the site are identified as electrical power facilities, and existing uses within the 0.5-mile buffer also include commercial, utilities, vacant, and some scattered residential uses.

***Specific Concerns*.** No specific concerns were identified.

***Mira Loma Substation*.**

***Jurisdiction*.** The existing Mira Loma Substation is located within the City of Ontario. Segments 8A, 8B, and 8C connect to the Mira Loma Substation (see Figure 3.1-1).

***General Plan Land Use, Existing Land Use, and Zoning*.** General plan land use designations and existing uses within and near Mira Loma Substation are summarized in Table 4.10-11 and an overview is shown on Figure 4.10-1 and Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

Zoning within the Mira Loma Substation area and within the 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-11. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

The General Plan land use designation for the Mira Loma Substation is Agriculture and the zoning is Specific Plan. Existing land uses within the site are identified as agriculture/vacant and existing uses within the 0.5-mile buffer also include commercial, water, and school.

TABLE 4.10-10
SEGMENT 9 – MESA SUBSTATION – JURISDICTION,
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Location	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
Mesa Substation	City of Monterey Park	General Commercial	R-S PD	R-S PD, O-P, R-3, R-1	Commercial, utilities, vacant, residential

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

TABLE 4.10-11
SEGMENT 9 – MIRA LOMA SUBSTATION – JURISDICTION,
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Location	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
Mira Loma Substation	City of Ontario	Agriculture	SP	SP	Agriculture, vacant, commercial, water, and school

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

***Specific Concerns*.** The Final Recovery Plan for the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly (Recovery Plan) HCP is located within a transmission line corridor that terminates at the Mira Loma Substation. In addition, the Western Riverside County MSHCP is located less than 0.25 mile from the Mira Loma Substation.

4.10.6.6.2 Impact Analysis.

***Impact Summary*.** Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 9 Substation improvements would not divide any established communities. Conflicts with applicable local plans or policies would be less than significant. The proposed Project would not be expected to have significant impacts due to conflicts with existing SEAs or with HCPs. Whirlwind Alternatives A and C would be located in a site zoned Floodplain Secondary Combining. Potential impacts related to flooding and hydrology are addressed in Section 4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources. Potential noise impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Substation improvements and expansion are addressed in Section 4.12, Noise.

***Construction*.** Construction impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

The proposed new Whirlwind Substation would not be located within an established community. The Antelope and Vincent expansion areas would be located adjacent to the existing substations on vacant land. Staging areas would also be located on vacant land near the substations. Therefore, the proposed improvements outside the existing substations' fence lines would not divide an established community. The Mesa, Gould, and Mira Loma Substation improvements would occur within existing substation fence lines and would not divide any community. No impacts would occur.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The proposed Whirlwind Substation is located within the Willow Springs Specific Plan area. Alternative Sites B and C are located in land designated Residential and Site A is located in land designated Resource Management. However, all three sites are currently vacant and no conflicts are anticipated. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Whirlwind Alternatives A and C would be located in a site zoned Floodplain Secondary Combining. Potential impacts are addressed in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality.

The Mesa, Gould, and Mira Loma Substation improvements would occur within the existing substation fence line. The Antelope and Vincent expansion areas would be located near or adjacent to the existing substations, on land designated Agriculture or Residential in the General Plan, but currently vacant. Existing access roads would be used for construction and maintenance activities. Less than significant impacts are expected.

Bohunk's Airpark airfield is located 0.9 mile east-northeast of the Antelope Substation. The maximum direct height limit would be 121.65 feet.[8] The proposed Antelope Substation expansion area could have a potential height conflict with the FAA approach zone airspace requirements for Bohunk's Airpark. Additional consultation will be required with Federal Aviation Association per FAA Guidelines Title 14 CFR Part 77 Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace. The proposed Project will be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. No impacts due to height restrictions are expected.

Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

There are no NCCPs within or near the Substations or Expansion Areas. BLM lands are located within the 0.5-mile buffer from the Substation Expansion Area; however, the proposed Project would not encroach on or affect BLM lands.

The Whirlwind Substation is located within the WMP area. However, since the WMP is currently applicable to federal lands only and the Whirlwind Substation is not located on federal lands, the WMP is not applicable to the proposed Project.

The Final Recovery Plan for the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly (Recovery Plan) HCP is located within a transmission line corridor that terminates at the Mira Loma Substation. However, no suitable habitat was identified within the proposed Project area. In addition, the Western Riverside County MSHCP is located less than 0.25 mile from the Mira Loma

[8] Maximum direct height limits were calculated using the nearest distance between the proposed transmission lines and the existing airstrips. These horizontal distances were then multiplied by the most conservative rise to run ratio provided by FAA height regulations, which is 1:50.

Substation. This HCP is addressed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources. No significant impacts are expected.

SEAs within the Vincent Substation proposed expansion area include the existing Kentucky Springs and proposed Santa Clara River SEAs. Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives and the proposed Project is not required to comply with the Los Angeles County's provisions regarding SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of SEAs and HCPs.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

The Mesa, Gould, and Mira Loma Substation improvements would occur within existing substation fence lines. The Antelope and Vincent expansion areas would be located on vacant land adjacent to the existing substations. Staging areas also would be located near the substations on vacant land. Therefore, operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not divide an established community.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The Mesa, Gould, and Mira Loma Substation improvements would occur within existing substation fence lines. The Antelope and Vincent expansion areas would be located on vacant land adjacent to the existing substations. No impacts of the Antelope Substation expand to the Bohunk's Airpark are expected, as the proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Whirlwind Alternatives A and C would be located in a site zoned Floodplain Secondary Combining. Potential impacts are addressed in Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality. Operation of the proposed Substation improvements would not have an impact resulting from a conflict with land use plans.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not conflict with applicable HCPs or SEAs, as detailed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources.

4.10.6.6.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts have been identified; therefore no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.6.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant will consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts are expected.

4.10.6.7 Segment 10

4.10.6.7.1 Environmental Setting.

***Segment 10 – Proposed T/L Route*.**

***Jurisdictions*.** Segment 10 begins at the Windhub Substation site located within Kern County unincorporated area and traverses county land until it ends at the proposed Whirlwind Substation (see Figure 3.1-1). Along the way, Segment 10 crosses the Los Angeles Aqueduct at S10 MP 6.8. There are two alternative routes (10 A and B) for a portion of Segment 10. These alternative routes are discussed further in this section of the document.

Table 4.10-12 provides a summary description of the jurisdictions, general plan land use designations, zoning, and existing land uses traversed by Segment 10 and its alternatives.

***General Plan Land Use Designation and Existing Land Use*.** General plan land use designation and existing land uses along Segment 10 are illustrated on Figures 4.10-1 and 4.10-2. For more detailed views refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 and 2).

The proposed Segment 10 R-O-W located between the proposed Windhub Substation and the proposed Whirlwind Substation is currently exclusively under an undeveloped open space use.

From S10 MP 0.0 to 11.3, the Segment 10 R-O-W crosses land designated Heavy Industrial, Extensive Agriculture, and Resource Management in the Kern County General Plan. From S10 MP 11.3 to the end of Segment 10, the R-O-W crosses the Willow Springs Specific Plan area and land designated Residential.

TABLE 4.10-12
SEGMENT 10 – PROPOSED T/L ROUTE – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S 10 MP 0.0 to 2.5	Kern County	Heavy Industrial	M-3 A-1	A WE, OS, PL RS, M-3, A-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Residential
S 10 MP 2.5 to 7.2	Kern County	Extensive Agriculture	A-1, A, A FPS, PL RS, PL RS FPS, E (20) RS	A-1, A, A FPS, PL RS, PL RS FPS, E (20) RS	Residential, Vacant, Institutional
S 10 MP 7.2 to 8.5	Kern County	Resource Management, Extensive Agriculture	PL RS FPS, PL RS, A FP	PL RS FPS, PL RS, A, A FPS, A FP	Residential, Vacant, Institutional
S 10 MP 8.5 to 10.3	Kern County	Resource Management	PL RS FPS, A FP, A FPS	PL RS FPS, A FP, A FPS	Residential, Vacant, Institutional
S 10 MP 10.3 to 11.3	Kern County	Extensive Agriculture	PL RS FPS, A FPS	PL RS FPS, A FP, A FPS	Residential, Vacant
S 10 MP 11.3 to 16.8	Kern County	Willow Springs Specific Plan: Residential	E (20) RS, FPS, E (5) RS FPS, E (2 ½) RS, E (2 ½) RS FPS	E (20) RS FPS, A FPS, E (5) RS FPS, E (5) RS, PL RS FPS, E (2 ½) RS, E (2 ½) RS FPS	Residential, Vacant, Agriculture

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

Existing land uses along the Segment 10 0.5-mile buffer include residential, vacant, agricultural (grazing), and institutional uses such as the Los Angeles Aqueduct.

Zoning. Zoning along Segment 10 R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-12. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

Zoning within the Project R-O-W is Heavy Industrial for the first 2.5 miles, and Agricultural, Residential, and Estate Residential for the remainder of the Project alignment. Some zoning classifications are also floodplain secondary combining.

Specific Concerns. State Lands Commission and BLM lands are located within the 0.5-mile buffer of Segment 10, but are not traversed by the proposed Project R-O-W.

Segment 10 from S10 MP 15.7 to MP 16.8 is located within the Antelope Valley Water Bank Project Area. This Project and potential impacts related to it are discussed in Section 4.9 Hydrology.

Skyotee Airport has a 2,600-foot airstrip and is located approximately 2.0 miles southeast of S10 MP 14.1. At S10 MP 14.1, the maximum direct height limit would be 211.2 feet.[9] It is estimated that transmission lines for Segment 10 would range from 94 feet to 172 feet in height. Therefore, no height conflicts are anticipated.

Segment 10A.

Jurisdictions. Segment 10A deviates from Segment 10 at S10 MP 7.0 and reconnects to Segment 10 at S10 MP 15.8 (see Figure 3.1-1). Segment 10A takes a more northerly route than Segment 10. See Table 4.10-13 for a summary description of the jurisdictions, general plan land use designations, zoning, and existing land uses traversed by Alternative 10A.

General Plan Land Use Designation and Existing Land Use. General plan land use designation and existing land uses along Segment 10A are illustrated on Figures 4.10-1 and 4.10-2. For more detailed views refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 and 2).

Segment 10A is currently exclusively under an undeveloped open space use.

[9] Maximum direct height limits were calculated using the nearest distance between the proposed transmission lines and the existing airstrips. These horizontal distances were then multiplied by the most conservative rise to run ratio provided by FAA height regulations, which is 1:50.

TABLE 4.10-13
ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT 10A – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S 10A MP 0.0 to 1.5	Kern County	Extensive Agriculture	PL RS FPS, A FPS, A FP	PL RS FPS, A FPS, PL RS, A, A FP	Residential, Vacant, Institutional
S 10A MP 1.5 to 2.8	Kern County	Resource Management, Extensive Agriculture	PL RS FPS, A FP, A FPS	PL RS FPS, A FP, A, A FPS	Residential, Vacant, Institutional, Agriculture
S 10A MP 2.8 to 3.9	Kern County	Extensive Agriculture	PL RS FPS, A FP, A FPS	PL RS FPS, A FP, A, A FPS, PL RS	Residential, Vacant, Institutional, Agriculture
S 10A MP 3.9 to 6.3	Kern County	Resource Management	A FP, A GH	PL RS FPS, A FP, A, A GH, A FPS, PL RS, E (20) RS FPS	Residential, Vacant, Institutional, Agriculture
S 10A MP 6.3 to 7.6	Kern County	Willow Springs Specific Plan: Resource management, Residential	A FPS, A FP, E (20) RS FPS	A FPS, A FP, E (20) RS FPS	Residential, Vacant, Institutional
S 10A MP 7.6 to 9.6	Kern County	Willow Springs Specific Plan: Residential	A FPS, E (20) RS FPS, E (2 ½) RS FPS	A FP, A FPS, E (20) RS FPS, E (2 ½) RS FPS, E (5) RS, E (5) RS FPS	Residential, Vacant

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

The R-O-W for Segment 10A crosses land designated Extensive Agriculture and Resource Management in the Kern County General Plan from S10A MP 0.0 to 6.3. From S10A MP 6.3 to 9.6 Segment 10A R-O-W traverses the Willows Springs Specific Plan and land use designations include Residential and Resource Management. Existing land uses along Segment 10A 0.5-mile buffer are primarily residential and vacant. At S10 MP 6.3, the R-O-W crosses existing institutional uses, primarily the Los Angeles Aqueduct. Agricultural uses are also located within the 0.5-mile buffer.

***Zoning*.** Zoning along Segment 10 R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-12. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses. Zoning within the Project R-O-W is Agricultural, Residential, and Estate Residential. Some zoning classifications are floodplain secondary combining.

***Specific Concerns*.** There are no specific land use concerns along Segment 10A.

***Alternative Segment 10B*.**

***Jurisdictions*.** Alternative Segment 10B represents a variant of Segment 10A (see Figure 3.1-1). It would replace the portion of Segment 10A between S 10A MP 2.3 and 6.0. Alternative 10B alignment crosses the Los Angeles Aqueduct at S10B MP 0.2 and follows a westerly direction until it turns south, crosses the Los Angeles Aqueduct a second time, and reconnects to Alternative 10A at S10B MP 5.0.

See Table 4.10-14 for a summary description of the jurisdictions, the general plan land use designations, the zoning, and existing land uses traversed by Alternative 10B.

***General Plan Land Use Designation and Existing Land Use*.** General plan land use designation and existing land uses along Segment 10B are illustrated on Figures 4.10-1 and 4.10-2. For more detailed views refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 and 2).

Segment 10B is currently exclusively under an undeveloped open space use.

The Segment 10B R-O-W crosses land designated Extensive Agriculture and Resource Management. Existing land uses along the Segment 10B 0.5-mile buffer are primarily residential, vacant, institutional (where it crosses the Los Angeles Aqueduct), and agricultural.

***Zoning*.** Zoning along Segment 10 R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-12. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses. Zoning within the Project R-O-W is

TABLE 4.10-14
ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT 10B – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning[1] within the R-O-W	Zoning[1] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S 10B MP 0.0 to 1.4	Kern County	Resource Management, Extensive Agriculture	A, A FPS	A, PL RS, PL RS FPS, A FP, A FPS	Residential, Vacant, Institutional, Agriculture
S 10B MP 1.4 to 2.4	Kern County	Extensive Agriculture	PL RS, PL RS FPS, A FP	PL RS, PL RS FPS, A FP, A	Residential, Vacant, Agriculture
S 10B MP 2.4 to 4.0	Kern County	Resource Management, Extensive Agriculture	A	A, PL RS, PL RS MH, OS	Residential, Vacant, Agriculture
S 10B MP 4.0 to 5.0	Kern County	Resource Management, Extensive Agriculture	A, A GH, A FP	PL RS MH, PL RS, A, A GH, A FP	Residential, Vacant, Institutional, Agriculture

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

Agricultural, Residential, and Estate Residential. Some zoning classifications are floodplain secondary combining.

***Specific Concerns*.** There are no specific land use concerns along Segment 10B.

4.10.6.7.2 Impact Analysis.

***Impacts Summary*.** Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 10 transmission line would not divide an established community. Conflicts with applicable local plans or policies would be less than significant. The proposed Segment 10 would be built on land that is currently not developed and would not traverse any existing communities. The proposed Project would not conflict with the existing WMP. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources. Segment 10 would traverse lands with floodplain secondary combining zones and would cross the Los Angeles Aqueduct. Potential flood impacts related to Segment 10 and Alternatives 10A and 10B are addressed in Section 4.9, Hydrology. Refer to Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, for a discussion of potential impacts and BMPs that would ensure that the Los Angeles Aqueduct would not be impacted by construction and operation of the proposed Project.

Potential impacts associated with Alternative 10A would be similar to the above-mentioned potential impacts associated with Segment 10. In addition, Segment 10A would require more R-O-W acquisition and land disturbance because it would be 0.7 mile longer than the proposed Segment 10.

Potential impacts associated with Alternative 10B would be similar to those associated with Segment 10. In addition, if Segment 10B was selected, the overall route from the Windhub Substation to the Whirlwind Substation would increase by 2 miles and would require more R-O-W acquisition and land disturbance.

***Construction*.** Construction impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

Construction of Segment 10 and both alternatives 10A and 10 B would require acquisition of an entirely new R-O-W. Acquisition of a new R-O-W over private land would be required for the entire 16.5-mile long transmission line route. The R-O-W width would be 330 feet. New access and spur roads would be built to access the new structures. In addition, new pull sites would be needed. The proposed Project assumes that staging areas would be located near the

endpoints of the proposed line route near the proposed substation sites. In this case, staging areas would be sited on vacant land and would be temporary, and, therefore, would not physically divide an established community.

The proposed Segment 10 and its alternatives would be built on vacant land and would not divide any established communities. No impact would occur.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Construction of the proposed Project would occur within new R-O-W and require new staging areas, pull sites, and access roads, as detailed above. The proposed T/L alignment would traverse lands designated Heavy Industrial, Extensive Agriculture, Resource Management, and the Willows Springs Specific Plan, where land use designation is Residential. The proposed Project would be consistent with the Heavy Industrial land use. The Resource Element of the Kern County General Plan includes the following policies: "*The County will encourage development of alternative energy sources by tailoring its Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances and Building Standards to reflect Alternative Energy Guidelines published by the California State Energy Commission"* and *"Work with other Agencies to define regulatory responsibility concerning energy-related issues."* In addition, the Energy Element of the Kern County General Plan includes the following policy: "*The County should support the construction of additional transmission capacity of wind energy developments where land use and other constraints are minimal."* (Kern County General Plan, 2004). Although the land use designation within the proposed Segment 10 R-O-W includes Resource Management, Agriculture, and Residential uses, the transmission line would traverse vacant lands away from communities and any existing development. Existing land use constraints are minimal for implementation of Segment 10. Per the CPUC requirement, the Project proponent shall consult with local agencies and consider local regulations in locating these projects. Impacts would be less than significant due to the CPUC's jurisdiction over electric power line projects and substations per General Order No. 131-D.

State Lands Commission and BLM lands are located within the 0.5-mile buffer from Segment 10 and BLM lands are also located within the 0.5-mile buffer of Segment 10 Alternative 10B. No impacts of the proposed Project on these lands are expected, as detailed in Section 4.5, Biological Resources.

Skyotee Airport is located approximately 2.0 miles southeast of S10 MP 14.1. At S10 MP 14.1, the maximum direct height limit would be 211.2 feet.[10] It is estimated that transmission lines for Segment 10 would range from 94 feet to 172 feet in height. Therefore, no height conflicts are anticipated. The proposed Project would be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts are expected to result from height restrictions.

Segment 10 and Alternatives 10A and 10B cross lands within a Floodplain Secondary Combining zone. Potential impacts are addressed in section 4.9, Hydrology.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Segment 10 is within the WMP boundaries. The proposed Project would not conflict with the WMP because this plan is currently applicable to federal lands only and the proposed Project will not cross federal lands. There are no NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

The proposed Segment 10 and its alternatives would be built on vacant land and would not divide any established communities. No impact would occur.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Operation of the proposed Project would occur within a new R-O-W, as detailed above. Although the proposed Project may conflict with some of the land use plans, policies, and regulations in Kern County, the impacts would be less than significant due to the CPUC's jurisdiction over electric power line projects and substations per General Order No. 131-D.

[10] Maximum direct height limits were calculated using the nearest distance between the proposed transmission lines and the existing airstrips. These horizontal distances were then multiplied by the most conservative rise to run ratio provided by FAA height regulations, which is 1:50.

Per the CPUC requirement, the Project proponent shall consult with local agencies and consider local regulations in locating these projects.

State Lands Commission and BLM lands are located within the 0.5-mile buffer of Segment 10 and Segment 10B, but are not traversed by the proposed Project R-O-W. No impacts would be expected.

The proposed Project will be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts due to height restrictions are expected.

Segment 10 and Alternatives 10A and 10B cross lands within a Floodplain Secondary Combining zone. Potential impacts are addressed in section 4.9 Hydrology.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would not conflict with the WMP, as detailed above. Operational impacts would be less than significant.

4.10.6.7.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts have been identified; therefore no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.7.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant would consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts would occur.

4.10.6.8 Segment 11

4.10.6.8.1 Environmental Setting.

***Jurisdictions*.** Segment 11 traverses federal and local jurisdictions which include the USDA Forest Service, County of Los Angeles, City of La Cañada Flintridge, City of San Gabriel, City of Pasadena, City of Temple City, City of Rosemead, and City of Monterey Park (see Figure 3.1-1). Table 4.10-15 provides a summary description of the jurisdictions, general plan land use designations, zoning, and existing land uses traversed by Segment 11.

Segment 11 begins at of the Vincent Substation in the High Desert area of the County of Los Angeles. From the Vincent Substation, Segment 11 traverses county land to MP 1.5 where it traverses ANF lands and, at S11 MP 7.3, crosses the Pacific Crest Trail to the Gould

TABLE 4.10-15
SEGMENT 11 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S11 MP 0.0 to S11 MP 1.5	County of Los Angeles	Agriculture	A-1-1	A-1-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Other Residential
S11 MP 1.5 to S11 MP 3.5	USFS (ANF)	Open Space Not Developable	W	W	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Other Residential
S11 MP 3.5 to S11 MP 3.8	USFS (ANF)Out Parcel	Open Space Not Developable	A-2-5	A-2-5	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Other Residential
3.8 to 16.8	USFS (ANF)	Open Space Not Developable	W	W	Vacant, Electrical Power Facilities, Special Use Facilities (near MP 7.8)
16.8 to 17.2	USFS (ANF) (out parcel)	Open Space Not Developable	W	W	Vacant, Wildlife Preserve and Sanctuaries (near MP 17.1)
17.2 to 17.5	USFS (ANF)	Open Space Not Developable	W	W	Vacant
17.5 to 17.7	USFS (ANF)y (out parcel)	Open Space Not Developable	W	W	Vacant
17.7 to 18.7 (Gould Substation)	USFS (ANF)	Open Space Not Developable	W	W	Vacant, Special Use Facilities (near MP 17.9)
S11 MP 18.7 to S11 MP 19.1	City of La Cañada Flintridge (Gould Substation)	Parks, Residential	OS	OS	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 19.1 to S11 MP 19.3	City of Pasadena	Utilities	W	W	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 19.3 to S11 MP 20.3	USFS (ANF)	Utilities	W	W	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 20.3 to S11 MP 20.8	Out Parcel / County of Los Angeles	Utilities	R-1-10000, SP	R-1-10000, SP	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential, Parks
S11 MP 20.8 to S11 MP 21.3	USFS (ANF)	Utilities	W	W	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential, Parks

TABLE 4.10-15 (CONTINUED)
SEGMENT 11 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S11 MP 21.3 to S11 MP 21.8	Out Parcel / County of Los Angeles	Utilities	A-1-10000	A-1-10000	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 21.8 to S11 MP 22.6	USFS (ANF)	Utilities	W	W	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential, Parks
S11 MP 22.6 to S11 MP 23	County of Los Angeles	Utilities	R-1-20000	R-1-20000	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 23 to S11 MP 24	USFS (ANF)	Utilities	W	W	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential, School
S11 MP 24 to S11 MP 24.3	City of Pasadena	Open Not Developable	OS	OS	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 24.3 to S11 MP 24.5	USFS (ANF)	Open Not Developable	W	W	Electrical Power Facilities, Vacant, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 24.5 to S11 MP 25.5	County of Los Angeles	Agriculture, Open Not Developable	R-A-2, SP	R-A-2,SP	Electrical Power Facilities, Single Family Residential
S11 MP 25.5 to S11 MP 27.5	City of Pasadena	Open Not Developable, General Industrial, Residential	OS, PD-1	OS, PD-1	Electrical Power Facilities, Single Family Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Public Facilities, Other Residential, Other Utilities, Park, Agriculture
S11 MP 27.5 to S11 MP 28.7	City of Pasadena	Mixed Urban Categories, Open Not Developable, Other Institution	OS, ECSP-CG-6	OS, EPSP-d2-PS, ECSP CG-6	Electrical Power Facilities, Single Family Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Public Facilities, Other Residential, Park, Agriculture

TABLE 4.10-15 (CONTINUED)
SEGMENT 11 – JURISDICTIONS TRAVERSED, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, EXISTING USE, AND ZONING

Approximate Mile Post	Jurisdiction	General Plan Land Use Designation within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the R-O-W	Zoning [1, 2] within the 0.5-Mile Buffer	Land Use within the 0.5-Mile Buffer
S11 MP 28.7 to S11 MP 30	County of Los Angeles	Open Not Developable,	R-A	R-A	Electrical Power Facilities, Single Family Residential, Commercial, Public Facilities, Other Residential, Other Utilities, Park, Agriculture
S11 MP 30 to S11 MP 31	County of Los Angeles	Open Not Developable	A-1	A-1	Single Family Residential, Commercial, Other Residential, Agriculture
S11 MP 31 to S11 MP 31.5	Temple City	Open Not Developable	A-1	A-1	Single Family Residential, Commercial, Other Residential, Agriculture, Industrial, Vacant
S11 MP 31.5 to S11 MP 33	City of Rosemead	Other Institutions	A-1	A-1	Single Family Residential, Commercial, Other Residential, Agriculture, Industrial, Vacant
S11 MP 33 to S11 MP 34.5	City of Rosemead	Other Institutions	A-1	A-1	Single Family Residential, Commercial, Other Residential, Agriculture, Industrial, Other Utilities
S11 MP 34.5 to S11 MP 35.2	County of Los Angeles	Open Not Developable	A-1	A-1	Single Family Residential, Commercial, Other Residential, Agriculture
S11 MP 35.2 to S11 MP 36.2	City of Monterey Park	Other Institutions, General Commercial	C-S, R-1	C-S, R-1	Single Family Residential, Commercial, Other Residential, Agriculture, Industrial, Other Utilities, Electrical Power Facilities

[1] Refer to Appendix L, Table L-1, for detailed information about zoning and zoning codes.

[2] W corresponds to the Los Angeles County Zoning for the Angeles National Forest Area. For detailed information about land use zones as specified in the ANF Management Plan (2005a), refer to section 4.10.6.8.1, "*Angeles National Forest Land Use Zones and Designated Utilities Corridor*"

Substation at S11 MP 18.7. There are three parcels traversed by the Segment 11 route between the Vincent and Gould Substations which are surrounded by ANF lands, but considered "Out Parcels," and therefore, within Los Angeles County jurisdiction. The first one is located between S11 MP 3.5 and 3.8, the second is located between S11 MP 16.8 and 17.2, and the third is located between S11 MP 17.5 and 17.7. From S11 MP 17.7 to the Gould Substation, Segment 11 is located along the boundary between the ANF and the Cities of Pasadena and La Canada Flintridge. From the Gould Substation to S11 MP 36.2, at the Mesa Substation, Segment 11 traverses the above mentioned cities and unincorporated Los Angeles County lands, within an urbanized setting.

***General Plan Land Use Designation and Existing Land Uses*.** General plan land use designation along Segment 11 is shown on Figure 4.10-1. Existing land uses along Segment 11 are represented on Figure 4.10-2. For a more detailed view of general plan land uses and existing land uses along the proposed Project alignment, refer to Appendix L, Figure L-1 and L-2 (sheets 1 through 9).

The proposed Segment 11 R-O-W and areas adjacent to it located between the existing Vincent Substation, the existing Gould Substation and the existing Mesa Substation are under undeveloped open space use adjacent to (from the Vincent to the Gould Substations) or a mix of suburban land uses (from the Gould to Mesa Substation). Existing permitted secondary land uses include: plant nurseries, at-grade vehicular parking lots, park, and open space areas and mini-storage facilities.

From S11 MP 0.0 to 1.5, Segment 11 runs south through County of Los Angeles unincorporated lands designated as Agriculture in the General Plan within the R-O-W. The existing land uses are electrical power facilities, vacant and residential within the 0.5-mile buffer. From S11 MP 1.5 through 18.7, the route runs through the ANF. There are two parcels within this portion of Segment 11 that are under Los Angeles County jurisdiction and with General Plan designation Open Space Not Developable: Conservation, Flood Control, Lakes within the R-O-W. Existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer are mostly vacant, with some residential uses located outside ANF lands. At S11 MP 18.7, the T/L connects to the Gould Substation within the City of La Cañada Flintridge. The General Plan land use designation within the R-O-W in the City of La Cañada Flintridge is Parks and Residential.

Between S11 MP 19.1 and 25.5, Segment 11 leaves the Gould Substation and enters and exits the City of Pasadena and the ANF several times. In doing so, the segment crosses "Out Parcels" on the forest (under Los Angeles County jurisdiction), and land uses designated Open Not Developable: Conservation, Flood Control, Lakes, Utilities, Agriculture, General Industrial, and Residential for the R-O-W.

The Project route continues to travel south through the City of Pasadena traversing the East Pasadena Specific Plan and East Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan areas between S11 MP 27.7 and 27.8. The existing land use within the Specific Plans is Commercial. County of Los Angeles unincorporated area is briefly traversed between S11 MP 28.7 and 31.0. The General Plan land use designation is predominantly Open Not Developable: Conservation, Flood Control, Lakes within the R-O-W. Open Not Developable land within Temple City is also briefly traversed within the R-O-W. Segment 11 then runs through City of Rosemead via a R-O-W of Other Institution General Plan land use designation. Segment 11 ends at the Mesa Substation within the City of Monterey Park. General Commercial and Other Institutions are the General Plan land use designations for Segment 11 R-O-W in the City of Monterey Park.

Existing land uses within the 0.5 mile buffer include vacant, residential, special use facilities, and wildlife preserve from S11 MP 0.0 to MP 18.7 (Gould Substation). From Gould Substation to the Mesa Substation, existing land uses within the 0.5-mile buffer are mostly urban uses, and include electrical power facilities, single family and other residential, school, commercial, industrial, public facilities, utilities, park, and agriculture.

***Zoning*.** Zoning along the Segment 11 R-O-W and 0.5-mile buffer are summarized in Table 4.10-13. Refer to Table L-1, included in Appendix L of this document, for detailed information on zoning codes and allowed uses.

Unincorporated Los Angeles County zones within the R-O-W include Wilderness (within USDA Forest Service lands), Agriculture, Residential, and Open Space. The proposed Project R-O-W traverses lands zoned Planned Development, Specific Plan (East Pasadena Specific Plan) and Open Space in the City of Pasadena. In the City of La Cañada Flintridge, the R-O-W crosses Open Space zone. In the Cities of Rosemead and Temple City the transmission line traverses lands zoned Agriculture. Segment 11 terminates in the City of Monterey Park, where it crosses lands zoned Commercial and Residential.

***Angeles National Forest Land Use Zones and Designated Utilities Corridor*.** The ANF Management Plan includes land use zones that specify allowable uses and opportunities within the Forest, as detailed in Section 4.10.3.1.2. The Project area traverses the following land use zones: Back Country, Back County Motorized Use Restricted, and Developed Area Interface, all of which allow major utility corridors in designated areas (USDA Forest Service, 2005a).

The Segment 11 T/L alignment is located within an existing designated utility corridor (Vincent-Gould Utility Corridor) Although Figure 4.10-4 shows the proposed Segment 11 south of the Gould Substation outside the ANF designated corridor, the project proponent SCE believes that the GIS data downloaded from the ANF website is incorrect and the entire

Segment 11 within the ANF borders is currently located within the designated corridor, including the proposed R-O-W expansion north of the Gould Substation. Proposed improvements south of the Gould Substation would occur within the existing transmission line R-O-W and would involve installing a second 220 kV line on the current empty side of the existing transmission towers.

Segment 11 crosses the USDA Forest Service Aliso-Arrastre Middle Special Interest Area. Please refer to 4.6, Cultural Resources for further discussion of this area.

Specific Concerns. HCPs and SEAs crossed by the proposed Segment 4 alignment are shown on Figure 4.10-3 and include the WMP, the proposed Santa Clara River SEA, and existing Kentucky Springs SEAs. There are no NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site.

Segment 11 also crosses the East Colorado Boulevard and East Pasadena Specific Plan areas. Five airfields are located between 1 and 3 miles from the segment. These include the El Monte Airport, the Rose Bowl landing field, the Camp 2 landing field, the Mesa landing field, and the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department landing field.

4.10.6.8.2 Impact Analysis.

Impact Summary. Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 11 transmission line would not divide an established community.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 11 transmission line would not conflict with the ANF Land Management Plan. Segment 11 would traverse lands within the ANF designated Back Country, Back Country Motorized Use Restricted, and Developed Area Interface, all of which are considered suitable for utility corridors at designated areas. Segment 11 is located within an existing designated utility corridor. Therefore, no conflicts with the ANF Management Plan would occur. Proposed improvements would occur within the existing T/L R-O-W south of Gould Substation and the proposed improvements from Gould Substation to the Mesa Substation would involve installing a second 220 kV line on the current empty side of the existing transmission towers. The proposed improvements to Segment 11 facilities south of Gould Substation would not have any impact on land use as there is no proposed expansion of the existing R-O-W or change of use.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the Segment 11 transmission line are not expected to have significant impacts due to conflicts with any applicable local land use plans or policies.

Segment 11 would not be expected to have conflicts with existing SEAs and HCPs. Potential visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in

Section 4.2, Aesthetic Resources. Potential noise impacts associated with the construction of the proposed Project are addressed in Section 4.12, Noise. Potential impacts associated with the Aliso-Arraste Special Interest Area are addressed in Section 4.6 Cultural Resources.

***Construction*.** Construction impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

From the Vincent Substation to the Gould Substation, Segment 11 would traverse unincorporated Los Angeles County land and USDA Forest Service land, mostly within an existing T/L R-O-W. These lands are mostly used as open space or agriculture. From the Gould Substation to the Mesa Substation, Segment 11 traverses urbanized areas entirely within an existing transmission line R-O-W. Temporary staging areas would be sited on vacant land and would not physically divide an established community. Construction of Segment 11 would not divide an established community and no impact is expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Construction of the proposed Project would occur within existing and expanded R-O-W. Since most of Segment 11 would be built within an existing R-O-W, most of the existing access and spur roads would be used. Some existing access roads would need improvement for construction of Segment 11 and approximately 14 miles of new spur roads would be required. Where new access or spur roads are impractical or impossible, structures in the most rugged terrain would be constructed using roadless construction techniques. Construction of most of Segment 11 north of Gould Substation would use existing structure locations and roads. No impacts are expected to result from construction of additional access and spur roads, staging areas, and pulling and tensioning sites, as those would have to comply with ANF requirements.

Would the Project cause potential conflicts with the Angeles National Forest management plan?

The Project would be consistent with the USDA Forest Service goals, policies, and strategies listed under Segment 6 Impact Analysis. Please refer to Section 4.10.6.3.2 for a summary of the consistency analysis, as the analysis applies to Segment 11 as well. Potential impacts

associated with the Aliso-Arrastre Middle Special Interest Area are discussed under Section 4.6, Cultural Resources.

The Project area traverses the following land use zones: Back Country, Back County Motorized Use Restricted, and Developed Area Interface, all of which allow major utility corridors in designated areas (USDA Forest Service, 2005a). SCE believes that Segment 11 is located within an existing designated utility corridor. Implementation of mitigation measures and APMs included in Section 4.5 would ensure the proposed Project's consistency with the Forest Plan's goals and policies. Less than significant impacts are expected.

Would the Project cause potential conflicts with local land use plans outside the Angeles National Forest.

The El Monte Airport is located approximately 2.5 miles from Segment 11 and the airport runway is almost parallel with Segment 11. The Mesa, Camp 2, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and Rose Bowl Helipads are located approximately 0.9, 1.5, 2.2, and 3.1 miles from Segment 11. Construction of the proposed Project is not expected to conflict with airport or helipad activities.

The portion of Segment 11 south of Gould Substation would be developed within an existing T/L R-O-W and is not expected to have any significant impact on applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

SEAs within the R-O-W include the proposed Santa Clara River and existing Kentucky Springs SEAs. In addition, Segment 11 is within the WMP from MP 0.0 to MP 1.4. There are no NCCPs within or near the proposed Project site.

The proposed Project would not be expected to have any significant impacts due to conflicts with local HCPs and SEAs. The WMP is currently applicable to federal lands within the plan's boundaries only. The proposed Project does not traverse federal lands within the WMP, therefore the proposed Project is not required to comply with the WMP. Policies and guidance related to SEAs are part of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and therefore, a local land use plan. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of public utilities in the State of California, no local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project or alternatives and the proposed Project is not required to comply with Los Angeles County's provisions regarding SEAs. Refer to Section 4.5, Biological Resources for a more detailed discussion of SEAs, and HCPs. Less than significant impacts would occur.

***Operation*.** Operation impacts can result if a project physically divides an established community, conflicts with an applicable land use plan, or conflicts with a habitat conservation plan.

Would the Project physically divide an established community?

From the Vincent Substation to the Gould Substation, the proposed Segment 11 improvements would traverse lands that are mostly used as open space or agriculture, and scattered residential uses exist near the Project alignment. However, no division would occur on this existing R-O-W, as the proposed Project would be constructed within and adjacent to an existing transmission line R-O-W. From the Gould Substation to the Mesa Substation, Segment 11 traverses urbanized areas within existing R-O-W, where transmission lines currently exist. No impact is expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect*?*

Operation and maintenance of Segment 11 would not have any impact on applicable land use plan, policies, or regulations with jurisdiction over the Project area. The entire R-O-W for Segment 11 is within a designated existing utility corridor in the ANF, and it is within an existing transmission line R-O-W outside the forest.

The proposed Project will be required to conform to all FAA adopted safety standards and guidelines for airfields and airports. Therefore, no impacts due to height restrictions are expected.

Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan*?*

Operation and maintenance of Segment 11 would not be expected to have an impact on applicable HCPs and SEAs, as detailed above. Operational impacts would be less than significant.

4.10.6.8.3 Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

4.10.6.8.4 Impact Significance After Mitigation Measure Application. Per GO 131-D, the Project applicant will consult with local agencies as appropriate. No significant impacts are expected.

4.10.7 References

California Department of Fish and Game. 2007. Habitat Conservation Plan GIS data for Western Riverside County Multiple Species HCP, and Final Recovery Plan for Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly HCP.

California Public Utilities Commission. 1995. General Order No. 131-D.

2006. Antelope-Pardee EIR/EIS.

Caruso Affiliated. 2006. The Shops at Santa Anita Parks Specific Plan. Prepared for the City of Arcadia.

CEQ. 1986. National Environmental Policy Act. 40 CFR 1502.16(c) and 40 CFR 1506.2(d).

City of Arcadia. 1986. General Plan.

2007. Municipal Code.

City of Azusa. 2004. General Plan.

2006. Development Code.

City of Baldwin Park. 1997. Municipal Code.

2002. 2020 General Plan.

City of Bradbury. 1993. General Plan.

1998. Development Code.

City of Brea. 2003. General Plan.

City of Chino Hills. 1994. General Plan.

2006. Municipal Code.

2007. The Commons Specific Plan Factsheet. Accessed May, 2007 at http://www.chino hills.org/%5CDocumentView.asp?DID=380.

City of Chino. 1981. General Plan.

1982. Central Avenue Specific Plan. Accessed May, 2007 at http://www.cityofchino.org/depts/cd/planning/specific_plans/central.asp.

1986. Majestic Spectrum Specific Plan. Accessed May 2007 at http://www.cityofchino.org/depts/cd/planning/specific_plans/majestic.asp.

1987. East Chino Specific Plan. Accessed May, 2007 at http://www.cityofchino.org/depts/cd/planning/specific_plans/east_chino.asp.

1990. Eucalyptus Business Park Specific Plan by the City of Chino, traversed by the proposed Project. Accessed May, 2007 at http://www.cityofchino.org/depts/cd/planning/specific_plans/eucalyptus.asp.

2002. East Chino Specific Plan.

2003a. The Preserve Specific Plan by the City of Chino. Accessed May 2007 at http://www.cityofchino.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=3609.

2003b. College Park Specific Plan by the City of Chino.

2007. Zoning Code.

City of Industry. 2007. Development Guidelines and Zone Code.

City of Diamond Bar. 1995. General Plan.

2006. Municipal Code.

City of Duarte. 1994. Las Brisas Specific Plan. Accessed May, 2007 at http://library.ceres.ca.gov/cgi-bin/display_page?page=1&format=gif&elib_id=2230.

1998. Encanto Parkway Specific Plan. Adopted 1998.

2004. General Plan.

2006. Zoning Ordinance.

City of El Monte. 1991. General Plan.

2006. Zoning Code.

City of Irwindale. 1973. General Plan.

2006. Municipal Code.

City of La Cañada Flintridge. 1980. General Plan

2000. Municipal Code.

City of La Habra Heights. 2004. General Plan.

2006. Municipal Code.

City of Lancaster. 1997. General Plan.

2004. Zoning Code.

City of Monrovia. 2002. General Plan.

2007. Municipal Code.

City of Montebello. 2006. Municipal Code.

City of Monterey Park. 2006. Municipal Code.

2007. General Plan.

City of Ontario. 1999. New Model Colony Specific Plan. Accessed May, 2007 at http:// www.ci.ontario.ca.us/index.cfm/2846.

2002. Zoning Code.

2007. General Plan Land Use Map.

City of Palmdale. 1992. City Ranch Specific Plan (a.k.a., Ana Verde). Amended in 2002.

1993. General Plan.

1994. Zoning Ordinance.

2006a. Website map. Palmdale College Park Specific Plan, Joshua Hills Specific Plan, and City Ranch Specific Plan (a.k.a., Anaverde Specific Plan) boundaries. Accessed May, 2007. http://www.cityofpalmdale.org/departments/traffic/maps/12-13-2006_GIS_ 00041-2_LandUse_CML.pdf.

2006b. Quail Valley Planned Development.

City of Pasadena. 2003. East Colorado Boulevard Specific Plan. Accessed May, 2007 at http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/code/printpage.asp?ref=http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/ECSP/ECSP.asp.

2004. General Plan.

2005. Zoning Code.

2006. East Pasadena Specific Plan. Accessed May, 2007 at http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/code/printpage.asp?ref=http://www.ci.pasadena.ca.us/planning/deptorg/commplng/GenPlan/epsp.asp.

City of Pico Rivera. 2007. City website, accessed at http://www.pico-rivera.org. March.

City of Rosemead. 1987. General Plan.

1999. Zoning Code.

City of San Gabriel. 2004. General Plan.

2007. Zoning Code. http://www.sangabrielcity.com.

City of San Marino. 2007. Zoning Code.

City of South El Monte. 2000. General Plan.

City of Temple City. 1987. General Plan.

2006. City Code.

City of Whittier. 2007. Municipal Code.

County of Kern. 1992. Willow Springs Specific Plan. Adopted March 16, 1992.

2004. General Plan.

2006a. General Plan Land Use Map.

2006b. Kern County Assessor. Mapping Division. Assessors Land Use Map.

2006c. Zoning Ordinance.

2006d. PdV Windfarm Project.

County of Los Angeles. 1980. General Plan. Last amended 1992.

1981a. Rowland Heights Community Plan.

1981b. Altadena Community Plan.

1986. Antelope Valley Area-Wide General Plan.

2000. Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs).

2007. County Code.

County of Riverside. 2003. General Plan.

2006. Zoning Ordinance.

County of San Bernardino. 1997. Development Code.

2007. General Plan.

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended. 1976. 43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.

Keith Companies, The. 1989. Final Environmental Impact Report, Del Sur Ranch. Prepared for City of Lancaster. September 25, 1989.

Robert Bein, William Frost & Associates. 1992. Ritter Ranch Specific Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report. Prepared for the City of Palmdale.

1993. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, Del Sur Ranch. Prepared for the City of Lancaster.

Southern California Association of Governments. 2004. SCAG Regional General Plan Database.

2005. SCAG Existing Land Use Database.

U.S. DOT. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). 2003. Regulation FAR Title 14 Part 77.

2007. Airport Master Record.

USDI, Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2005. Final EIR and EIS for the West Mojave Plan, A Habitat Conservation Plan and California Desert Conservation Area Plan Amendment.

2006. Resource Management Plans for California's Public Lands.

USDA, Forest Service. 1980. Pacific Crest Trail Management Plan.

1992. Forest Service Manual Region 5 Supplement No. 2700-92-8. Section 2726.43.

2004a. National Strategic Plan.

2004b. Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2004-2008.

2005a. Forest Service Manual Section 2700 (Special Uses Management).

2005b. Angeles National Forest Land Management Plan.

2006a. News Release, issued April 21, 2006.

2006b. Pacific Southwest Region. Remote Sensing Lab. Southern California Utility Corridors, retrieved from http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/rsl/clearinghouse/gis-download.shtml on April 7, 2007.

USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1981. Farmland Protection and Policy Act. Public Law 97-98, 7 U.S.C. 4201.