

C.8 Land Use and Public Recreation

This section describes the impacts to land use and public recreation associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project. The EIR considers existing and proposed land uses, including sensitive receptors that have the potential to be affected by the proposed Project. Sensitive receptors include the following land use types: residences, schools, hospitals, daycare centers, retirement homes, and cemeteries. Recreational resources are also defined as sensitive receptors, as they are susceptible to disturbances (e.g., noise, traffic, dust, etc.) that could decrease or eliminate the value of the recreational experience. In general, recreational facilities (including parks, open space, playgrounds, play fields, etc.), recreational activities (bicycling, hiking, boating, etc.), and recreationists are considered to be sensitive receptors for purposes of this impact assessment.

The extent of the area to be analyzed for land use impacts is considered the Land Use Study Area. While other issue areas in this EIR may identify their Study Area within a specific radius, the Land Use Study Area is defined as:

- Land and recreation uses immediately adjacent to the proposed Project ROW;
- Land and recreation uses located near the construction equipment/materials transportation routes; and
- Land and recreation uses affected by Project construction and operation activities.

As defined, the Land Use Study Area encompasses existing and proposed land uses adjacent to the Project, as well as other sensitive receptors that may be affected by Project activities. See Figure C.8-1 for the location of the Land Use Study Area.

Land use discussions typically address impacts to agricultural land uses. However, in order to better evaluate these impacts, this EIR contains a separate section addressing agriculture resources potentially affected by the proposed Project. See Section C.9 (Agricultural Resources) for an analysis of this issue area.

C.8.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed transmission line route would traverse city and unincorporated county jurisdictions that include Kern County, Los Angeles County, City of Lancaster, and City of Palmdale (see Figure C.8-1). Within the proposed 56.8-mile transmission line corridor, there are land use regulations and land use types that significantly differ from one jurisdiction to another. To facilitate the analysis of land use and public recreation, the Study Area is described based on the two segments of the proposed Project:

- **Segment 3.** Extending from Mile S3-0 to Mile S3-35.2, Segment 3 begins at the proposed Substation Two site in unincorporated Kern County and travels south to Antelope Substation in the City of Lancaster (Los Angeles County). Jurisdictions traversed by Segment 3 include unincorporated Kern County and the community of Willow Springs; the Antelope Valley area of unincorporated Los Angeles County, including the communities of Antelope Acres and Del Sur; and the City of Lancaster.
- **Segment 2.** Extending from Mile S2-0 to Mile S2-21.6, Segment 2 begins at Antelope Substation in the City of Lancaster and travels south to Vincent Substation in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Jurisdictions traversed by Segment 2 include the City of Lancaster; the City of Palmdale, including the Ritter Ranch and Anaverde communities; and the communities of Lakeview and Big Mountain Ridge in unincorporated Los Angeles County. In addition to the proposed Project route, Segment 2 includes the following two route options:

- **Option A:** Option A would deviate from the proposed Project at Mile S2-5.7, and would travel 2.1 miles east of and parallel to the existing utility corridor through unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Palmdale. Option A would reconnect with the proposed Project at Mile S2-7.7.
- **Option B:** Option B would deviate from the proposed Project at Mile S2-8.1, and would travel 3.1 miles southeast along the existing utility corridor through the Ritter Ranch and Anaverde communities of the City of Palmdale. Option B would reconnect with the proposed Project at Mile S2-14.9.

Further discussion of these segments can be found in Sections C.8.1.1 and C.8.1.2, which describe the key characteristics of each area as well as land uses and non-residential sensitive receptors. As Segment 3 encompasses the north area and Segment 2 encompasses the south area of the Project route, the Project discussion begins with Segment 3.

Table C.8-1 summarizes the key land uses that are located within one mile of Segments 2 and 3, as well as other notable land uses that are located greater than one mile from the Project route.

Table C.8-1. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors along Segments 2 and 3			
Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use Categories	Specific Land Uses¹
Segment 3 (Mile S3-0 to Mile S3-35.2)			
Tehachapi Boulevard (1 mile north of proposed Substation 2)	Unincorporated Kern County	Industrial	Monolith Cement Works
Eumatilla Street (0.6 miles north of proposed Substation 2)	Unincorporated Kern County	Educational Institution	Monroe Continuation High School*
Brett Avenue (0.2 miles east of proposed Substation 2)	Unincorporated Kern County	Industrial	GE Wind Energy
Harris Road (2 miles west of Mile S3-0.5)	Unincorporated Kern County	Transportation	Fantasy Haven Airport
Mile S3-1.8 to Mile S3-2.5	Unincorporated Kern County	Industrial	Wind turbines
Mile S3-4.4 to Mile S3-4.9	Unincorporated Kern County	Open Space and Recreation	Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail*
0.3 miles southwest of Mile S3-7.8	Unincorporated Kern County	Industrial	Cal Cement
East and north of Mile S3-7.2 to Mile S3-9.4	Unincorporated Kern County	Industrial	Wind turbines
Mile S3-15	Unincorporated Kern County	Industrial	Los Angeles Aqueduct
0.3 miles east of Mile S3-19.4	Unincorporated Kern County	Transportation	Lloyd's Landing Airstrip
1.3 miles east of Mile S3-21.0	Unincorporated Kern County	Open Space and Recreation	Willow Springs Butte*
Rosamond Boulevard (2.2 miles east of Mile S3-21.6)	Unincorporated Kern County	Open Space and Recreation	Willow Springs International Motorsports Park*
Gaskell Road (0.2 miles west of Mile S3-24.6 to Mile S3-25)	Unincorporated Kern County	Planned Residential	Proposed Copa De Oro/ Kern Ross Estate*
110 th Street West (0.2 miles west of Mile S3-25.3)	Unincorporated Kern County	Residential/ Agriculture	Approximately 3 single-family residences*
Avenue A (0.4 miles east of Mile S3-25.5)	Unincorporated Kern County	Residential/ Agriculture	Single-family residence*
105 th Street West (less than 0.1 miles east of Mile S3-26.4)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential/ Agriculture	Single-family residence*
110 th Street West (0.5 miles west of Mile S3-26.8)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential/ Agriculture	Approximately 3 single-family residences*
100 th Street West (0.5 miles east of Mile S3-27)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Open Space and Recreation	Little Buttes*
Avenue D (0.4 miles east of Mile S3-28.6)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Single-family residence*

Table C.8-1. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors along Segments 2 and 3			
Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use Categories	Specific Land Uses¹
Avenue E-11 (0.2 miles west of Mile S3-30.1)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential/ Agriculture	Single-family residence*
Lancaster Road (2.4 miles west of Mile S3-30.7)	California Dept. of Parks and Recreation	Open Space and Recreation	Antelope Valley California Poppy Reserve*
110 th Street West (.04 miles west of Mile S3-31.1)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Single-family residence*
110 th Street West (0.4 miles west of Mile S3-31.6 to Mile S3-31.7)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Approximately 2 single-family residences*
East of and adjacent to Project along 105 th Street West (Mile S3-31.6 to Mile S3-33.1)	City of Lancaster	Proposed Residential	Proposed Del Sur Ranch Development*
West Avenue H (1.3 miles east of Mile S3-32.6)	City of Lancaster	Educational Institution	Del Sur School*
Avenue I (0.2 miles east of Mile S3-33.7)	City of Lancaster	Agriculture	Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District Nursery*
105 th Street West (less than 0.1 miles west of S3-33.9)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential/ Agriculture	Single-family residence*
Avenue J (0.2 miles west of Mile S3-34.5)	City of Lancaster	Residential	Approximately 4 single-family residences*
Avenue J (0.2 miles east of Mile S3-34.8)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Single-family residence*
Avenue J (0.1 miles northeast of Antelope Substation)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Single-family residence*
Avenue J at 90 th Street West (0.5 miles east of Antelope Substation)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential; Commercial	Single-family residence;* Mobile home park;* Dobb's Derby Pub
85 th Street West (1.1 miles northeast of Antelope Substation)	City of Lancaster; Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Transportation	Bohunk's Airpark
Segment 2 (Mile S2-0 to Mile S2-21.6)			
90 th Street West (ranging from 0.6 miles east of Mile S2-5 to 0.4 miles east of Mile S2-9)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Approximately 3 single-family residences*
Avenue K (0.4 miles east of Mile S2-0.9)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Transportation	Landing Strip
Avenue K-8 (0.5 miles east of Mile S2-1.6)	City of Lancaster	Residential	Single-family residence*
85 th Street (ranging from 0.2 miles east of Mile S2-1.9 to 0.1 miles east of Mile S2-2.2)	City of Lancaster	Residential	Approximately 3 single-family residences*
Avenue L (traversed by ROW at Mile S2-2.2)	City of Lancaster	Residential/ Agriculture	Single-family residence*
Avenue L (ranging from 0.2 miles to 0.3 miles west of Mile S2-2.2)	City of Lancaster	Residential	Approximately 4 single-family residences*
Avenue L-8 and 75 th Street West (ranging from 0.6 miles east of Mile S2-2.9 to 0.2 miles east of Mile S2-3.8).	City of Lancaster; City of Palmdale	Residential	50+ single-family residences*
70 th Street West (0.4 miles east of Mile S2-4.3)	City of Palmdale	Residential	30+ single-family residences*
Mile S2-4.4	City of Palmdale	Industrial	California Aqueduct
Godde Hill Road (0.2 miles west of proposed Project Mile S2-6.5; 0.3 miles west of Option A)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Approximately 2 single-family residences*
0.6 miles east of proposed Project Mile S2-6.5; 0.5 miles east of Option A	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Open Space and Recreation	Warnack Nature Park*

Table C.8-1. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors along Segments 2 and 3

Location	Jurisdiction	Land Use Categories	Specific Land Uses ¹
Hacienda Ranch Road (0.2 miles east of proposed Project Mile S2-6.7; less than 0.1 mile east of Option A)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Approximately 2 single-family residences
Cherry Tree Lane (ranging from 0 miles to 0.2 miles west of proposed Project Mile S2-7.4; ranging from 0.1 miles to 0.3 miles west of Option A)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential/ Agriculture	10+ single-family residences*
Elizabeth Lake Road (0.3 miles west of Mile S2-7.9)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Single-family residence*
Proposed Project Mile S2-7.5 to Mile S2-9.3, Mile S2-9.5 to Mile S2-13.9 (Not traversed by Option B)	City of Palmdale	Open Space and Recreation	Ritter Ranch*
Traversed by Option B	City of Palmdale	Planned Residential	Ritter Ranch*
Proposed Project Mile S2-9.3 to Mile S2-9.5; 0.8 miles west of Option B	Antelope Valley Union High School District	Proposed Educational Institution	Proposed school site*
Traversed by Option B	City of Palmdale	Planned Residential	Anaverde Development*
0.1 miles northeast of Mile S2-15	City of Palmdale	Residential	30+ single-family residences (Anaverde Development)*
Mile S2-16.3 to Mile S2-16.8	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Proposed Residential	Proposed Palmdale 1000 Development*
0.4 miles northeast of Mile S2-17.8	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Industrial	Telecommunication facilities
Tuckerway Ranch Road (ranging from less than 0.1 miles east of Mile S2-18.1 to 0.2 miles east of Mile S2-18.5)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential; Open Space and Recreation	Approximately 6 single-family residences*
Tuckerway Ranch Road (0.2 miles west of Mile S2-18.3)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential; Open Space and Recreation	Approximately 2 single-family residences*
Peaceful Valley Road (ranging from 0.2 miles to 0.3 miles west of Mile S2-19.6)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential; Open Space and Recreation	Approximately 5 single-family residences*
Peaceful Valley Road (less than 0.1 miles east of Mile S2-20)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential; Open Space and Recreation	Approximately 3 single-family residences*
Sierra Highway (0.1 miles east of Mile S2-20.4)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Transportation	Acton/Vincent Grade Metrolink Station Park and Ride Lot
Rockyford Road (less than 0.1 miles west of Mile S2-20.8)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Approximately 7 single-family residences*
Rockyford Road (0.1 miles west of Vincent Substation)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Single-family residence*
Rockyford Road (ranging from 0.2 miles to 0.5 miles west of Mile S2-21.2)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	20+ single-family residences*
Kentucky Springs Road (0.1 miles south of Mile S2-21.6)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	5 single-family residences*
Hillside Drive (ranging from 0.2 miles to 0.3 miles east of Vincent Substation)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Residential	Approximately 10 single-family residences*

Source: Aspen, 2006a and 2006b; Google Earth, 2005; Thomas Bros. Maps, 2004.

¹ Bold and asterisk denotes sensitive land uses.

[Click here for Figure C.8-1](#)

Page intentionally left blank

C.8.1.1 Segment 3

Segment 3 involves the construction of Substations One and Two in unincorporated Kern County, a 220-kV transmission line that would connect the two new substations, and a 500-kV transmission line that would begin at Substation One and terminate at Antelope Substation in the City of Lancaster (Los Angeles County). The following is a brief summary of the Project components:

Substation Two. Located at the northernmost end of the Project route, Substation Two would be constructed on approximately 20.2 acres (includes enclosed area only) of grazing land in unincorporated Kern County. The existing site is currently zoned by the County as Exclusive Agriculture.¹ No sensitive land uses would be located within 0.5 miles of the substation.

Substation One. Substation One would be constructed on approximately 53.7 acres (includes enclosed area only) of open space in unincorporated Kern County. The existing site is currently zoned by the County as Industrial.² No sensitive land uses would be located within 0.5 miles of the substation.

220-kV Transmission Line. The 9.6-mile 220-kV transmission line would be constructed from Substation Two to Substation One across open space areas and wind farms in unincorporated Kern County. Approximately 1.7 miles of the proposed route would be constructed in an entirely new ROW. Sensitive land uses located within 0.5 miles of the proposed transmission line include the following:

- **Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT).** The 2,650 mile PCT was designated by Congress in 1968 as one of the first scenic trails in the National Trails System. Extending from Mexico to Canada, the PCT traverses the states of California, Oregon, and Washington and is limited to non-mechanized means of travel (PCT, 2005). The proposed Project would traverse the PCT from Mile S3-4.4 to Mile S3-4.9. The Project would also traverse a parking area that is used to access the PCT, located southwest of the intersection of Tehachapi Willow Springs Road and Cameron Road (Mile S3-4.4).

500-kV Transmission Line. The 25.6-mile 500-kV transmission line would be constructed from Substation One to Antelope Substation across open space and agriculture lands in unincorporated Kern County, Los Angeles County, and the City of Lancaster. Approximately 23.2 miles of the proposed route would be constructed in an entirely new ROW. Sensitive land uses located within 0.5 miles of the proposed transmission line include the following:

- **Existing Residences.** Single-family residences are located along 110th Street West and Avenue A in unincorporated Kern County; along 110th Street West, 105th Street West, 100th Street West, Avenue D, Avenue E-11, and Avenue J in unincorporated Los Angeles County; and along Avenue J in the City of Lancaster. See Table C.8-1 for the locations of these residences relative to the Project.
- **Antelope Valley Resource Conservation District (AVRCD) Nursery.** The AVRCD is a special district of the State of California that assists communities in managing and enhancing natural resources through education and conservation strategies. The AVRCD encompasses an area of approximately 1.65 million acres (AVRCD, 2006). As part of its program, the AVRCD owns and operates a conservation nursery that provides desert grown and adapted plants to the public, government agencies, and private organizations (AVRCD, 2006). The proposed Project would be constructed approximately 0.2 miles west of the AVRCD Nursery. See Section C.9 (Agricultural Resources) for a discussion of impacts to important farmland.

¹ Permitted uses within an Exclusive Agriculture zone include utility and communication facilities (i.e., utility substation, transmission lines, and supporting towers) (Kern County, 2005).

² Permitted uses within an Industrial zone include utility and communication facilities (i.e., utility substation, transmission lines, and supporting towers) (Kern County, 2005).

C.8.1.2 Segment 2

Segment 2 involves the construction of a 500-kV transmission line that would begin at Antelope Substation in the City of Lancaster and would terminate at Vincent Substation in Los Angeles County. This portion of the Project would also relocate approximately 4.4 miles of 66-kV transmission line to the westerly edge of the existing ROW. The proposed Project would traverse open space, agriculture, and residential areas in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, and in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Option A would traverse open space areas in the City of Palmdale and unincorporated Los Angeles County, while Option B would be sited across existing and planned residential areas in the City of Palmdale. Sensitive land uses located within 0.5 miles of the proposed Project, Option A, and Option B include the following:

- **Existing Residences.** Single-family residences are located along 90th Street West, Godde Hill Road, Hacienda Ranch Road, Cherry Tree Lane, Elizabeth Lake Road, Tuckerway Ranch Road, Peaceful Valley Road, Rockyford Road, Kentucky Springs Road, and Hillside Drive in unincorporated Los Angeles County; along Avenue K-8, Avenue L, Avenue L-8, and 85th Street in the City of Lancaster; and along 75th Street West, 70th Street West, and the Anaverde development in the City of Palmdale. See Table C.8-1 for the locations of these residences relative to the Project, Option A, and Option B routes.
- **Ritter Ranch.** Located within the City of Palmdale, the 10,625-acre Ritter Ranch development includes planned single and multiple family residential, neighborhood commercial, open space and recreation, and educational facilities (City of Palmdale, 1992a). Approximately 4,200 acres of Ritter Ranch was dedicated as open space in 1992 and was turned over to the management of the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (LA Daily News, 2005). This dedicated open space (termed Ritter Ranch Park) is currently the subject of a landowner dispute between the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and a private investment firm (LA Daily News, 2005). The proposed Project would traverse planned open space areas in Ritter Ranch from Mile S2-7.5 to Mile S2-9.3 and from Mile S2-9.5 to Mile S2-13.9. Option B would be located east of Ritter Ranch Park, and would traverse planned residential areas.
- **School Property.** The proposed Project would cross a 110-acre property owned by the Antelope Valley Union High School District (AVUHSD), which has been proposed as the future site for High School #10 (Aspen, 2006b; AVUHSD, 2006). The Project would be sited adjacent to the school property for 0.1 miles, and would traverse the southeast corner of the property for 0.2 miles. Option B would be located east of the AVUHSD property.

C.8.2 Regulatory Framework

Within each section of the EIR, the plans and policies that are applicable to the respective issue area are evaluated in order to assist the CPUC in determining the proposed Project's consistency with local plans, policies, and regulations. As the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of investor-owned utilities, no local discretionary permits (e.g., conditional use permits) or local plan consistency evaluations are required for the proposed Project. However, SCE would be required to obtain all ministerial building and encroachment permits from local jurisdictions.

Plans, policies, regulations, and standards that are applicable to land use and public recreation are listed below and are analyzed for consistency in Table C.8-3. Refer to Section C.9.2 for information on agriculture regulations, plans, and standards.

C.8.2.1 Federal

No federal plans or policies that are applicable to land use and public recreation have been identified. Please see the remaining issue area sections for a discussion of federal policies applicable to each resource area.

C.8.2.2 State

California Department of Education School Site Selection and Approval Guide

The proposed Project would traverse property that is proposed by the AVUHSD as a future school site. California Education Code Section 17251 and the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 5, Sections 14001 through 14012 outline the California Department of Education's (CDE's) authority for approving proposed school sites and constructing school buildings. CDE must approve each site in order for that site to receive State acquisition funds under the School Facilities Program administered by the State Allocation Board (CDE, 2006a). According to the CDE School Site Selection and Approval Guide, some of the many factors that affect school site selection include health and safety, location, size, and cost. The CDE regulations adopted pursuant to Section 17251 contain the following standard for school sites, among others:

- **5 CCR Section 14010[c]:** For power lines and transmission lines, the property line of a proposed school site shall be at least: (i) 100 feet from the edge of an easement for a 50-133 kV line; (ii) 150 feet from the edge of an easement for a 220-230 kV line; and (iii) 350 feet from the edge of an easement for a 500-550 kV line.³

Under CDE's Power Line Setback Exemption Guidance dated May 2006, a school district may request a Limited Use Activity Exemption for proposed school sites that are located within the setback established by CDE for overhead transmission lines. With CDE's approval, the following uses would be allowed within the setback area: parking; drop-off and loading zones; driveways, access roads, and sidewalks; internal vehicular circulation and fire lanes; landscaping; gross acres that are unusable for school purposes or activities (e.g., retention basins, steep slopes, wetlands, waterways); and support facilities of occasional use (e.g., warehouses, boiler rooms, etc.) (CDE, 2006b). Uses that would not be permitted within the setback would include play and activity fields, stadiums, and occupied school buildings.

CDE may also approve a school district request for a Setback Exemption, which would measure the setback from the ground level of the closest or highest kilo-voltage transmission line (whichever creates the largest setback) instead of from the edge of the easement. However, a Setback Exemption would only be approved if it can be reasonably determined that new or relocated overhead transmission lines would not be placed closer to the school within the easement, unless these transmission lines reduced the EMF on the usable portions of the school site (CDE, 2006b).

Prior to issuing any exemption, CDE must be satisfied that a selected school site was determined to be the preferable site (per the School Site Selection and Approval Guide and other safety and cost complications) among all other potential sites considered by the school district during its school site selection process (CDE, 2006b).

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide

The SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide is a compilation of the summaries of plans for the Southern California region, which includes the counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura (SCAG, 1996). The plan consists of the following sections: the Core Chapters (i.e., Growth Management, Regional Mobility, Air Quality, Water Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management) include the federal and State requirements placed on SCAG in addition to non-binding advisory materials and guidance; the Ancillary Chapters (i.e., Economy, Housing, Human Resources and Services, Public Finance,

³ For an underground 500-kV transmission line, the setback distance to usable unrestricted portions of a school site would be 87.5 feet from the edge of the easement (CDE, 2006b).

Open Space and Conservation, Water Resources, Energy, and Integrated Waste Management) reflect other regional plans, but do not contain actions or policies that are required of local governments.

The Housing, Open Space and Conservation, and Energy chapters provide background information for the status of these issue areas in Southern California, but do not contain policies that would be applicable to the proposed Project. However, the Growth Management chapter lists the following policy regarding public facility and utility systems:

- **Growth Management Policy D-1(iii):** The timing, financing, and location of public facilities, utility systems, and transportation systems shall be used by SCAG to implement the region's growth policies.

C.8.2.3 Local

Kern County General Plan

The Kern County General Plan identifies the goals, policies, and implementation measures that are applicable to the unincorporated areas within the county. The General Plan provides for a variety of land uses for future economic growth while also assuring the conservation of Kern County's agricultural, natural, and resource attributes (Kern County, 2004). The following policies would be applicable to portions of the Project route that traverse unincorporated Kern County areas:

Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element

- **Resource Policy 2:** In areas with a resource designation on the General Plan map, only industrial activities which directly and obviously relate to the exploration, production, and transportation of the particular resource will be considered to be consistent with this General Plan.

Energy Element

- **Transmission Line Policy 1:** The County should encourage the development and upgrading of transmission lines and associated facilities (e.g., substations) as needed to serve Kern County's residents and access the County's generating resources, insofar as transmission lines do not create significant environmental or public health and safety hazards.
- **Transmission Line Policy 3:** In reviewing proposals for new transmission lines and/or capacity, the County should assert a preference for upgrade of existing lines and use of existing corridors where feasible.

County of Los Angeles General Plan

The County of Los Angeles General Plan establishes goals and policies for the management of county resources. The policies of the Land Use Element of the County of Los Angeles General Plan (Los Angeles County, 1990) support the countywide General Plan policies of encouraging a more concentrated urban pattern through the revitalization of deteriorating urban areas, infilling of bypassed lands, and focusing new urban development in the most suitable locations.

The following policies would be applicable to portions of the proposed Project and Option A routes that traverse unincorporated Los Angeles County areas:

Land Use Element

- **Policy 14:** Assure that new development is compatible with the natural and manmade environment by implementing appropriate locational controls and high quality design standards.
- **Policy 15:** Protect the character of residential neighborhoods by preventing the intrusion of incompatible uses that would cause environmental degradation such as excessive noise, noxious fumes, glare, shadowing and traffic.

Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan

The Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (Los Angeles County, 1986) is a component of the Los Angeles County General Plan, and includes policies that are specific to the unincorporated county areas of the Antelope Valley planning area. The following policy statements from the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan are applicable to the portions of the proposed Project and Option A routes that traverse unincorporated Los Angeles County:

- **Community Design, Physical Appearances/Community Image, Policy 65:** Encourage the locating of new power distribution networks, communication lines, and other service network facilities underground in urban areas. Transmission lines should be located underground where feasible.
- **Environmental Resource Management, Antelope Valley Trails Plan, Policy 163:** Encourage the use of public utility ROWs for trails when practical and compatible with the utility.

City of Lancaster 2020 General Plan

The City of Lancaster General Plan (City of Lancaster, 2003) establishes local policy for the City of Lancaster. The Plan considers both the city's sphere of influence, as well as the need to integrate regional and countywide policies. The General Plan includes policies and specific actions that serve to achieve the objectives of the Plan through the establishment of programs within the appropriate city departments.

The following policy and specific action is applicable to the portions of the Project route along Segments 2 and 3 that traverse the City of Lancaster:

- **Policy 10.2.2:** Establish and acquire rights-of-way for master planned trails.
 - **Specific Action 10.2.2(a):** Pursue agreements with public and private utilities for the use and maintenance of utility corridors and ROWs for trail purposes.

City of Palmdale General Plan

The City of Palmdale General Plan (City of Palmdale, 1993) establishes local policies for the City of Palmdale that consider regional issues pertaining to transportation, housing, open space, infrastructure, coordination of emergency services, and other physical, social, and economic concerns. The City has incorporated a number of recent developments into its planning boundaries, which include Ritter Ranch and the Anaverde development (originally entitled City Ranch). Specific Plan EIRs were prepared for both the Ritter Ranch and the Anaverde (City Ranch) projects, and the City Ranch Specific Plan (for the Anaverde development) was issued in May 1992. While a separate specific plan document was not issued for the Ritter Ranch development, the Ritter Ranch Specific Plan was incorporated into the City of Palmdale General Plan. As such, the policies presented in the City of Palmdale General Plan are applicable to the Ritter Ranch specific plan area.

The following policy applies to portions of Segment 2, including the Option A and B routes, which traverse the City of Palmdale:

- **Policy S2.6.1:** If, in the future conclusive evidence links electromagnetic fields (EMF) associated with electrical distribution lines, electrical distribution stations, or transformers with deleterious health effects, develop standards for construction, building setbacks, and/or land use restrictions for those areas impacted by hazardous EMF fields.

City Ranch Specific Plan

The City Ranch Specific Plan was prepared to establish a site specific framework for the Anaverde development (City of Palmdale, 1992b). The goals, policies, and design guidelines have been developed

consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Palmdale General Plan, and have been incorporated into the city's general plan elements. The following policy applies to the portions of Segment 2 and Option B that traverse the Anaverde Specific Plan area.

Environmental Resources Management Element

- **Hillside Management Guideline 9:** Utility lines in City Ranch are required to be built underground, in conformance with this guideline.

C.8.3 Applicant-Proposed Measures (APMs)

In its PEA, SCE has listed a number of APMs that are designed to reduce impacts from the proposed Project. None of these APMs are specifically applicable to land use and public recreation. The impact discussion in Section C.8.4 below introduces mitigation measures, where appropriate, to reduce significant adverse impacts.

C.8.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section presents the significance of land use impacts associated with the proposed Project. New facilities such as the proposed Project can be considered incompatible with existing land uses if they create noise, visual impacts, or other environmental impacts that disturb existing land uses or preclude the full use of property. Applicable federal, State, and local land use plans are intended to, among other things, prevent such incompatibilities. This section evaluates the Project's consistency with applicable land use plans and considers the impact the Project may have on existing land uses and also considers potential impacts on proposed or planned land uses. The assessment is based on an evaluation of land uses identified during site reconnaissance in May and June of 2006, an analysis of the Project's consistency with local plans and policies, and information provided in the proponent's PEA.

C.8.4.1 Criteria for Determining Significance

The proposed Project would result in significant impacts to land uses and recreational resources if it would:

- Criterion LU1: Conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects.
- Criterion LU2: Directly or indirectly disrupt an established or recently approved land use (e.g., residences, businesses, schools, recreational facilities).
- Criterion LU3: Contribute to the long-term loss or degradation of the recreational value of an established, designated, or planned recreational use area.

C.8.4.2 Impact Analysis

The following discussion identifies the proposed Project's impacts to land use and public recreation, as determined by the significance criteria listed in Section C.8.4.1. If necessary, mitigation measures have been provided to reduce potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

C.8.4.2.1 Impact and Mitigation Summary

This section summarizes the conclusions of the impact analysis and associated mitigation measures presented in Section C.8.4.2.2. Table C.8-2 lists each impact identified for the proposed Project, along with the significance of each impact. Impacts are classified as Class I (significant, cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant), Class II (significant, can be mitigated to a level that is not significant), Class III

(adverse, but not significant), or Class IV (beneficial). Detailed discussions of each impact and the specific locations where each is identified are presented in the following sections.

Impact	Impact Significance	Mitigation Measures*
L-1: Construction of the proposed Project would temporarily disturb land uses that are traversed by or adjacent to the Project.	Class II	L-1a, L-1b, L-1c, N-3a, N-3b
L-2: Operation of the proposed Project would require the removal of a residence in the City of Lancaster.	Class II	L-2
L-3: Operation of the proposed Project would require the removal of residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County.	Class I (Proposed Project and Option B only; No Impact for Option A)	None identified
L-4: Operation of the proposed Project would preclude the development of a school property.	Class I (Proposed Project and Option A only; No Impact for Option B)	L-4
L-5: Implementation of Option B would preclude planned development within Ritter Ranch.	Class I (Option B only; No Impact for Proposed Project and Option A)	L-4
L-6: Operation of the proposed Project would change the character of a recreational resource, diminishing its recreational value.	Class II	L-6

* Applicable to significant impacts only (i.e., Class I and Class II).

C.8.4.2.2 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations Adopted for the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating Environmental Effects (Criterion LU1)

CEQA requires an EIR to discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed project and the applicable general plans and regional plans (14 CCR Section 15125[d]). While a project may be approved even though there is an inconsistency, CEQA requires that an evaluation be made and measures identified to reduce any potential impacts. Table C.8-3 documents the land use and recreation policies considered in the preparation of the EIR and identifies measures taken to avoid potential inconsistencies. See Section C.8.2.3 for the complete text of these policies.

Agency	Plan/Policy	Consistency	Explanation
California Department of Education	California Department of Education School Site Selection and Approval Guide	Yes	The Project would not be sited within 350 feet of an existing school. A future school could be located on the AVUHSD property to remain 350 feet away from the proposed ROW. As such, the Project would not conflict with this requirement.
	5 CCR Section 14010[c]		
Southern California Association of Governments	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide	Yes	The Project would involve the construction and operation of new electrical utility structures, which would serve to meet growth within Southern California.
	Growth Management Policy D-1(iii)		
Kern County	Kern County General Plan	Yes	The Project would traverse the following resource designations: Intensive Agriculture, Resource Reserve, Extensive Agriculture, Mineral and Petroleum, Resource Management. According to the zoning maps for these resource areas, utility facilities (i.e., transmission lines, utility substations) are a permitted use. ¹
	Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Resource Policy 2		

Table C.8-3. Consistency with Applicable Land Use Plans and Policies			
Agency	Plan/Policy	Consistency	Explanation
	Energy Element Transmission Line Policy 1	Yes	The proposed Project would develop new transmission lines and substations that would access generating resources within Kern County. As such, the Project would not conflict with this policy.
	Energy Element Transmission Line Policy 3	Yes	Although the Project would be constructed in a new ROW for approximately 16.5 miles across Kern County, the proposed route utilizes existing corridors where feasible. As such, the Project would not conflict with this policy.
Los Angeles County	County of Los Angeles General Plan		
	Land Use Element Policy 14	Yes	SCE would implement all industry accepted methods and materials for construction of the proposed Project and Option A, and would be consistent with Policy 14.
	Land Use Element Policy 15	Yes	The proposed Project and Option A would utilize an existing ROW near residential communities in Los Angeles County, and would therefore be compatible with existing uses. To minimize construction impacts to residences, SCE would implement APMs AQ-1 through AQ-12, NOI-3, VIS-1 and VIS-2, and TRA-1 through TRA-5. Please see Sections C.2 (Air Quality), C.10 (Noise), C.11 (Visual Resources), and C.12 (Traffic and Transportation) for a discussion of potential impacts and subsequent mitigation measures.
Los Angeles County	Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan		
	Community Design, Physical Appearances/Community Image, Policy 65	Yes	Within the unincorporated Los Angeles County areas of Antelope Valley, the proposed Project and Option A would not be located in urban areas. As such, the Project would not conflict with Policy 65.
	Environmental Resource Management, Antelope Valley Trails Plan, Policy 163	Yes	The development of recreational uses within a utility corridor would be initiated by the local agency and could be established after construction of the proposed Project and Option A. The Project would not conflict with Policy 163.
City of Lancaster	City of Lancaster 2020 General Plan		
	Policy 10.2.2	Yes	The development of recreational uses within a utility corridor would be initiated by the local agency and could be established after construction of the Project. The Project would not conflict with Policy 10.2.2
City of Palmdale	City of Palmdale General Plan		
	Policy S2.6.1	Yes	SCE would implement all industry accepted methods and materials for construction of the proposed Project, Option A, and Option B. See Appendix 2 for a discussion of the potential EMF effects of the Project.
City of Palmdale	City Ranch Specific Plan		
	Environmental Resources Management Element Hillside Management Guideline 9	Yes	Local plans generally define utility lines as low-voltage subtransmission and distribution lines (33-kV and below). The proposed high-voltage 500-kV transmission lines would be located adjacent to an existing utility corridor that is currently developed with overhead transmission lines. As such, the proposed Project, Option A, and Option B would not conflict with this specific plan.

Source: Kern County, 2004; Los Angeles County, 1986, 1990; City of Lancaster, 2003; City of Palmdale, 1992b, 1993.

¹ Resource areas traversed by the Proposed Project are zoned as one of the following districts: Exclusive Agriculture (A), Limited Agriculture (A-1), Estate (E), Platted Lands (PL). Each of these zoning districts permits transmission lines and supporting towers, poles, and underground facilities for electricity that are owned and operated by a utility company under the jurisdiction of the CPUC. Zoning district A also permits utility substations.

As described in Table C.8-3, the proposed Project would be consistent with State and local plans and policies. No conflicts would occur.

Option A

The 2.1-mile portion of Option A that deviates from the proposed Project traverses unincorporated Los Angeles County and the Ritter Ranch development site in the City of Palmdale. As such, the policies from the County of Los Angeles General Plan, the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, and the City of Palmdale General Plan would be applicable to Option A. As described in Table C.8-3, Option A would not conflict with local plans and policies.

Option B

The 3.1-mile portion of Option B that deviates from the proposed Project traverses the Ritter Ranch and Anaverde development sites in the City of Palmdale. Consequently, the policies from the City of Palmdale General Plan and the City Ranch Specific Plan would be applicable to Option B. As described in Table C.8-3, Option B would not conflict with local plans and policies.

Disrupt an Established or Recently Approved Land Use (Criterion LU2)

The proposed Project would require an easement that would vary in width from 160 feet (Mile S3-0.0 to S3-9.6), to 180 feet (Mile S3-33.4 to S3-35.2, Mile S2-0.0 to S2-8.1, Mile S2-10.6 to S2-21.6), to 200 feet (Mile S3-9.6 to S3-33.4, Mile S2-8.1 to S2-10.6). The Project would be located across or adjacent to existing residential and recreational land uses, which would be affected by construction activities. The proposed transmission line route would also traverse a planned school site, and would require the relocation of residences that are within the proposed Project ROW along Segment 2. Temporary and permanent disruptions to land uses as a result of construction and operation of the Project are described below.

Impact L-1: Construction of the proposed Project would temporarily disturb land uses that are traversed by or adjacent to the Project. (Class II)

The proposed Project would be located in the proximity of residential and recreational uses that would be affected by construction activities. As described in Table C.8-1, a minimum of 80 residences are located less than 0.2 miles (approximately 1,000 feet) from the Project. Given their proximity to the Project, these residences would be affected by the noise and air pollutant emissions generated from construction equipment, and by the dust associated with the creation of tower footings and new access and spur roads. For a discussion of air, noise, and traffic impacts on land uses, see Sections C.2 (Air Quality), C.10 (Noise), and C.12 (Traffic and Transportation).

In addition to residential uses, construction of the proposed Project would cross recreational resources in Kern and Los Angeles Counties. From Mile S3-4.4 to Mile S3-4.9, the Project would parallel and cross the PCT, including a parking area that is used for the PCT. In Los Angeles County, the proposed Project would cross Ana Verde Mountainway and Edison Road, which serve as access and hiking trails for Ritter Ranch Park (SMMC, 2004). During Project construction, temporary closure of these trails would be required to ensure public safety. Temporary closure of the PCT and trails within Ritter Ranch would likely occur for several hours and no more than one day (Williams, 2006). However, the closure of these trails and the potential preclusion of recreational parking areas would negatively impact recreational users within Ritter Ranch and along the PCT.

As described above, residences located adjacent to the Project and recreationists along the PCT and within Ritter Ranch would be significantly impacted during Project construction. However, implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level (**Class II**): Mitigation Measures L-1a (Coordinate Construction Schedule and Activities with the Authorized Officers for the

Recreation Areas), L-1b (Provide Access for Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Users), L-1c (Identify Alternative Recreation Areas), N-3a (Provide Advance Notification of Construction), and N-3b (Implement Best Management Practices for Construction Noise). Mitigation Measures L-1a, L-1b, and L-1c would minimize construction impacts to recreationists and recreational sites. Mitigation Measures N-3a and N-3b would serve to limit the hours of construction, would minimize noise levels, and would provide advance notice of potentially disruptive activities to nearby residences. See Section C.10 (Noise) for a complete description of Mitigation Measures N-3a and N-3b.

Mitigation Measures for Impact L-1

L-1a Coordinate Construction Schedule and Activities with the Authorized Officers for the Recreation Areas. No less than 40 days prior to construction, SCE shall coordinate construction activities and the Project construction schedule with the authorized officers for the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. SCE shall schedule construction activities to avoid heavy recreational use periods, including major holidays, in coordination with, and at the discretion of the authorized officers. SCE shall prepare a public notice of construction activities consistent with Mitigation Measure N-3a (Provide Advance Notification of Construction). SCE shall document its coordination efforts with the authorized officers, and provide this documentation to the CPUC 30 days prior to construction.

L-1b Provide Access for Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Users. No less than 40 days prior to construction, SCE shall coordinate with the authorized officer of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT) to establish a temporary detour of the trail to avoid hazardous construction areas. SCE shall prepare a public notice of the temporary trail closure and information on the trail detour consistent with Mitigation Measure N-3a (Provide Advance Notification of Construction). SCE shall document its coordination efforts with the authorized officer and submit this documentation to the CPUC 30 days prior to construction.

During construction, SCE shall locate construction equipment and materials to allow for continual access to the PCT trailhead and parking area located southwest of the intersection of Tehachapi Willow Springs Road and Cameron Road.

L-1c Identify Alternative Recreation Areas. SCE shall coordinate with the authorized officer for the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy to identify alternative recreation sites that may be used by the public. SCE shall post a public notice at recreation facilities within Ritter Ranch to be closed or limited during construction, which shall provide information on alternative recreation facilities. SCE shall document its coordination with the authorized officer, and submit this documentation to the CPUC 30 days prior to construction.

Option A

Option A would be sited less than 0.2 miles (approximately 1,000 feet) from residences located along Hacienda Ranch Road and Cherry Tree Lane in unincorporated Los Angeles County. As described for the proposed Project, residences within close proximity to the Project route would be impacted by the temporary noise, dust, and traffic generated during construction (i.e., tower footings, erection of new towers, creation of access and spur roads). No recreational resources would be traversed by the 2.1-mile portion of Option A that deviates from the proposed Project route. However, north of Mile S2-5.7 and south of Mile S2-7.7, Option A would not differ from the proposed Project, and would continue to cross recreational resources in Los Angeles and Kern Counties. As discussed for the proposed Project, construction activities would require temporary closure of the PCT and trails within Ritter Ranch. Construction impacts to residential uses and recreational resources as a result of Option A would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures L-1a

(Coordinate Construction Schedule and Activities with the Authorized Officers for the Recreation Areas), L-1b (Provide Access for Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Users), L-1c (Identify Alternative Recreation Areas), N-3a (Provide Advance Notification of Construction) and N-3b (Implement Best Management Practices for Construction Noise) would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level (**Class II**).

Option B

Option B would be sited across the planned residential communities of Ritter Ranch and Anaverde, in areas that have been graded for housing development. Existing residences would be located east of and immediately adjacent to the Option B route within Ritter Ranch and Anaverde. As such, the residences that abut the Option B route would be exposed to the construction noise and dust associated with the Project. While the 3.1-mile portion of Option B would avoid recreational resources in Ritter Ranch, Option B would be identical to the proposed Project route north of Mile S2-8.1. Construction activities along Segment 3 would require temporary closure of the PCT, which would adversely affect recreationists. Option B would create significant but mitigable construction impacts to residential and recreational uses (**Class II**). Temporary impacts resulting from the construction of Option B would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measures L-1a (Coordinate Construction Schedule and Activities with the Authorized Officers for the Recreation Areas), L-1b (Provide Access for Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Users), N-3a (Provide Advance Notification of Construction), and N-3b (Implement Best Management Practices for Construction Noise).

Impact L-2: Operation of the proposed Project would require the removal of a residence in the City of Lancaster. (Class II)

The proposed Project would traverse an existing residence in the City of Lancaster along Avenue L (Mile S2-2.2) that is located on an olive orchard. Construction and operation of the Project would require the displacement and relocation of this residence. Further discussion of the displacement of residences is included in Section C.13 (Population and Housing). See also Section C.9.4 for a discussion of impacts to agriculture. The removal of an existing residence would result in a significant impact (**Class II**), which could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with a Project re-route around this residence. Implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2 (Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence) would be recommended to avoid permanent impacts to the residence in the City of Lancaster.

Mitigation Measures for Impact L-2

L-2 Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence. Along Segment 2 of the Project, from Mile S2-2.1 to Mile S2-2.3, SCE shall re-locate the proposed transmission towers within 500 feet to the west of the proposed route to avoid the displacement and relocation of the existing residence located on Avenue L at Mile S2-2.2.

From Mile S2-2.1 to Mile S2-2.3, the area within 500 feet to the west of the proposed Project route is characterized by open space. No sensitive receptors or other notable land uses are located in this area, and consequently, no additional land uses would be impacted by the relocation of the Project transmission towers within 500 feet of the proposed route. Implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2 would not result in the creation of new adverse impacts.

Option A

North of Mile S2-5.7 and south of Mile S2-7.7, Option A would not differ from the proposed Project. As discussed for the proposed Project route, this option would be constructed across an existing residence located

along Avenue L (Mile S2-2.2), resulting in a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2 (Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence) would avoid permanent impacts to the City of Lancaster residence. With Mitigation Measure L-2, potentially significant impacts to this residence would be reduced to a less-than-significant level (**Class II**).

Option B

The portion of Option B that is identical to the proposed Project route would continue to traverse an existing residence along Avenue L, requiring the acquisition of this home and the relocation of its residents. Although Option B would result in a significant impact, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2 (Re-locate Project ROW to Avoid Residence) (**Class II**). Mitigation Measure L-2 would create a Project re-route around this residence, thereby avoiding permanent residential impacts in the City of Lancaster.

Impact L-3: Operation of the proposed Project would require the removal of residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County. (Class I)

As discussed for Impact L-2, the proposed Project would require an easement that would extend over privately owned parcels and would restrict future use of the property within the proposed easement. The removal of some existing structures would be required and no new structures would be permitted within the easement during Project operation. The proposed easement would traverse a minimum of three existing residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County along Cherry Tree Lane (Mile S2-7.4), and would require the displacement and relocation of these residences for construction and operation of the Project. Further discussion of the displacement of residences is included in Section C.13 (Population and Housing). The removal of existing residences and the restriction of current or future land uses on private property is considered a significant and unavoidable impact (**Class I**). This impact can only be avoided with a re-route around the residences along Cherry Tree Lane, such as the routes presented in Option A and in Alternative 4. If Option A or Alternative 4 were selected, impacts to existing residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County would not occur.

Option A

Option A would be located east of the proposed Project route from Mile S2-5.7 to Mile S2-7.7. This option would not traverse the existing residences along Cherry Tree Lane that would be affected by the proposed Project route, and as such, would not require their relocation. As Option A would avoid the condemnation of the three Los Angeles County residences that are affected by the proposed Project, no impact would occur under this re-route.

Option B

The portion of Option B that is identical to the proposed Project route would continue to traverse existing residences along Cherry Tree Lane, and would require the acquisition of these homes and the relocation of the residents. The removal of existing residences along Cherry Tree Lane would create significant and unavoidable impacts (**Class I**). This impact can only be avoided with a re-route around the residences along Cherry Tree Lane, such as the routes presented in Option A and in Alternative 4. If Option A or Alternative 4 were selected, impacts to existing residences in unincorporated Los Angeles County would not occur.

Impact L-4: Operation of the proposed Project would preclude the development of a school property. (Class I)

The proposed Project would traverse property that is owned by the AVUHSD and has been proposed as a future school site. As discussed in Section C.8.2.2, implementation of the proposed Project would preclude the use of the AVUHSD property for development of educational facilities within 350 feet of the edge of the Project easement. In order to comply with CDE school facilities siting requirements and 5 CCR Section 14010[c], the AVUHSD would need to either limit its use of this property such that it could not site the property line of a future school within 350 feet of the Project easement, or apply for a Limited Activity Use Exemption. However, according to the CDE, a school district is required to screen several sites when selecting a proposed school site, and as such, CDE may not allow AVUHSD to construct a school on a property that is traversed by a 500-kV transmission line if other potential school sites are available (CDE, 2006c). As proposed, the Project would hinder the selection and approval of the AVUHSD property as a future school site. At this time, CPUC is not aware of any negotiations between SCE and the AVUHSD regarding the district's property. For this reason, Mitigation Measure L-4 (Coordinate with Antelope Valley Union High School District and Ritter Ranch) has been recommended. However, SCE's coordination with the AVUHSD may not avoid impacts to the school property. As such, impacts to the development of an existing school property would remain significant (**Class I**).

Mitigation Measures for Impact L-4

L-4 Coordinate with Antelope Valley Union High School District and Ritter Ranch. SCE shall coordinate with the Antelope Valley Union High School District (AVUHSD) and with Ritter Ranch to discuss options for siting the Project route to avoid impacts to the AVUHSD property as well as to the adjacent Ritter Ranch property. SCE shall document the results of this coordination, which shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval no less than 60 days prior to construction.

In order to entirely avoid impacts to school property, a re-route around the AVUHSD property would be required, such as the routes presented in Option B and Alternative 4. If Option B or Alternative 4 were selected, impacts to school property would not occur.

Option A

North of Mile S2-5.7 and south of Mile S2-7.7, Option A would not differ from the proposed Project. As discussed for the proposed Project route, this option would be constructed across a proposed AVUHSD school site, and would serve to permanently restrict the use of the property. The location of a 500-kV transmission line across or adjacent to the school property may hinder the selection and approval of this property as a future school site. Mitigation Measure L-4 (Coordinate with Antelope Valley Union High School District and Ritter Ranch) would be recommended to ensure that SCE considers options for avoiding impacts to the AVUHSD. However, SCE's coordination with the AVUHSD may not avoid impacts to the proposed school site, and as such, impacts would be significant (**Class I**). In order to entirely avoid impacts to school property, a re-route around the AVUHSD property would be required, such as the routes presented in Option B and Alternative 4. If Option B or Alternative 4 were selected, impacts to school property would not occur.

Option B

Option B would travel across the Ritter Ranch and Anaverde developments and would be located approximately 0.8 miles (4,224 feet) east of the AVUHSD property. This 3.1-mile route would not restrict the use of a proposed school site, nor would it affect the screening process required by CDE for the selection of new school sites. As such, impacts to the development of the AVUHSD property would not occur.

Impact L-5: Implementation of Option B would preclude planned development within Ritter Ranch. (Class I)

Neither the proposed Project nor Option A would traverse planned residential development within Ritter Ranch. However, Option B would travel across the Ritter Ranch development for which home sites have been planned within this optional ROW. The construction and operation of Option B would preclude the use of land parcels within the 180-foot ROW that have been approved as future residential sites. Mitigation Measure L-4 (Coordinate with Antelope Valley Union High School District and Ritter Ranch) has been recommended to minimize the effects of Option B to Ritter Ranch. However, SCE's coordination with Ritter Ranch may not avoid impacts to planned residential development, and as such, impacts would be significant and unavoidable (Class I).

Contribute to the Long-Term Loss or Degradation of the Recreational Value of Established, Designated, or Planned Recreational Use Area (Criterion LU3)

The siting of industrial land uses across a recreational resource may contribute to the loss or degradation of the recreational value of that resource. The proposed Project would traverse recreational trails along Segments 2 and 3, and Impact L-6 discusses the long-term effects of the proposed transmission line across these resources.

Impact L-6: Operation of the proposed Project would change the character of a recreational resource, diminishing its recreational value. (Class II)

Recreational resources would be traversed along Segment 2 (i.e., Ritter Ranch Park) and Segment 3 (i.e., PCT) of the proposed route. In Segment 2, the proposed Project would be adjacent to an existing ROW as it crosses recreational trails within Ritter Ranch Park. These trails are currently traversed by two existing 500-kV transmission lines, and the proposed Project would add a third transmission line to the utility corridor. In Segment 3, the portion of the PCT that would be crossed by the proposed Project is surrounded by industrial land uses. The PCT is currently traversed by an existing 66-kV transmission line, which parallels the proposed Project route across the trail. The PCT is routed through wind farms to the north and south of the Project's trail crossing, and Cal Cement is located approximately two miles southeast of the trail.

Given the existing industrial land uses that currently traverse or abut the recreational resources along Segments 2 and 3, the proposed Project would not significantly change the character of these resources. However, the siting of lattice steel towers along Segment 3 may permanently affect recreational access to the PCT (i.e., parking). A portion of the parking area for the PCT (Mile S3-4.4) is currently occupied by an existing H-frame transmission tower, and as such, the parking area can accommodate no more than 20 vehicles. The erection of a new lattice steel tower within this limited parking area would significantly impact recreational access to the PCT (Class II). To reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level, Mitigation Measure L-6 (Site Towers to Avoid Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Trailhead) is recommended. Implementation of Mitigation Measure L-6 would avoid precluding access to the PCT, which would diminish the recreational value of the trail.

Mitigation Measure for Impact L-6

L-6 Site Towers to Avoid Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Trailhead. SCE shall site transmission towers to avoid the parking area and trailhead for the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT), located southwest of the intersection of Tehachapi Willow Springs Road and Cameron Road. SCE shall ensure that the location of new transmission towers would not be sited in an area that is used to access the PCT.

Option A

The 2.1-mile portion of Option A that deviates from the proposed Project would not traverse a recreational resource. However, north of Mile S2-5.7 and south of Mile S2-7.7, Option A would not differ from the proposed Project. As discussed for the proposed Project, Option A would construct a new transmission line across the PCT in an industrial area. While Option A would not significantly diminish the value of this recreational resource, the siting of a transmission tower within the parking area for the PCT would preclude existing access to the PCT trailhead, creating a significant but mitigable impact (**Class II**). Implementation of Mitigation Measure L-6 (Site Towers to Avoid Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Trailhead) would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Option B

The 3.1-mile portion of Option B would avoid traversing recreational facilities in Ritter Ranch Park. However, north of Mile S2-8.1 and south of Mile S2-14.9, Option B would not differ from the proposed Project. As such, Option B would construct a 220-kv transmission line across the PCT in an area that is characterized by existing transmission lines, wind farms, and the Cal Cement facility. Construction and operation of this option would not diminish the value of the trail, unless the siting of transmission towers permanently precludes access to the PCT parking area and trailhead. Impacts to this recreational resource would be potentially significant (**Class II**) but mitigable through implementation of Mitigation Measure L-6 (Site Towers to Avoid Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Trailhead).