

RESULTS: The following counts and comments are compilations from the "Review of Draft Goals and Policies" worksheet provided at the June 18, 2011 Renewable Energy Meeting hosted by the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. The comments were provided by meeting attendees and have not been edited.

Review of Draft Goals and Policies

PART II: ANALYSIS OF DRAFT MATERIALS

Directions: Please indicate whether you think the goals and policies listed below need to be revised or not. If you are recommending change, specify what needs to be addressed.

Goal C0510

Diverse energy systems that utilize existing renewable or waste resources to meet future energy demands.

26 - No change:

No change comments:

10 - Change:

Comments:

1. Remove "resources"
2. Update.
3. I see no requirement.
4. To safely meet future energy demands.
5. While leaving a small footprint on areas containing these systems.
6. So fewer utility scale projects are needed. Use "infill" in the LA Basin.
7. Work with communities! You never worked with W. Antelope Valley. We do not get the Lancaster papers.
8. No turbines on Portal Ridge.
9. No one wants to "waste resources". Bad use of language.

o Policy C0510.1: Encourage the use of non-hazardous materials in all individual renewable energy systems and all utility-scale renewable energy production facilities to prevent the leaching of potentially dangerous run-off materials into the soil and watershed.

28 - No change.

12 - Change:

Comments:

1. Avoiding "encourage" and "all utility-scale" together as they conflict.
2. No hazardous materials.
3. Change "encourage" to "require"

4. Delete "Encourage. "The use of non-... materials shall not be used..."

5. Too vague on hazardous materials.

6. The State has laws already for this.

7. Not encourage. Make it illegal to use hazardous materials.

8. During construction. A sustainability.

9. Require the use.

10. Turbine oil construction effluent.

11. Promote more.

12. Add language that would discourage the construction of wind turbine facilities in high fire hazard grasslands such as hazard zone 4.

o Policy C0510.2: Ensure that all individual renewable energy systems and all utility-scale renewable energy production facilities do not interfere with commercial and military flight operations or communication facilities. Consult with Edwards Air Force Base and U.S. Air Force Plant 42 on all proposed renewable energy projects that require discretionary approval.

29 - No change.

7 - Change:

Comments:

1. Flight operations and communication facilities should not have "veto power" over projects.
2. Include China Lake and Pt Mugu Naval Base as they too use the flight corridors.
3. Add upgrade costs to be paid by energy company.
4. Add FAA, China Lake Pt.
5. Add fire fighting aircraft that must fly lower than 500' to drop water.
6. Yes, I was wondering if this was addressed.
7. Within reasonable limits there could be impact.
8. Air Force Plant 42 "as well as other DOI flight corridors" on all proposed renewable energy...

o Policy CCS 10.3: Encourage the safe and orderly development of biomass conversion facilities as an alternative to burning agricultural wastes.

24 - No change.

9 - Change:

Comments:

1. Be careful what you get.
2. What "agricultural wastes"?
3. Must be cost offset.
4. Must be low cost for ag permit holders to encourage use.
5. No
6. List possible biomass conversion, eg. Algae farming, ethanol, methane, etc.
7. Heavy water use! Study biomass water usage before working on this.
8. Emphasis safe
9. Is this workable/feasible?
10. More info required.
11. Need more info.
12. Sure just burn all the animals coming out of the pound.

o Policy CCS 10.4: Promote methane recapture in existing landfills to generate energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from waste disposal.

37 - No change.

0 - Change:

Comments:

1. Concur.
2. Promote more.
3. Add site facilities along linear infrastructure that already exists.
4. Need more info.

o Policy CCS 10.5: Encourage the development of emerging energy technologies, such as "solar roads."

23 - No change.

6 - Change:

Comments:

1. Cover aqueduct.
2. Cover aqueduct with solar.
3. Do not waister taxes on some private company's research and development.
4. Be more descriptive of solar roads. Should be limited to right of way.
5. Great idea!!

6. What? Explain.
7. Not familiar with term "solar road."
8. No definition of solar roads. What are these?
9. Not sure what a solar road is.
10. "solar roads"? Need more info.
11. Need more info.
12. Such as?

Goal CCS 11

Energy systems for use in public facilities that reduce consumption of non-renewable resources while maintaining public safety.

29 - No change.

6 - Change:

Comments:

1. Exclude schools, courts, and other budget crisis entities.
2. Is offset so energy company pays for public facilities.
3. Schools have money for solar over parking, but no money for teachers and downsize room capacity.
4. Implement requirements for large parking lots to have solar panels covering them.

o Policy CCS 11.1: Promote energy retrofits of existing public facilities throughout the County to complement and reduce dependence upon utility-scale renewable energy production facilities, such as solar facilities and wind facilities, in the Antelope Valley.

29 - No change.

7 - Change:

Comments:

1. Not at the cost of tax payer.
2. Reduce dependence on renewable? Should retrofit facilities.
3. Don't like retrofit. Build new.
4. Encourage efficiently upgrades of existing equipment to lower energy consumption.
5. No wind facilities-large scale.
6. That respect natural environmental land forms and are compatible with open space uses.
7. I so agree- use the parking areas to install solar panels?
8. This is an excellent policy that needs to be strengthened to create financial incentives for businesses, schools and private residents to install solar panels on rooftops and over parking lots. This type of program will also provide a steady source of

jobs for local residents and opportunities for small local businesses.

o Policy COS 11.2: Promote the use of solar-powered lighting for highways, streets, and public facilities, including parks and trails.

35 - No change.

2 - Change:

Comments:

1. First focus on eliminating exterior lighting, especially in rural areas.
 2. Increase, significantly, wind and solar use.
 3. Have you addressed issues with batteries (cost) associated with highway/street lighting? May not be cost efficient long term.
-

o Policy COS 11.3: Promote the use of renewable energy systems in public facilities, such as hospitals, libraries, and schools, to ensure access to power in the case of major disasters.

32 - No change.

4 - Change:

Comments:

1. Ensure alternative heating/cooling methods as well renewable sources. For example ground source heat pumps.
 2. This is stupid.
 3. Daily use.
 4. A sustainable energy across the years.
 5. Ensure alternative heating/cooling methods as well renewable sources. For example ground source heat pumps.
 6. Need for exits from facilities service.
-

Goal COS 12

Individual energy systems for onsite use that reduce consumption of non-renewable resources and dependence on utility-scale energy production facilities.

25 - No change.

5 - Change:

Comments:

1. Simplify.
2. Make it simpler to do.
3. Encourage use where affordable.

4. Add "as a First priority" to end of goal.
 5. No.
 6. Permit process should encourage use of (pointing to Policy COS 12.1).
-

o Policy COS 12.1: Promote the use of individual renewable energy systems throughout the County to complement and reduce dependence upon utility-scale renewable energy facilities, such as solar facilities and wind facilities, in the Antelope Valley.

27 - No change.

7 - Change:

Comments:

1. Add "Promote the use of solar facilities"
 2. Private sector too.
 3. Promote utility scale renewable energy facilities.
 4. No wind facilities
 5. Add "as a First priority" to end of goal.
 6. "Promote" as a policy is too vague. Promote should be changed to "prioritize" or "incentivize" over utility scale if utility scale has more environmental impact and can be scaled back.
 7. Not on Portal Ridge! Mitigation not possible
 8. LA County is the worst area for a private person to develop private energy in. Resident are not just a resources for permit fees!
 9. Another excellent policy that should be strengthened to give financial incentives to make this decentralized model cost effective. This approach puts money into the hands of local citizens through savings on utility bills – dollars that will be spent locally instead of enriching out of state corporations. It also has the potential to create opportunities for local small businesses and their employees.
-

o Policy COS 12.2: Require appropriate development standards for individual renewable energy systems to minimize potential impacts to surrounding properties. Simplify the permitting process for individual renewable energy systems that meet these development standards.

20 - No change.

14 - Change:

Comments:

1. No utility scale renewable energy facilities in "significant ecological area"
2. Require EIR. Keep aesthetic impact to a minimum.
3. Ok with policy. Add public meeting component.
4. Needs much improvement.

5. Make it easier to do.
6. Make it easier.
7. Use energy taxes to offset cost of individual systems.
8. And use utility scale subsidies to outfit residential projects.
9. I want to know or participate in specifics.
10. Develop a specific simplified permitting.
11. Streamline where can but still allow for Environmental Studies and public input.
12. Use of individual wind turbines should be discouraged and solar panels encouraged due to the threat to birds and bats and noise and low frequency concerns posed by wind turbines.

Goal CCS 13

Utility-scale energy production facilities for off-site use that reduce consumption of non-renewable resources while minimizing potential impacts on natural resources and existing communities.

20 - No change.

13 - Change:

Comments:

1. Preference solar over wind.
2. Need to localize transmission of power to local municipalities.
3. Provided that
4. Unclear
5. Unclear language
6. What? Explain.
7. Limited # of projects. Limited acreage.
8. The produced energy should be for the community where produced.
9. Not minimizing impacts, getting rid of them.
10. Add "as a last option" to end of goal.
11. Eliminate.
12. Not in SEAs
13. Discourage utility scale due to large environmental impacts
14. Provided the County does not significantly deter the necessary development.
15. Change "while minimizing potential impacts on natural resources and existing communities" to: "will be directed to areas that do not impact natural resources such as Scenic Resource Areas, ridgelines, and existing communities."

o Policy CCS 13.1: Direct utility-scale renewable energy production facilities, such as solar facilities and wind facilities, to priority locations on the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map (Zones 1 through 3)

where environmental, noise, and visual impacts will be minimized.

21 - No change.

13 - Change:

Comments:

1. Use "encourage" rather than "direct"
2. Add "Significant Ecological Areas (SEA's) to map, and exclude these areas from "Energy Zones"
3. Priority solar over wind.
4. No large scale utility projects.
5. Map is flawed. Unrealistically small.
6. I can drive a truck thru. Minimize (and reduce)
7. Should be localized to users.
8. Ensure no impact to humans in regards to solar.
9. Absolutely not. The zones are not realistic and based on "real data"
10. Zones 1-3 are some of the most harmful areas to put them. No projects should be put on undisturbed land.
11. Require, not direct. Map does not identify where noise and visual impacts should be minimized.
12. Restrict from SEA's, rural communities.
13. Cumulative impacts need to be considered in the direction of utility scale.
14. "environmental, noise, and visual impacts will be minimized." Be absolutely sure!!
15. Concur.
16. Provided the County does not significantly deter the necessary development.
17. They will always effect someone
18. Map needs significant work. Do not site any utility scale facilities in Significant Ecological Areas and do not permit any view "ahead" of this policy process such as Next Era Blue Sky and Element Power wildflower.
19. Change "to priority locations" to "to priority and privately owned locations"
20. The Production Priority map does not adequately identify areas where environmental, noise and visual impacts should be minimized. Portal Ridge (the ridge system that runs between Godde Pass and Pine Canyon Road north of the San Andreas Fault) is in the view shed of two state parks, the AV California Poppy Reserve and Ripley Desert Woodland and provides wildlife linkages between these protected open spaces and the Angeles National forest. It should all be labeled in such a way to indicate that it is not appropriate for industrialization by utility scale energy development.

o Policy CCS 13.2: In the High Priority Zone (Zone 1) of the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map, require basic conditions and mitigation measures for utility-scale renewable energy production facilities during the application review process because of the

limited potential impacts they may have on known sensitive biotic communities.

18 - No change.

15 - Change:

Comments:

1. Remove "limited"
2. Wording
3. Require EIR
4. Stringent condition. They should go through all processes along with providing an Environmental Impact Study.
5. Define "basic conditions". Too vague.
6. Stringent conditions.
7. Include water use in environmental impact.
8. Have companies pay County to perform studies.
9. There is no "limited" impact. It is significant.
10. Does zone 1 not have sensitive biotic communities? Will a full EIR be required?
11. Must be specific to each project.
12. Cumulative impact and cumulative mitigation need to be directed to designated area.
13. Not on SEA 58 and SEA 57.
14. Until the map is developed, adopt a "no regrets" approval to siting. Do not site in SEAs.
15. Depends on final map.
16. These so called zones are meaningless. Wildlife can be found anywhere on the map except where people have destroyed it.
17. Does this mean that zone 1 identified areas have no sensitive biotic communities? How was this determined? Will all projects in zone 1 be required to complete the full EIR process? Production Priority Map should be changed to indicate that Portal Ridge and adjacent areas are not labeled as Priority 1. Change to: "require full EIR process to be followed to ensure that sensitive biotic communities, Scenic Resources Areas, existing communities and existing dedicated open spaces are not impacted" (instead of "require basic conditions...etc.").

o Policy 13.3: In the Medium Priority Zone (Zone 2) of the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map, require moderate conditions and mitigation measures for utility-scale renewable energy production facilities during the application review process because of the potential impacts they may have on the swainson's hawk, Mojave ground squirrel, and desert tortoise species habitats, which are known sensitive biotic communities.

12 - No change.

22 - Change:

Comments:

1. Permit individual projects to conduct bio assessment if that would reduce the need for mitigation.
2. Remove "moderate"
3. And other animals
4. Require EIR.
5. Full process – stringent conditions.
6. Future energy needs of people weighed more.
7. Put human needs above animal needs.
8. Define "moderate conditions"
9. Stringent conditions.
10. Should only require "basic" conditions, as in Zone 1.
11. Include water use.
12. Add environment tax.
13. Define potential mitigation measures.
14. There are golden eagles, bald eagles, tricolored black birds and many other endangered species.
15. All wildlife should be addressed.
16. What are moderate conditions? Will a full EIR be required.
17. Need to know specifics.
18. Cumulative impact and cumulative mitigation need to be directed to designated area.
19. The "medium" shows areas that connect the SEA areas. These areas must connect to be in Low priority zones.
20. What's the difference in moderate and stringent?
21. There should only be two zones, disturbed and undisturbed.
22. "and mitigation measures..." Be certain!
23. "moderate conditions and mitigation measures" to require "full EIR process and mitigation measures." Add at the end: "Require full EIR process to be followed to ensure that sensitive biotic communities, Scenic Resources Areas, existing communities and existing dedicated open spaces are not impacted." Production Priority Map should be changed to indicate that Portal Ridge and adjacent areas are not labeled as Priority 2.

o Policy 13.4: In the Low Priority Zone (Zone 3) of the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map, require stringent conditions and mitigation measures for utility-scale renewable energy production facilities during the application review process because of the potential impacts they may have on Significant Ecological Areas, which are known sensitive biotic communities.

14 - No change.

17 - Change:

Comments:

1. "Stringent" conditions must be reasonable.
2. Require EIR.

3. Define "stringent"
4. Should only require "basic" conditions, as in Zone 1.
5. Include water use.
6. Delete low priority zones.
7. Define approved mitigation measures – gain approvals.
8. Not in SEAs. This is industrial use!
9. To high or med.
10. SEA's should be inviolate or designated mitigation which doesn't impact the adjacent areas.
11. No utility scale in SEAs
12. Enforcement
13. Discourage in additional ways possible.
14. Do not place in SEA!
15. Production Priority Map should be changed to indicate that Portal Ridge and adjacent areas are not labeled as Priority 3 but are instead placed completely off limits to industrial development by utility scale project. Areas in the view shed of public parks should also be placed off limits. Also off limits should be areas that would tend to worsen the fragmentation of SEAs.

o Policy C13.5: Allow utility-scale renewable energy production facilities outside priority locations on the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map (Zones 1 through 3), provided that a contiguous site has been assembled near new transmission lines on previously disturbed lands that are not designated as Prime Farmland by the State of California, and require stringent conditions and mitigation measures for such facilities during the application review process because of potential impacts.

17 - No change.

18 - Change:

Comments:

1. Requirement regarding new transmission line location is unclear. Also, Prime Farmland should not be preserved at the expense of renewable energy due to water shortages.
2. Require EIR.
3. Compensate affected residents for loss of property value, view disruption, noise, etc!
4. Near "new" – those already built or currently under permit to build?
5. Too stringent. Will result in too many lost renewable opportunities.
6. Add as a zone.
7. Do not allow.
8. Solar maybe.
9. Clarify "contiguous site". Contiguous to what? Near transmission lines?
10. No projects should be built on undisturbed land.
11. This appears to make the priority designations meaningless and allow utility scale energy

- development anywhere in any designation. Will an EIR be required?
12. Should be considered on an individual basis, due to the lack of Study of these Areas.
13. No.
14. And all concerns addressed. Preference for not doing this as project should be kept in corridors.
15. Use Edison Co. right of way!
16. What does this mean? It appears to make the designation of priority zones 1 - 3 meaningless and allow industrial scale energy development anywhere in the Antelope Valley as long as "stringent conditions and mitigation measures" are followed. Is this the only time an EIR will be required? This policy needs to be explained.

o Policy C13.6: Restrict development of utility-scale wind energy production facilities within the Edwards Air Force Base Impact Area, as identified on the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map, to limit interference with military operations.

23 - No change.

7 - Change:

Comments:

1. Project should be evaluated individually.
2. Add "and flight corridors"
3. How about interference of quality of life.
4. All areas. No wind.
5. Change "Restrict" to "Prohibit"?
6. Force utility scale renewable energy within Edwards.
7. Concur.
8. Edwards has its own plan!

o Policy C13.7: Require all utility-scale renewable energy production facilities to implement a decommissioning plan that will restore the full site to its natural state upon complete discontinuance of operations and will restore non-operational portions of the site while the remainder continues operating.

20 - No change.

13 - Change:

Comments:

1. "Natural state" needs to be clarified-could be extremely expensive. Also, decommissioning should allow for replacement with other uses.
2. Is this a joke?
3. Miles don't have to put it back exactly as it was.
4. Expand to allow re-paving. See Kern County
5. Should not be allowed to build on a natural site.

6. What is meant by “natural state”? Wildlife will be changed and indigenous plants will not be in an active life cycle.
7. Inflation adjusted.
8. Specify the restoration condition “as original”
9. Read DRECP Science Advisory report. Science says these impacts are permanent and should be reused for renewable.
10. Agreed but add timeline for restoration and penalty for nonconformance.
11. Enforcement?
12. Basically impossible!
13. Will decommissioning costs be placed in an account at the beginning of each project and allow for inflation? Policy should be changed to enforce this.

o Policy CDS 13.8: Promote the use of recycled water in utility-scale renewable energy production facilities to limit impacts on the available fresh water supply.

25 - No change.

8 - Change:

Comments:

1. No need for this as water use is minimal.
2. Homeowner included.
3. Unrealistic.
4. Change “promote” to “mandate”
5. Minimize use of water usage. Agree recycled only.
6. Require.
7. Specify “promote”. Could be “require”
8. Require. Only.
9. I thought State law required the use of recycled water for solar projects.

o Policy CDS 13.9: Where development of utility-scale renewable energy production facilities cannot avoid sensitive biotic communities, require open space dedication within Significant Ecological Areas as a mitigation measure.

15 - No change.

15 - Change:

Comments:

1. Too broad-other mitigations may be appropriate.
2. Add “within the Antelope Valley” to end of policy.
3. Provide for public comment.
4. Never
5. DFG may not find SEA as best open space dedication. Don’t limit to SEA, but promote
6. No, should not be able to build on significant ecological area.

7. Why place in or around sensitive biotic communities?
8. They should be denied.
9. If they cannot avoid, don’t build.
10. Open space mitigation, SEA should consider ownership and impact to value.
11. “energy production facilities cannot avoid sensitive biotic...” They can!!
12. Consider creative mitigation measures.
13. Yes but never allow siting in SEA’s.
14. Utility-scale renewable energy should not be allowed in SEA areas.
15. Not at the risk of private land ownership.
16. Some things can’t be mitigated. Some projects shouldn’t be permitted.
17. Again, this policy seems to provide an opening for industrial scale energy installations anywhere, making the Production Priority Map irrelevant. Why not just avoid sensitive biotic communities? If a project cannot avoid a sensitive biotic community, it should not be there in the first place. How can a project be green if it impacts sensitive biotic communities?

o Policy CDS 13.10: Ensure that all utility-scale renewable energy production facilities, such as solar facilities and wind facilities, do not create land use conflicts with adjacent agricultural lands or existing residential areas in the vicinity. Require buffering and appropriate development standards to minimize potential conflicts.

24 - No change.

7 - Change:

Comments:

1. Add “landscape” to last sentence. Require “landscape” buffering and appropriate...
2. What is an appropriate buffer for a 50 story wind turbine? Between parks? Residences?
3. Eliminate.
4. Stop rezoning from A1 to Rural.
5. Not in SEA’s
6. Some restrictions are too constrictive.
7. How much of a buffering zone??
8. But – property values will decrease – how do the utility co. plan to compensate property owners?
9. Depends on the standards.
10. This is a good policy that needs to be strengthened. How do you establish buffers between residences, existing public parks and 50 story wind turbines? What is an adequate buffer?

o Policy CCS 13.11: Limit the aesthetic impacts of utility-scale renewable energy production facilities to preserve rural character.

19 - No change.

13 - Change:

Comments:

1. Too broad-could result in excessive development regs.
2. Not achievable.
3. Limit at all cost... must.
4. How? Include examples of how to do this?
5. How do you limit aesthetic impact for a 50 story wind turbine.
6. Limit development.
7. Make more Regs.
8. No utility scale wind in LA County and never in SEA.
9. Concur.
10. This is a good policy that needs to be strengthened. How do you limit aesthetic impacts of wind turbines in scenic areas and rural neighborhoods?

o Policy CCS 13.12: Coordinate with other jurisdictions to plan for utility-scale renewable energy production facilities in order to minimize impacts to sensitive biotic communities and existing residential areas.

26 - No change.

7 - Change:

Comments:

1. Include town meeting.
2. No should not be able to build on sensitive biotic areas at all.
3. Who are stakeholders? Parks, SEA's, conservation groups?
4. Eliminate.
5. Coordinate with residents.
6. This is a good policy that needs to be strengthened. The revision of the Production Priority Map needs and energy policies should include local state park representatives and other holders of protected open spaces.

o Policy CCS 13.13: Review and update the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map when any boundaries within the data layers are revised.

20 - No change.

9 - Change:

Comments:

1. What? Explain.
2. The map is no good. A wildlife corridor cannot be represented by a line.
3. Notify public.
4. With community input.
5. DRECP is spending 1 million on mappy A.V. – Use these maps!!!
6. Define periods.
7. Should have public outreach prior to changes in maps.
8. Yes
9. This is a good policy that needs to be strengthened. Review and update should include local state park representatives and other holders of protected open spaces.

Goal CCS 14

Energy infrastructure that is sensitive to the scenic qualities of the Antelope Valley and minimizes potential environmental impacts.

18 - No change.

12 - Change:

Comments:

1. Promote usable areas.
2. Add "ensure energy" to beginning of goal.
3. I see no requirement.
4. Not strong enough.
5. EIR mandates.
6. What are scenic qualities? What are the scenic areas in the AV?
7. Eliminate.
8. Good goal.
9. No siting in Poppy Reserve view shed!!
10. This is a good policy that needs to be strengthened. The Land Use Element of the Town and Country Plan mentions Scenic Resource Areas. These need to be identified on the Production Priority Map and Priority areas changed to reflect these areas.

o Policy CCS 14.1: Require that new transmission lines be placed underground whenever physically feasible.

19 - No change.

10 - Change:

Comments:

1. Financial feasibility must be considered.
2. Change "physically" to "economically"
3. All ways (Always?)
4. Add: and economically feasible. 1. Underground first unless it kills the project

5. Explain required mitigation.
6. Eliminate this policy. It hasn't happened so far and it will not happen.
7. Remove "whenever physically feasible". Must be placed underground.
8. Absolutely.
9. "Whenever physically feasible" should go away. All new transmission lines should be underground.
10. Concur.
11. Yes.
12. a. "Whenever physically feasible". Who determines this? b. All the line across "slat terrain" could be underground.
13. No other county/city in CA requires this.
14. What is an example of a physical constraint that would prevent underground transmission lines? Shouldn't these areas be avoided? This policy should be changed to forbid new transmission lines where there are physical constraints.

o Policy COS 14.2: If new transmission lines cannot feasibly be placed underground due to physical constraints, require that they be collocated with existing transmission lines, or along existing transmission corridors, whenever physically feasible.

18 - No change.

12 - Change:

Comments:

1. Financial feasibility must be considered.
2. Change "physically to "economically"
3. Do not allow.
4. Add: and economically feasible. 1. Corridor first unless it kills the project.
5. Remove "whenever physically feasible". Must be placed underground.
6. Put a ban on all new transmission lines, power should be local.
7. First requirement should be collocation.
8. What are the limits of the existing transmission lines? Can towers be added whenever?
9. Question-how to limit the width of a Right of Way. Have you seen Vincent substation? And the towers at least a mile across.
10. For lines that cannot be undergrounded, deny its permit.
11. This is the caveat to "whenever physically feasible. Don't use it again here as a cover all!
12. No more transmission lines in the A.V.
13. a. "Whenever physically feasible". Loop hole! b.
14. On all these policies/goals, ensure all stakeholders are informed – have input.
15. Co-locate not feasible with utility companies.
16. Bundle generation and transmission along already existing easements and linear infrastructure.

17. CPUC needs to be County based. Or County needs to have authority over CPUC.
18. put a period after existing transmission corridors and take out whenever physically feasible. In addition, add language that places limits on existing transmission lines so that the densities of towers has a limit. **Policy COS 14.3:** If new transmission lines cannot feasibly be placed underground or feasibly collocated with existing transmission lines or along existing transmission corridors due to physical constraints, direct new transmission lines to locations where environmental and visual impacts will be minimized.

o Policy COS 14.3: If new transmission lines cannot feasibly be placed underground or feasibly collocated with existing transmission lines or along existing transmission corridors due to physical constraints, direct new transmission lines to locations where environmental and visual impacts will be minimized.

21 - No change.

12 - Change:

Comments:

1. Financial feasibility must be considered.
2. Do not allow.
3. Require underground lines
4. Replace "direct new transmission lines to locations where..." with "they should not be built"
5. If it cannot, it cannot. Deal with it.
6. And allow for future growth so as to prevent additional new transmission lines location.
7. What could be physical constraints? Should the SEA areas be avoided?
8. Eliminate.
9. If they cannot be put underground don't build. People live here. Remember this.
10. Of course.
11. If not feasible – for new location – upgraded existing infra in place, make larger not add additional line in corridors.
12. Yes.
13. Change: direct new transmission lines to locations where environmental and visual impacts will be minimized to "direct utility scale industrial development to other areas."

o Policy COS 14.4: Discourage the placement of new transmission lines on undisturbed lands containing sensitive biotic communities.

18 - No change.

14 - Change:

Comments:

1. Do not allow.
2. Do not allow.
3. Do not allow.
4. a. Allow placement. b. Required construction techniques that do not impact the sensitive area.
5. Stronger language required. "Prohibit"
6. Maybe more than discourage!
7. Replace "discourage" with "prohibit"
8. Actively and aggressively.
9. Restrictor deny.
10. Change "discourage" to "disallow"
11. Yes Yes Yes
12. Concur.
13. Yes.
14. Need more info – list of species!
15. Even if they are underground?
16. change Discourage to Strongly discourage

o Policy C14.5: Discourage the placement of new transmission lines through existing communities or through properties with existing residential uses.

23 - No change.

13 - Change:

Comments:

1. Do not allow.
2. Do not allow.
3. Change to prohibit the placement...
4. Stronger language required.
5. Why do we need to put them through existing communities?
6. Replace "discourage" with "prohibit"
7. "Discourage" is not strong enough. Avoid at all cost.
8. Actively and aggressively.
9. Restrict or deny or require placement underground.
10. Change "discourage" to "disallow"
11. No new placements in the communities.
12. No change, although existing communities are where existing lines are located.
13. Concur. Safety concerns.
14. Yes.
15. change Discourage to Strongly discourage

o Policy C14.6: Review all proposed transmission line projects for conformity with the goals and policies of the Area Plan, including those listed above. When the California Public Utilities Commission is the decision-making authority for these projects, provide comments regarding conformity with the goals and policies of the Area Plan.

19 - No change.

7 - Change:

Comments:

1. Add timeline penalty for lack of conformity. Appropriate corrections.
2. Require EIR for all projects before CUP is allowed.
3. Dump this plan. It is not conducive to living.
4. LA County, representative of residents, become a party to, or create intervener status on projects in the area.
5. Yes.
6. At what cost \$. Fee sheet.
7. Have fire department at a T-C meeting to clarify the impacts of windmills on water dropping in fire areas.
8. Add: "Provide opportunities for review and comments for all projects by interested parties by requiring a full EIR process for all industrial scale energy projects."

o Policy C14.7: Require that electrical power lines in new residential developments be placed underground.

30 - No change.

1 - Change:

Comments:

1. And rural, Scenic areas, Scenic Hwy areas.
2. Retrofit all lines!
3. Yes.

o Policy C14.8: When new transmission lines are developed, review and update the Renewable Energy Production Priority Map to reduce the need for long distance tie-ins from utility-scale renewable energy production facilities to electric utility substations.

26 - No change.

3 - Change:

Comments:

1. Dependent upon habitat studies, community surveys and consider all conflicts.
2. Personally, I think this was not covered nearly enough.
3. Hard to give input when you don't have the policies as area specific.
4. Language need to be very specific and clean, nothing left to interpretation.

5. Read my attached DRECP Science Advisory Excerpts on Siting and read The Federal Guidelines on wind siting signed by all Energy generators, USFWS, DFG.
 6. New policy: For utility-scale energy production facilities favor the technology giving the highest KW/acre production to reduce each impact. No wind in LA County and here in an SEA!
 7. Insure that the approval process for new transmission lines makes it clear to residents that new lines will change the Production Priority Map and outline those changes as a part of the approval process for new transmission lines.
-