

## **APPENDIX C**

---

### **Summary of All Comments Received**

- C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies
- C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from a Private Organization
- C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens
- C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings and on the Project Information Line
- C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

## **APPENDIX C-1**

---

### Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies

**Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies**

Date	From	Comments
<b>State Agencies</b>		
July 24, 2007	<b>Native American Heritage Commission</b> Katy Sanchez Program Analyst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead agency required to assess whether the Proposed Project will have an adverse impact on historical resource, which includes archeological resources. Must consider impact on historical resources within area of project effect and mitigate as necessary.</li> <li>• Contact the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center for a record search.</li> <li>• If an archaeological inventory survey is required, prepare a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.</li> <li>• Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for a Sacred Lands File Check and a list of appropriate Native American contacts for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in the mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Include in the mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archaeological resources.</li> <li>• In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.</li> <li>• Include in the mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.</li> <li>• Include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan.</li> </ul>
August 15, 2007	<b>Department of Toxic Substances Control</b> Greg Holmes Unit Chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the project site may have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances.</li> <li>• Evaluate whether conditions at the site may pose a threat to human health or the environment.</li> <li>• Identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight.</li> <li>• Proper investigation, sampling and remedial actions overseen by the appropriate agency, if necessary, should be conducted at the site prior to the new development or any construction.</li> <li>• Appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is within a "Border Zone Property."</li> <li>• Appropriate sampling is required prior to disposal of the excavated soil.</li> <li>• If the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, proper sampling should be conducted.</li> <li>• Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during the construction or demolition activities.</li> <li>• If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented.</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Agency</b>		
July 20, 2007	<b>South Coast Air Quality Management District</b> Steve Smith Ph.D Program Supervisor, CEQA Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the 1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook or the CARB approved URBEMIS 2007 Model when preparing air quality analysis.</li> <li>• Calculate both construction and operation air quality impacts, and include air quality impacts from indirect sources (sources that generate or attract vehicular trips) in the analysis.</li> </ul>

- Quantify and compare PM2.5 emissions to the recommended PM2.5 significance thresholds.
- Calculate localized air quality impacts and compare the results to localized significance thresholds in addition to regional significance thresholds, or perform dispersion modeling as necessary.
- Perform a mobile source health risk assessment.
- Refer to Chapter 11 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook for sample air quality mitigation measures. The letter also provides other sources for examples of air quality mitigation measures.

**County Agencies**

August 6, 2007	<b>Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District</b> Teresa Tung Senior Civil Engineer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any work that involves District right-of-way, easements or facilities will require an encroachment permit from the District</li> <li>• Coordinated with the District any construction of facilities within road right-of-way that may impact District storm drains</li> <li>• Demonstrate that all construction related activities within the District right-of-way or easement are consistent with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) by including a MSHCP consistency report with the EIR</li> <li>• Address potential impacts to proposed Banning and Beaumont Master Drainage Plan facilities within the project area</li> <li>• The Proposed Project may require coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity</li> <li>• New development and significant redevelopment must implement site, source, and treatment control best management practices to minimize the discharge of pollutants in stormwater and to prevent non-stormwater discharges to the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System. Refer to a copy of the Water Quality Management Plan on the web.</li> <li>• If the proposed project will impact watercourses that may have floodplains associated with them, the DEIR should address potential direct and indirect floodplain impacts</li> </ul>
August 14, 2007	<b>County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department</b> Matthew Slowik, MURP, MPA Senior Planner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the potential aesthetic impacts associated with the Proposed Project including scenic vistas, visual character of site and surroundings, and damage/impact to heritage and significant trees.</li> <li>• Evaluate disruptions to traffic and circulation.</li> <li>• Evaluate undergrounding as an alternative.</li> </ul>

**City Agency**

July 25, 2007	<b>City of Banning</b> Gregory Murphy Burke, Williams, & Sorenson, LLP City Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIR must analyze the aesthetic impacts of the Proposed Project and the Northerly Alternative with the City of Banning.</li> <li>• Other than impacts on the Municipal Airport, EIR must consider other land use and planning impacts associated with the Proposed Project. Impacts on City planning and private projects adjacent to the airport must be considered. In addition, impacts from the Northerly Alternative on private projects in the City must be evaluated.</li> <li>• A thorough analysis of EMF impacts is needed to satisfy the requirements of CEQA.</li> <li>• EIR must evaluate the potential terrorist activities that could arise from the Proposed Project. Recent court case supports need for review of potential terrorist activities in the EIR. Also quotes statements by the FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III that acknowledge the potential for terrorists to attack power lines because they have "softer defenses" than other facilities. Requests that the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section of the EIR include this analysis.</li> </ul>
---------------	---	---

## **APPENDIX C-2**

---

Summary of Written Comments Received  
from a Private Organization

---

Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies

---

Date	From	Comments
August 2, 2007	<b>Banning Chamber of Commerce – Transportation Advisor</b> Osvaldo E. (Henry) Tappata	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a resident of the Sun Lakes community, Mr. Tappata is concerned about the increase in EMF radiation associated with the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• Mr. Tappata requests that his property and his neighbors' properties be evaluated in terms of the increase in EMF radiation.</li> <li>• Mr. Tappata attached several articles and web sources related to EMF, which are briefly described below:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Google discussion group at <a href="http://groups.google.com/group/misc.activism.progressive">http://groups.google.com/group/misc.activism.progressive</a> talking about Power Transmission Lines. The bulk of the attached discussion centers around health risks due to EMF exposure.</li> <li>○ Answers.com search for “Environmental Protection Agency.” The attached result provides a brief description of the EPA.</li> <li>○ Google.com search for “Definition of Pollution.” The first results page is attached, and the web definition provided by Google is underlined.</li> <li>○ USEPA Webpage: Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) Radiation from Power Lines. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/radtown/power-lines.htm">http://www.epa.gov/radtown/power-lines.htm</a>. Includes basic and general information on EMF radiation and the possible related health effects.</li> <li>○ Online article by Dr. Joseph Mercola, “Are EMFs Hazardous to Our Health?”. <a href="http://www.mercola.com/article/emf/emf_dangers.htm">http://www.mercola.com/article/emf/emf_dangers.htm</a>. Discusses health risks associated with EMF and provides instruction on how to measure EMF strength.</li> <li>○ Online excerpt ‘Chapter 5: Summary’ from <a href="http://www.ortho.lsuhs.edu/Faculty/Marino/EL/EL5/Summary">http://www.ortho.lsuhs.edu/Faculty/Marino/EL/EL5/Summary</a>. Discusses studies on health effects of EMFs on laboratory animals.</li> <li>○ Online excerpt ‘Point No. 2’ from <a href="http://www.ortho.lsuhs.edu/Faculty/Marino/Point2/Point2.html">http://www.ortho.lsuhs.edu/Faculty/Marino/Point2/Point2.html</a>. Discusses paradigm for thinking about EMF health effects.</li> <li>○ Letter from Brenda Salas, City of Banning Mayor, to Michael Peevey at the CPUC. Requests that the El Casco System Project be undergrounded through Sun Lakes.</li> <li>○ Online excerpt on EMF from <a href="http://www.qlinkworks.com/emfxp.htm">http://www.qlinkworks.com/emfxp.htm</a>. Discusses negative health effects of EMF exposure.</li> <li>○ Term paper by Abbie Webb of Colgate University “Midwest Power Line Expansion &amp; the EMF Debate”. From <a href="http://classes.colgate.edu/wpeck/fsem039/Power.html">http://classes.colgate.edu/wpeck/fsem039/Power.html</a>. Discusses several theories linking EMF exposure to negative health effects.</li> <li>○ Press-Enterprise article on 12/21/06 “Edison seeks approval to cancel rate increase”. Article discusses a \$500 million revenue surplus and SCE’s efforts to return the surplus to the ratepayers.</li> <li>○ “Comparison of Magnetic Fields” graphs from SCE Fact Sheet on El Casco System Project</li> <li>○ Excerpt from <u>Warning: The Electricity Around You May Be Hazardous to Your Health</u> by Sugarman. Discusses mounting legal challenges against EMF exposure. Also discusses health risks of EMF exposure.</li> <li>○ Written response from Edison to Marvin Friedman’s</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

---

questions at the SCE Open House held at Sun Lakes on January 23, 2007. These responses discuss the location of the line, the size of the towers, mitigation measures considered by Edison, the possible re-location of the line, and the possible undergrounding of the line.

- Excerpt from “Questions and Answers – EMF in the Workplace”. From <http://www.neihs.nih.gov/emfrapid/html/Q&A-Workplace>. Discusses studies and theories about health effects. Discusses ways to avoid EMF exposure. Discusses levels of EMF exposure.
-

## **APPENDIX C-3**

---

Summary of Written Comments Received  
from Private Citizens

---

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

Date	From	Comments
August 1, 2007	Mr. Marvin Friedman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mitigation methodology and plan proposed by SCE is inadequate to guarantee the health and safety of Sun Lakes Residents.</li> <li>• Members of our community will be exposed to high levels of EMF radiation for the first time since the existing wooden structure has been classified as a "Phantom Structure" by SCE and unenergized.</li> <li>• National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences recommendations and guidelines are not met or addressed by the PEA.</li> <li>• There is no question that the SCE proposal is New Construction and the City of Banning has demanded that new construction should be buried underground properly shielded to remove the EMF risk.</li> </ul>
August 1, 2007	Mr. Osvaldo Henry Tappata	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCE claims there is no EMF ("0") on the existing transmission lines adjacent to my home: not true!</li> <li>• I respectfully request the review of the existing regulations by CPUC by an unbiased panel of experts, and to establish new ones if needed.</li> <li>• And I suggest that the CPUC approval of the SCE project reference the crossing over the SLCC development, be suspended until the review is completed, or if SCE decides to re-route the new lines away from our residential area, or to bury them underground at the SLCC development, if the EMF mitigation requirement is met.</li> <li>• Several attachments were included with Mr. Tappata's comment letter, which are listed and briefly described below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SCE's Fact Sheet for the EI Casco System Project. Shows visual simulation of Proposed Project.</li> <li>○ Article in Press-Enterprise on 12/21/06 titled "Edison seeks approval to cancel rate increase". Describes Edison's plans to return a revenue surplus to ratepayers.</li> <li>○ Term paper by Abbie Webb of Colgate University "Midwest Power Line Expansion &amp; the EMF Debate". From <a href="http://classes.colgate.edu/wpeck/fsem039/Power.html">http://classes.colgate.edu/wpeck/fsem039/Power.html</a>. Discusses several theories linking EMF exposure to negative health effects.</li> <li>○ Online excerpt on EMF from <a href="http://www.qlinkworks.com/emfxp.htm">http://www.qlinkworks.com/emfxp.htm</a>. Discusses negative health effects of EMF exposure.</li> <li>○ Letter from Mr. Tappata to Mr. John Machisic, Banning City Council Member on March 23, 2007. Discusses Mr. Tappata's concern about the EMF exposure from the Proposed Project.</li> <li>○ Hand drawing of distance measurements between Mr. Tappata's home and the proposed subtransmission line.</li> <li>○ Copy of first page of SCE's Amended Application dated July 16, 2007.</li> <li>○ Copy of magnetic fields graph from SCE for Segment 4.</li> <li>○ Copy of letter from Norm Carter, Assistant Public Advisor for the CPUC, to Mr. Tappata, sent July 27, 2007. Letter references CPUC Decision D.06-01-042.</li> <li>○ Copy of first page of CPUC Decision D.06-01-042. Discusses low cost/no cost.</li> <li>○ List of observations and noted discrepancies from Mr. Tappata's reading of the NOP. States that Mr. Tappata believes that there is bias towards approval of the SCE Proposal as presented.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
August 1, 2007	Mr. Virgil Barham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the Zanja Substation is going to grow in size significantly</li> <li>• Expresses opposition to any expansion of the Zanja Substation for three reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Aesthetics</li> <li>○ Noise</li> <li>○ Unresolved emissions</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

---

August 1, 2007	Mr. Tim K. Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Expresses desire to have the subtransmission line underground based on:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Visual preference</li><li>○ Property value concerns</li><li>○ Fear of lines falling or being sheared off in a storm</li></ul></li></ul>
August 6, 2007	Mr. Ron Domme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Expresses concern that the new lines will be very close to his home and will affect electronic devices such as wireless routers and telephones. Also expresses concern that the EMF radiation will affect his neighbors' pacemakers.</li><li>• Expresses concern that the new lines will affect the ability to fight fires with helicopters and airplanes.</li><li>• Expresses concern that the noise/buzz will be constantly bothersome.</li><li>• Expresses concern that property values will be negatively affected.</li><li>• Requests that SCE re-route the line around Sun Lakes or bury the line through the Sun Lakes community.</li></ul>
August 6, 2007	Mr. Edward H. Leonhardt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concerned about noise pollution caused by the new lines.</li><li>• Concerned about visual impacts of the taller towers and increased number of lines.</li><li>• Greatly concerned about the health impacts of EMF exposure.</li><li>• Concerned about the possibility of electrocution.</li><li>• Suggests running the new subtransmission line underground through Sun Lakes.</li><li>• Suggests re-routing the project around Sun Lakes, either through the Devers-San Bernardino #2 ROW or the Devers-Valley #1 ROW.</li></ul>
August 8, 2007	Mr. & Mrs. James W. & Nancy R. Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Expresses concern about the adverse effect on the scenic vista.</li><li>• Expresses concern about the adverse effect on property values.</li><li>• Requests that the new subtransmission line either be buried or re-routed around the Sun Lakes community.</li></ul>

---

## **APPENDIX C-4**

---

Summary of Oral Comments Received at  
Scoping Meetings and on the Project  
Information Line

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings and on the Project Information Hotline**

Date	From	Comments
<b>Scoping Meeting, August 1, 2007 (2:30 pm – 4:30 pm) – Banning, CA</b>		
	Virgil Barham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is not just a transmission project but also a substation project.</li> <li>• Commenter's property is directly north of the parcel referred to as the Zanja Substation. Purchased property in 70's and area has been rezoned from farmland to one-acre residential. This project is a "downer" with regard to potential use of high-end property.</li> <li>• The current substation generates noise 24/7. Noise can be heard from any part of 8.5-acre parcel. Would like to know existing noise levels and what levels will be expected with the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• Edison purchased property with large drainage area and a fault. Wants to see what the seismic studies will show regarding this property.</li> <li>• If a school cannot be sited near transmission lines why are cities allowing residences near transmission lines. Would Edison be able to put a substation next to housing? What are Edison's future plans for this site? Could the substation increase in size and unfairly impact residences?</li> <li>• What are the emissions associated with the Proposed Project and their impact on adjacent homes?</li> </ul>
	Marvin Friedman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents comments that address lines that go through the Sun Lakes Community.</li> <li>• Commenter believes that the mitigation methodology proposed by SCE is inadequate to guarantee the health and safety of the Sun Lakes residents with homes adjacent to the proposed transmission lines. Also, mitigation is inadequate to protect the public and resident golfers.</li> <li>• Community will be exposed to EMF for the first time as the existing wooden structures were classified as "phantom" structures and are not energized.</li> <li>• High EMF could be a factor in accentuating serious illnesses to elderly population that already have compromised immune systems.</li> <li>• SCE states that no EMF standards exist, but the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences has recommendations and guidelines regarding EMF, which are not addressed in the application.</li> <li>• EIR cannot ignore EMF and potential to impact elderly population, residents near the lines, and golfers who will at times be below the transmission lines.</li> <li>• Proposed Project should be considered new construction. City of Banning has requested that the transmission lines be buried underground and properly shielded to remove the EMF risk.</li> <li>• EIR must consider that EMF has a greater impact on the elderly.</li> </ul>
	Ron Domme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Home is near power lines; 50 feet or less.</li> <li>• Currently have periodic noise from lines when they are tested or in temporary use. With the Proposed Project the noise would be 24/7.</li> <li>• Transmission lines affect computerized devices such as pace makers; concerned because a couple of residents near his home use pacemakers.</li> <li>• The Proposed Project would affect property values.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings and on the Project Information Hotline**

Date	From	Comments
	Tim Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefers the southern route of the Proposed Project and believes that placing the lines underground would be best. Proposed Project will impact less people if placed on the southern route and does not cross 10 Freeway.</li> </ul>
	Phyllis Enet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenter lost two friends to cancer that lived near the “current wires.” Concerned that [health affects] have not been considered.</li> <li>• Original meeting with Edison told that wires would be 35 feet. 75-foot pole is a concern.</li> <li>• Concerned with the potential for the poles to fall in an earthquake and cause damage to homes. Also concerned with steel poles and summer storms (lighting).</li> <li>• There have been two fires in the area. The Proposed Project would require low-flying helicopters. Poles would get in the way of firefighting.</li> <li>• ROW does not mean the right to destroy people’s lives or property values.</li> <li>• Remove lines/towers or go underground.</li> </ul>
	Milton Bracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with EMF comments made by previous speakers.</li> <li>• Abandon ROW through Sun Lakes; suggests coming out of Banning Substation to valley desert ROW, follow ROW to Highway 79 and cut down to Maraschino Substation.</li> <li>• If this route is not feasible then suggest undergrounding the line in Sun Lakes Community.</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, August 1, 2007 (6:30 pm – 8:30 pm) – Beaumont, CA</b>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm because of lack of attendance.</li> </ul>
<b>Oral Comments Received on the Project Information Hotline</b>		
August 1, 2007	Nancy Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Called to say that she went to the Beaumont meeting at 7:50 pm and no one was there. She received meeting handouts from a City employee. Concerned that an end time was identified and that the meeting ended before the advertised time.</li> <li>• Concerned with EMF and whether the Proposed Project will increase or decrease the amount of EMF near her property. She runs an equestrian treatment facility and uses sensitive equipment. How will EMF affect this equipment? Wants analysis of EMF to consider safety and health as well as impacts to businesses.</li> </ul>

## **APPENDIX C-5**

---

### Summary of Agency Consultations

### Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
<b>County</b>		
Riverside County Planning Department Desert Planning Office Adam Rush, Principal Planner	May 29, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Rush by phone and provided a brief description of the project as well as mentioned that El Casco Substation would be within the Norton Younglove Reserve. He asked for a Project Fact Sheet and requested additional information on the County's approvals or permits for the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map.</li> </ul>
Riverside County Regional Park and Open-Space District Cesar Quinones, Administrative Manager	May 31, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Quinones by phone and left a brief voice message regarding the project and asked about his interest in meeting to discuss issues the County may have with the use of the Norton Younglove Reserve for the El Casco Substation.</li> <li>• Mr. Quinones stated that he is interested in a Project briefing. No meeting has been set to date but a Project Fact Sheet with 11x17 map was emailed to him.</li> </ul>
Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency (Responsible for operations of Banning Municipal Airport) John Guerin	May 29, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Guenn by phone and provided a description of the project and information on early consultation with those agencies and jurisdictions that may be impacted by the Proposed Project. Mr. Guenn is responsible for determining land use compatibility issues for projects impacting the Banning airport.</li> <li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map.</li> </ul>
San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department Matt Slowik, Supervising Planner	May 29, 2007 through June 15, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Slowik by phone to provide information on the project. He requested a Fact Sheet describing project, and a map.</li> <li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map</li> </ul>
<b>City</b>		
City of Banning Community Development Department Oscar Orci, Planning Director	May 30, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Orci by phone and offered a fact sheet about the project and interest in meeting with the El Casco Project Management team to discuss the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map.</li> </ul>
City of Banning Utility Department Jim Earhart, Electric Utility Director	May 30, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Earhart by phone and left a brief voice message regarding the Proposed Project and interest in a face-to-face meeting. Received email requesting a Project Fact Sheet.</li> <li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map.</li> </ul>
City of Beaumont Planning Department Ernest Egger, Planning Director	May 29, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Egger by phone and left a brief voice mail describing the project, letting them know that we are at the very beginning stages of the environmental review process and are looking to do early consultation with those agencies and jurisdictions that may be impacted by the Proposed Project. Mr. Egger responded by asking for a copy of the Project Fact Sheet</li> <li>• Mailed hard copy of Fact Sheet with 11x17 map.</li> </ul>
City of Calimesa Planning Department Gabriel Elliott, Director	May 29, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted Mr. Elliott by phone and left a brief voice message describing the project, letting them know that we are at the very beginning stages of the environmental review process and are looking to do early consultation with those agencies and jurisdictions that may be impacted by the Proposed Project. Noted that an alternative and fiber optic cable routing would be in the City of Calimesa.</li> <li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map</li> </ul>

City of Redlands Community Development Department Jeffrey Shaw, Director	May 29, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Contacted Mr. Shaw and left a brief voice message describing the project, letting them know that we are at the very beginning stages of the environmental review process and are looking to do early consultation with those agencies and jurisdictions that may be impacted by the Proposed Project. Noted that the project would involve placement of fiber optic cable on existing towers and underground vaults in the City of Redlands.</li><li>• Received return calls with a request to send three copies of the Fact Sheet to Mr. Shaw, Mr. Mutter and the City Managers office.</li><li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map and mailed hard copy of the Fact Sheet to Civic Center address (City Manager's Office).</li></ul>
City of Yucaipa Community Development and Planning Department John McMains, Director of Community Development	May 29, 2007 through June 13, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Contacted Mr. McMains's office and spoke with an agency representative regarding the project. The City requested a copy of the Project Fact Sheet.</li><li>• Emailed Fact Sheet with 11x17 map.</li></ul>

---