

# 1. Introduction

This report, Scoping Report Part 2, documents the results of the second public comment period held for the Sunrise Powerlink Project (SRPL). A second public scoping period was held from January 22 through February 24, 2007 to allow the public an opportunity to provide input to the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) Team on its preliminary assessment of all identified alternatives. Additional public meetings were conducted on February 5-9, 2007 to provide another venue for public and agency input on the Proposed Project alternatives. The second public scoping period and meetings resulted from an October 19, 2006 Ruling, that determined a second scoping period be held to solicit comments from the public on the alternatives proposed to be fully analyzed in the EIR/EIS as well as those eliminated from detailed analysis.

Scoping Report Part 1 for SRPL, published November 2006, documented the issues and concerns expressed by members of the public, government agencies, and organizations during the first public scoping period held from September 15, 2006 through October 20, 2006. During this first public scoping period, public scoping meetings were held from October 2 through October 5, 2006.

**Project Background.** The environmental review of the SRPL project is being conducted by two lead agencies, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for the State of California and the United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for the United States, and therefore is regulated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under California law and by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) under federal law. San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), the Project proponent, has filed an application with the CPUC for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for approval to construct SRPL. In addition, SDG&E has filed an application for a Right-of-Way Grant with the BLM. As part of the approval process, the CPUC and BLM will prepare the EIR/EIS, which will evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with SRPL and will identify mitigation measures to reduce these impacts, where possible.

While the public scoping requirements for CEQA and NEPA differ slightly, the intent of each process remains the same — to initiate the public scoping for the EIR/EIS, provide information about the SRPL Project, and solicit information that will be helpful in the environmental review process.

## 1.1 Purpose of Scoping

The process of determining the focus and content of the EIR/EIS is known as scoping. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and eliminates from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the Proposed Project. The scoping process is not intended to resolve differences of opinion regarding the Proposed Project or evaluate its merits. Instead, the process allows all interested parties to express their concerns regarding the Proposed Project and thereby ensures that all opinions and comments are considered in the environmental analysis. Scoping is an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Members of the public, relevant federal, State, regional and local agencies, interests groups, community organizations, and other interested parties may participate in the scoping process by providing comments or recommendations regarding issues to be investigated in the EIR/EIS.

Comments received during the scoping process are part of the public record as documented in Part 1 and Part 2 of the scoping reports. The comments and questions received during the public scoping process have been reviewed and considered by the CPUC and BLM in determining the appropriate scope of

issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS and in the selection of alternatives to be carried forward for further analysis.

The purpose of the second round of scoping for SRPL was to:

- Inform the public and relevant public agencies about the SRPL Project, Project alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS, CEQA and NEPA requirements, and the environmental impact analysis process;
- Solicit input on the alternatives to the SRPL Project for evaluation in the EIR/EIS; and
- Update the mailing list of public agencies and individuals interested in future project meetings and notices.

## 1.2 Summary of SRPL Project and Alternatives

### 1.2.1 Proposed Project

SDG&E proposes transmission line and facility upgrades in San Diego and Imperial Counties. The entire Project would span a total of 150 miles (676 new towers), including a 91-mile 500-kilovolt (kV) transmission line (in Imperial County and eastern San Diego County) and a new 59-mile 230 kV line (in central and western San Diego County) that includes both overhead and underground segments. It would also include a new substation in central San Diego County and upgrades at four existing substations. The Project includes five segments or links as follows:

- **Imperial Valley Link** – This 61-mile segment would start at SDG&E’s Imperial Valley Substation (near the City of El Centro) and end at the eastern boundary of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP). This route would include 204 new 500 kV towers, new access roads, and for a portion of the route, a new 200-foot right of way (ROW).
- **Anza-Borrego Link** – This link would include 22.6 miles through ABDSP. This segment would include 141 new structures on an existing 100-foot-wide ROW, which would require an additional 50-feet of ROW. This link would affect 43 acres of land currently designated as State Wilderness.
- **Central Link** – This 27.3-mile route would begin on the western boundary of ABDSP, to the Central East Substation (a new substation proposed as part of this Project), and then continue south-southwest on the east side of SR-78. This link would include 156 new towers (both 500 and 230 kV) within a new 200- to 300-foot-wide ROW.
- **Inland Valley Link** – This link would extend from Santa Ysabel, south of central Ramona, and end at the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation on the north edge of MCAS Miramar. The route would include 125 230 kV structures. South of Ramona, a portion of the transmission line would be placed underground.
- **Coastal Link** – This 13.6-mile link would begin at the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation and end at the existing Peñasquitos Substation in the Torrey Hills area of the City of San Diego. This segment would include 48 new structures and a 5.9-mile underground portion (west of Chicarita Substation).

### 1.2.2 Alternatives Identified by the EIR/EIS team

The alternatives identified by the EIR/EIS team fall into four categories as follows:

- **Routing Alternatives** – These alternatives deviate from the proposed route to avoid sensitive areas, but would still connect the existing Imperial Valley Substation to a new central San Diego County substation by crossing Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP), switching from a 500 kV to a 230 kV line, and end at Peñasquitos Substation in the City of San Diego.
- **Non-Park Alternatives** – These alternative routes would avoid ABDSP by following a portion of the existing Southwest Powerlink south of the Park, then turning north to continue along the proposed route to the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation. Most of these routes would traverse Cleveland National Forest.
- **Non-Wire Alternatives** – These alternatives include in-area generation, renewable energy, and energy efficiency options for San Diego County as well as combinations using available infrastructure and new generation to meet project objectives.
- **Project System Alternatives** – System alternatives rely on different transmission line upgrades and interconnections to allow the free flow of power between generators and population centers, to relieve congestion, and to reduce operational costs of the transmission system. Within the project area, these alternatives include upgrades to the existing transmission infrastructure, different voltage configurations of the proposed line, interconnections to points other than the Imperial Valley Substation, or alternative transmission technologies.

## 1.3 Scoping Report Organization

This scoping report includes four main sections and appendices, as described below:

- Section 1 provides an introduction to the report and describes the purpose of scoping and a brief overview of the SRPL Project and alternatives considered for analysis in the EIR/EIS.
- Section 2 provides information on the scoping meeting and notification materials, including the Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings.
- Section 3 summarizes the comments received and issues raised during the scoping comment period.
- Section 4 describes the next steps in the EIR/EIS process.
- Appendices consist of all the supporting materials used during scoping as well as copies of comment letters. The appendices include copies of the Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings, Notice of Preparation, Notice of Intent, and meeting materials provided at the public scoping meetings.

# 2. Project Scoping

This section describes the methods used to notify the public and agencies about the second scoping process conducted for SRPL. It outlines how information was made available for public and agency review and identifies the different avenues available for providing comments on the Project (meetings, fax, email, mail, and phone).

## 2.1 Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings on Alternatives

On January 22, 2007, the CPUC and BLM mailed the Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings on Alternatives (Notice). While this second round of scoping was not required by CEQA or NEPA, the

CPUC’s Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Weissman requested it to solicit comments from the public on the alternatives recommended by the EIR/EIS team and those recommended to be eliminated from detailed analysis. The Ruling was initiated by a motion filed by the Sierra Club and the Center for Biological Diversity requesting the scoping period be extended and that additional scoping meetings be held.

The Notice included information on the public scoping meetings that were held on February 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, 2007 in El Centro, San Diego-Rancho Peñasquitos, Julian, Ramona, Boulevard, Alpine, Borrego Springs, and Temecula. The Notice included information on the 30-day public scoping period. The second public review period ended on February 24, 2007. However, on a case-by-case basis extensions were provided to this review period to allow agencies, organizations, and citizens sufficient time to comment on the Proposed Project Alternatives.

Approximately 12,600 copies of the Notice were distributed to federal, State, regional, and local agencies; elected officials; and the general public. This mailing was significantly larger than the first scoping period because the database was updated to add in those individuals that requested to be added to the mailing list and to add those that submitted written comments during the first scoping period. The mailing included the following approximate distribution:

- 236 agency representatives and area planning groups (includes over 65 different agencies)
- 52 environmental groups/organizations
- 63 tribal government representatives
- 41 elected officials
- 12,208 private citizens and other interested parties (including property owners within 300 feet of the Project corridor and alternative routes)

In addition, twenty six additional copies of the Notice were delivered to the local repository sites. The Notice and SRPL-related documents are available for review at the following repository sites:

---

**Table 1. Repository Sites**

Repository Sites	Address and Phone
<b>Imperial County – Public Libraries and BLM Office</b>	
Brawley Public Library	400 Main Street, Brawley, CA (760) 344-1891
Calexico Public Library	850 Encinas Avenue, Calexico, CA (760) 339-2470
El Centro Public Library	539 West State Street, El Centro, CA (760) 337-4565
Imperial Public Library	200 West 9th Street, Imperial, CA (760) 355-1332
BLM – El Centro Field Office	1661 South 4th Street, El Centro, CA (760) 337-4400
<b>San Diego County – Public Libraries and CPUC Office</b>	
Alpine Branch Library	2130 Arnold Way, Alpine, CA (619) 445-4221
Borrego Springs Public Library	571A Palm Canyon Drive, Borrego Springs, CA (760) 767-5761
Campo-Morena Village Branch Library	31356 Highway 94, Campo, CA (619) 478-5945
Carmel Mountain Ranch Library	12095 World Trade Drive, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8181
Descanso Branch Library	9545 River Drive, Descanso, CA (619) 445-5279
El Cajon Branch Library	201 East Douglas, El Cajon, CA (619) 588-3718
Jacumba Branch Library	44605 Old Highway 80, Jacumba, CA (619) 766-4608
Julian Branch Library	1850 Highway 78, Julian, CA (760) 765-0370
Lakeside Branch Library	9839 Vine Street, Lakeside, CA (619) 443-1811

**Table 1. Repository Sites**

Repository Sites	Address and Phone
Pine Valley Branch Library	28804 Old Highway 80, Pine Valley, CA (619) 473-8022
Potrero Branch Library	24883 Potrero Valley Road, Potrero, CA (619) 478-5978
Poway Public Library	13137 Poway Road, Poway, CA (858) 513-2900
Ramona Public Library	1406 Montecito Road, Ramona, CA (760) 738-2434
Rancho Peñasquitos Library	13330 Salmon River Road, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8159
San Diego City Central Library	820 E Street, San Diego, CA (858) 484-4440
Scripps Miramar Ranch Library	10301 Scripps Lake Drive, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8158
Spring Valley Branch Library	836 Kempton Street, Spring Valley, CA (619) 463-3006
CPUC – San Diego Office	1350 Front Street, Room 4006, San Diego, CA (619) 525-4217
<b>Other Government Offices</b>	
BLM – North Palm Springs Field Office	690 West Garnet Avenue, North Palm Springs, CA (760) 251-4849
CPUC – Los Angeles Office	320 West 4th Street, Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA (213) 576-7000
CPUC – San Francisco Office	505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2103, San Francisco, CA (415) 703-2074

## 2.2 Public Scoping Meetings

The CPUC and BLM held eight public scoping meetings in different locations in San Diego and Imperial Counties on February 5–9, 2007. The scoping meetings provided an opportunity for the public and government agencies to obtain more information on the SRPL Project and alternatives, to learn more about the CEQA and NEPA processes, to ask questions regarding the SRPL Project, and to provide formal comments on the SRPL Project alternatives to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

### Meeting Locations and Handouts

The scoping meetings were held at the locations and on the dates specified on Table 2. Handouts and informational materials available at each meeting are listed below. Refer to Appendices A and B for copies of these materials.

- Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings
- PowerPoint Presentation
- Self-Addressed Speaker Comment Sheet
- Speaker Registration Card

Other information was also made available for public review, which included a copy of the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment and detailed maps of the proposed and alternative routes.

A court reporter recorded all oral comments presented at the meetings. Appendix D-4 presents the transcripts for each of the public scoping meetings. In addition, the CPUC and BLM provided Spanish translation services at the El Centro and Borrego Springs meetings in the event that such services were needed.

**Table 2. Public Scoping Meetings**

<b>Date and Time</b>	<b>Meeting Location</b>	<b>Sign-Ins</b>	<b>Oral Comments</b>	<b>Written Comments</b>
<b>Monday February 5, 2007</b> 12:30 pm to 2:30 pm	<b>EI Centro</b> Imperial County Board of Supervisors 940 West Main St. Suite 219 EI Centro, CA 92243	24	9	0
<b>Monday February 5, 2007</b> 7:30 pm – 9:30 pm	<b>San Diego – Rancho Peñasquitos</b> Doubletree Golf Resort 14455 Peñasquitos Drive San Diego, CA 92129	90	14	6
<b>Tuesday February 6, 2006</b> 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm	<b>Wynola/Julian</b> Wynola Pizza Express 4355 Hwy 78 Julian, CA 92036	77	28	11
<b>Tuesday February 6, 2006</b> 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm	<b>Ramona</b> San Vicente Inn 24157 San Vicente Rd Ramona, CA 92065	63	15	5
<b>Wednesday February 7, 2006</b> 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm	<b>Boulevard</b> Boulevard Fire Dept 39223 Hwy 94 Boulevard, CA 91905	42	15	2
<b>Wednesday February 7, 2006</b> 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm	<b>Alpine</b> Alpine Community Center 1830 Alpine Blvd Alpine, CA 91901	80	21	2
<b>Thursday February 8, 2006</b> 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm	<b>Borrego Springs</b> Borrego Springs Resort 1112 Tilting T Drive Borrego Springs, CA 92004	174	36	9
<b>Friday February 9, 2006</b> 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm	<b>Temecula</b> City of Temecula City Hall 43200 Business Park Dr Temecula, CA 92590	46	18	5
<b>Totals</b>		<b>596</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>40</b>

## Newspaper Advertisements

The dates and locations of the public scoping meetings were advertised in eleven local and regional newspapers. Two of the ads were published in Spanish in the *Adelante Valle* and *El Latino* newspapers. The advertisements provided a brief description of the types of alternatives that were to be discussed and encouraged attendance at the meetings to share comments on the Project alternatives. The meeting advertisements were placed in the newspapers presented in Table 3 (also see Appendix B-1 for copies of these advertisements).

Table 3. Newspaper Advertisements

Newspaper	Type	Run Date	
Adelante Valle	Weekly	February 1, 2007	
Alpine Sun	Daily	January 25, 2007	February 1, 2007
Borrego Sun	Weekly	January 25, 2007	
El Latino	Weekly	January 26 – February 1, 2007	
Imperial Valley Press	Daily	January 20, 2007	January 29, 2007
North County Times	Daily	January 21, 2007	January 29, 2007
Press Enterprise	Daily	January 21, 2007	January 29, 2007
Ramona Sentinel	Weekly	January 25, 2007	February 1, 2007
San Diego Business Journal	Weekly	January 29, 2007	
San Diego Union Tribune	Daily	January 20, 2007	January 29, 2007
The Valley News	Weekly	January 26, 2007	February 2, 2007

## Agency and Tribal Government Consultation

Several key federal, State, and local agencies and tribal governments were contacted by phone to provide information on the Project Alternatives and to determine interest in face-to-face meetings. These agencies and tribal governments received the Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings. Ten requests (listed below) for meetings were received after publication of the first Scoping Report in November 2006.

- County of Imperial, Planning Department
- Cleveland National Forest
- California State Parks – Anza-Borrego Desert State Park
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
- Marine Corps Air Station Miramar
- El Centro Naval Air Station
- City of San Diego, Community Development Department
- San Diego Regional Energy Office
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
- Vista Irrigation District

Since the publication of the Scoping Report Part 1 in November 2006, one agency and three tribal governments (listed below) have requested meetings. The comments received during the face-to-face consultations are summarized in Appendix C-5.

- Marine Corps Air Station Miramar
- Campo Kumeyaay Nation
- Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
- Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians

## 2.3 Outreach

The CPUC and BLM also provided opportunities for the public and agencies to ask questions or comment on the SRPL Project outside of the meetings. A public hotline, email address, and website were established and available during the public comment period. Information on these additional outreach efforts are described below.

### Project Information Hotline

In order to offer another opportunity to inquire about the scoping meetings or the SRPL Project, a hotline [(866) 711-3106] was established to take oral comments and questions from those unable to attend the meetings. Telephone messages were retrieved daily and all calls were responded to within a 48-hour period. The hotline also served as a fax line to allow for comments to be submitted by fax instead of mail. Comments received through this hotline (voice or fax) have been considered and incorporated in this report.

### Email Address

An email address was established for the SRPL Project ([sunrise@aspenerg.com](mailto:sunrise@aspenerg.com)) to provide another means of submitting comments on the scope of the EIR/EIS. The email address was provided on meeting handouts and posted on the website. Comments received by email have been considered and incorporated in this report.

### Internet Website

Information about the SRPL Project was made available through the Project website hosted by the CPUC. During the January/February 2007 scoping period, the website included electronic versions of the Project application, and other Project-related documents and maps, and thus provided another public venue to learn about the Project. The website will remain a public resource for the Project and will announce future public meetings and hearings. The website address is:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/aspeng/sunrise/sunrise.htm>

## 3. Scoping Comments

This section summarizes the comments raised by the public and agencies during the second scoping period for the SRPL EIR/EIS. This summary is based upon both written and oral comments that were received during the scoping review period, which officially extended from January 24, 2007 to February 24, 2007. On a case-by-case basis, members of the public and agencies were provided extensions to this scoping period in order to allow sufficient time for comment. All written and oral comments received during the public comment period, during the public scoping meetings, through the phone line (voice/fax), and through email were reviewed for this report and for the EIR/EIS. Section 3.1 summarizes the key issues that were raised in relation to the Project Alternatives. Section 3.2 references Appendix C, which summarizes all written and oral comments received during the scoping period.

Over 156 individuals presented oral comments during the second round of scoping meetings, and 289 comment letters were submitted during the January–February 2007 scoping process. In addition, form letters from 31 individuals and a petition signed by 93 people were submitted. In addition to private individuals, 8 gov-

ernment agencies, 43 community and private organizations, and 2 tribal governments submitted written comments. The list below presents the agencies and organizations that submitted written comments.

### **Government Agencies and Special Districts**

- California Regional Water Quality Control Board
- California State Lands Commission
- Cleveland National Forest
- County of San Diego
- Native American Heritage Commission
- San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park (Joint Powers Authority)
- Vista Irrigation District

### **Private Organizations and Companies**

- Acctiva Corporation
- Back Country Coalition
- Back Country Horseman
- Bloomdale Ranch Partnership
- Boy Scouts of America
- CBH
- California State Parks Foundation
- California State Park Rangers Association
- California Wilderness Coalition
- Campo/Lake Morena Planning Group
- Castle Eurasia Corp./Zen Media Corp.
- Center for Biological Diversity
- Community Alliance for Sensible Energy (CASE)
- Concerned Residents of Boulder Creek
- Crest, Dehesa, Granite Hills, Harbison Canyon Planning Group
- Desert Protective Council
- Environmental Health Coalition
- Friends of Goodan Beach and Sycamore Canyon
- Haagen Company, LLC
- La Jolla Industries
- Mountain Empire Resources Information Taskforce
- Mussey Grade Road Alliance
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- NRG Energy Inc.
- Pine Valley Community Planning Group
- Protect our Communities Fund
- Peace Engineering, Inc
- People's Powerlink
- Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens
- Raceland Holdings, LLC
- San Diego Conservation Resources Network
- San Diego Country Estates
- San Diego Gas and Electric

- Santa Ysabel General Store
- Santa Ysabel Ranch
- SD Center for BioPsychosynthesis
- Sierra Club (Conservation Groups)
- Spangler Peak Ranch
- Tulloch Family Partners
- United States Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association
- Utility Consumer's Action Network (UCAN)
- West Chase Homeowners Association

#### **Tribal Governments**

- Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
- Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
- Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
- Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians

### **3.1 Key Issues Raised during the Public Comment Period**

As discussed above, written and oral comments were provided by members of the public, organizations, and government agencies. The discussion below presents the key issues identified from the written and oral comments received on the Project. The specific issues raised during the second public scoping process focused on the proposed project alternatives as presented in the scoping meetings and in written notices regarding this phase of the project. During this second scoping period, comments addressed from agencies, community organizations, and residents focused on opposition to the project in general, opposition to routing the Project through ABDSP, implementation of non-wire alternatives instead of the Proposed Project, and preferences for specific alternative routes. Close to 600 individuals participated in the scoping meetings and 289 written comments were received during the second scoping process. Several residents and organizations submitted more than one comment letter and presented oral comments at more than one meeting. Appendix C provides a summary of all of the comments received and Appendix D includes copies of all written correspondence provided on the project.

#### **3.1.1 Comments on Preliminary Retained Alternatives**

The key purpose of the second round of scoping meetings was to solicit comments on the alternatives that were proposed to be retained and studied further in the EIR/EIS. These alternatives were summarized in the Notice that was distributed approximately two weeks prior to the scoping meetings. The Notice included information on the purpose of the meetings and the date, time, and location of the meetings. It also provided information on the scoping period and the avenues available to submit formal written comments. Table 4 presents a summary of the comments made regarding the alternatives that were identified as retained in the Notice of the second scoping meeting. Appendices C and D include additional information and the content of these comments.

**Table 4. Comments Made on Preliminary Retained Alternatives**

<b>Retained Project Alternatives</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of comments stated a preference for the No Action Alternative. The comments generally indicated that there was no solid basis established for the need for the SRPL Project and therefore the No Action Alternative was the preferred option.</li> <li>• County of San Diego requested that the No Project Alternative consider regional energy need and multiple options for achieving regional need.</li> </ul>
<b>Imperial Valley and Anza-Borrego Link</b> a. SDG&E Desert Western b. Imperial Valley FTHL d. Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2 d. Overhead 500 kV ABDSP within existing 100-foot ROW e. SDG&E Bullfrog Farms f. Huff Road Bullfrog Farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were a number of organization and individuals that opposed the Imperial Valley FTHL Alternative.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E expressed concern with the SR78 to S2 alternative because of technical, engineering, and environmental concerns. Requested consideration of Borrego Valley Underground Alternative if want underground route through the Park. Strongly encourages lead agencies to carry forward the ABDSP Borrego Valley Alternative.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E also encourages consideration of an alternative to the Imperial Valley FTHL Alternative to avoid impacts to a proposed development. Also encourages consideration of West Main Canal–Huff Road Modification Alternative to avoid impacts to a proposed race track.</li> <li>• County of San Diego requested that the SDG&amp;E Desert Western Alternative be eliminated due to wilderness impacts. Supports the underground option of the 230 kV ABDSP SR 78 to S2 Alternative.</li> </ul>
<b>Central Link</b> a. Santa Ysabel Existing ROW b. Santa Ysabel Partial Underground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support for the Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Alternative from the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Park agency.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E encourages consideration of a Santa Ysabel Partial Underground modified. States that the Existing ROW alternative would have significant visual and cultural impacts.</li> <li>• County of San Diego recommends eliminating the Santa Ysabel Existing ROW and Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Alternative due to insignificant reduction of potential visual impacts. Urges retaining the Santa Ysabel SR79 All Underground Alternative.</li> </ul>
<b>Inland Valley Link</b> a. CNF Existing 69 kV Route b. Oak Hollow Road Underground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Starlight Mountain Estate owners and several property owners stated their support for the Oak Hollow Road Underground Alternative.</li> <li>• County of San Diego supports retaining these two alternatives.</li> <li>• The Forest Service agrees with retaining the CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative with mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Coastal Link</b> a. Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North b. MCAS Miramar All Underground and Underground/Overhead d. Rancho Peñasquitos Blvd. Bike Path e. Carmel Valley Road f. Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road g. Black Mountain to Park Village Road Underground h. Coastal Link System Upgrade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West Chase Homeowners Association and several property owners requested retaining State Route 56 as an alternative in the interest of the community and public.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E states that the MCAS Miramar Alternative may not be feasible because of land rights, narrow roads, and unfavorable terrain.</li> <li>• Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Residents expressed support for transmission upgrades over the coastal link portion and alternatives. Requests further consideration of MCAS Miramar and disagrees with elimination of Mercy Road to Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Alternative.</li> <li>• County of San Diego supports studying all of these alternatives except requests more information on the Coastal Link System Upgrade.</li> </ul>
<b>Substation Alternatives</b> a. SDG&E Central South Substation b. Mataguay Substation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few commented on the substation alternatives. However, the Vista Irrigation District and the Boy Scouts of America strongly oppose the Mataguay substation because of its impact on the Warner Valley and its impact on the Mataguay Scout Ranch.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E also stated concerns regarding the Mataguay Substation Alternative because of potential impacts to Stephen's kangaroo rat habitat.</li> </ul>

**Table 4. Comments Made on Preliminary Retained Alternatives**

Retained Project Alternatives	Comment Summary
<b>Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)</b> a. Route D b. Interstate-8 (I-8) c. BCD d. West of Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial comment from agencies, organizations and individuals regarding the I-8 and West of Forest Alternatives. Many comments supported the implementation of the I-8 Alternative, while the majority of the comments opposed the West of Forest Alternative. There was one comment in favor of the West of Forest Alternative.</li> <li>• Received one comment in favor of eliminating routes B and BC from consideration. However, one tribal government urged that routes B and C be considered in the evaluation because of the wind energy available along these routes. Another tribal government endorsed the I-8 Alternative but suggested it cross the Campo Reservation north of the I-8.</li> <li>• The Forest Service agrees with the elimination of SWPL Alternatives B, C, and B-C, and recommends elimination of Route D Alternative east of Loveland Substation, and the I-8 Alternative. Agrees with retaining a modified version of Routes BCD and Route D south of Loveland Substation as well as West of Forest Alternatives with mitigation..</li> <li>• Hang gliding and Paragliding Association objects to I-8, BCD, and West of Forest Alternative because of impacts to two popular hang gliding/paragliding locations. Concerned Residents of Boulder Creek objects to I-8, BCD, and D routes.</li> </ul>
<b>Non-Wires</b> a. New In-area Renewable Generation b. New In-area All-Source Generation c. Resource Bundle 1: In-Area All-Source Generation Plus Demand Response d. Resource Bundle 2: In-Area All-Source Generation, Demand Response, and Renewable Energy Certificates e. In-area Generation Plus Transmission Upgrades	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial comment was received on the need to pursue non-wire alternatives instead of the SRPL project. Organizations and individuals favored in-basin generation and stated that they preferred these alternatives for San Diego County.</li> <li>• San Diego government agencies provided comments that supported the consideration of in-area generation.</li> <li>• Environmental Health Coalition recommends removing South Bay Replacement Project because of its regulatory infeasibility.</li> </ul>
<b>System Alternatives</b> a. LEAPS Project or Serrano/Valley-North 500 kV b. Mexico Light 230 kV c. Path 44 Upgrade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal comment received on these alternatives, but the Community Alliance for Sensible Energy expressed support for the Mexico Light and the Path 44 Alternatives.</li> <li>• Some landowners objected to the LEAPS Project because it would impact their homes while others thought it would be less expensive and would be a less invasive alternative.</li> <li>• The Forest Service agrees with the elimination of the Serrano/Valley Central 500 kV Full Loop Alternative and finds that retaining the LEAPS Project Alternative should depend on FERC approval.</li> </ul>

### 3.1.2 Project Need and In-Area Generation

Many commenters felt that the need for the Project had not been clearly established and, therefore, the focus should be on in-area generation. Comments provided evidence of the workability of in-area generation and one company explained that during the energy crunch it was independent producers and SDG&E that supplied energy for the region. Commenters suggested that in-area generation was the preferred and only feasible option. Similar to the previous scoping period, concern was expressed by private citizens and organizations that the Project had the potential to import “dirty” unregulated energy from Mexico.

### 3.1.3 Comments on the Proposed Project and the ABDSP Route

There was a substantial number of commenters that opposed the project altogether and others that opposed the Project going through ABDSP. Although opposition to the Project and to the route through ABDSP

was identified in the first scoping period, during the second scoping period there was a larger number of comments that explicitly stated this opposition.

The concerns centered on the use of ABDSP (proposed route) and Cleveland National Forest land (potential alternative route) for the project. Environmental organizations and community groups continue to strongly oppose the use of ABDSP for the project. Commenters emphasized the need to preserve public lands and protect the natural quality of the park. Another major concern is the proposed project's location within State Wilderness and the required re-designation of wilderness land to allow relocation of the existing corridor within ABDSP to avoid a cultural site. There were significant concerns from community and environmental groups that the project would have significant impacts to biological resources within ABDSP. Commenters have asked that a thorough evaluation of biological resources be conducted in order to effectively mitigate potential impacts to biological resources.

### 3.1.4 Tribal Government Concerns

Four comment letters were received from tribal governments and one from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC expressed concern on behalf of tribes in San Diego and Imperial Counties with regard to the lack of information and inadequate consultation and urged the BLM to be proactive in providing tribes adequate opportunity for consultation on the Proposed Project. The Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians requested expedient government-to-government consultation and expressed concern with ancestral lands and the surrounding community and stated their opposition to the Project. Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians also requested government-to-government consultation on this project and requested additional information on the project such as detailed maps and aerial photographs of the alternative routes.

The Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians expressed concern with the evaluation of Project alternatives. Specifically, the tribe is requesting that Alternative B (preferred) or C (identified in SDG&E's PEA and eliminated from consideration in the preliminary analysis) be seriously concerned in the analysis of alternatives. The tribe believes that SDG&E will need to rely on the wind energy along alternative routes B and C in order to meet its renewable energy goals.

The Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians expressed opposition to the Proposed Project route through ABDSP and endorsed the I-8 Alternative route with a reroute. The tribe suggested that the route cross the Campo Reservation north of the I-8 to reduce impacts to businesses and residential areas south of the interstate. The letter acknowledges that this may be difficult but offers assistance in exploring this reroute. In addition, the tribe asks that the EIR team study the impacts of the I-8 Alternative on the Campo Reservation.

### 3.1.5 Other Issues

#### Conflicts with Existing and Proposed Land Uses

A number of residents expressed concern with the placement of towers near their homes and the impact it would have on the use of their property. Homeowner groups continue to support and request that the transmission line be placed underground in their neighborhoods. Concern raised by Castle Eurasia Corporation/Zen Media Corporation regarding the Proposed Project's impact on the Imperial Gateway Development project. This organization recommended that the line be placed at least one mile away from their proposed development.

## Fire Risk and EMF

The Forest Service and property owners near the proposed and existing transmission corridor were concerned with the potential for wildfires and fire management. Commenters wanted thorough analysis of how the SRPL Project could contribute to fires and felt that having the project close to their homes or to areas of dense vegetation such as preserve lands and ABDSP made their community more susceptible to fires. In addition, there was concern that the power lines would be an obstruction to low-flying planes, which would present another significant safety risk to neighborhoods near the transmission corridor.

Another key issue was the EMF impact on cattle and farming along the Project route. Commenters believe that the transmission lines would be detrimental to the dairy industry, and would have significant impacts on operation of an existing dairy. The potential health and safety-related issues resulting from increased EMF emissions, especially in those neighborhoods where additional towers and lines would be placed within an existing corridor was also identified.

## 3.2 Summary of All Public and Agency Comments

Appendix C presents a comprehensive summary of all oral and written comments received from the general public, government agencies, and private companies. Appendices C-1 to C-3 provide a summary of all written comments received. Appendix C-4 presents a summary of all comments received at the scoping meetings. Appendix C-5 presents a summary of the agency consultations conducted as part of the scoping process. Appendix D includes copies of written comments received on the SRPL Project and the transcripts of the scoping meetings.

# 4. Next Steps in EIR/EIS Process

## 4.1 EIR/EIS Events and Documents

While scoping is the initial step in the environmental review process, additional opportunities to comment on the project EIR/EIS will be provided. Both the CPUC and the BLM will hold additional meetings when the Draft EIR/EIS is released for public review. Table 5 presents the proposed schedule for the EIR/EIS and identifies where in the process the public and agencies can provide additional input in the environmental review process.

Table 5. EIR/EIS Events and Documents

Event/Document	Purpose	Approximate Date
<b>Completed Events/Documents</b>		
Notice of Intent (NOI)	NOI published in the Federal Register	Initiated the public scoping process and served to inform other cooperating agencies of the BLM's and CPUC's intent to prepare an EIR/EIS.
Notice of Preparation (NOP)	Release of NOP	Notified interested parties and agencies of the CPUC's and BLM's intent to prepare an EIR/EIS.
	Public Review Period	Held public scoping period on the project to provide for public comments on the scope of EIR/EIS.
Scoping Meetings – NOP	Seven scoping meetings were held	Presented information on the project and provided opportunity for public and agency comments in a public forum.

**Table 5. EIR/EIS Events and Documents**

<b>Event/Document</b>		<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Approximate Date</b>
Scoping Report (Part 1)		Reported public and agency comments on the proposed project and environmental issues of concern to the public and agencies.	December 2006
<b>Upcoming Events/Documents</b>			
Project Alternatives Scoping Meetings	Additional scoping meetings held February 5-9, 2007	Presents information on the project and provides opportunity for public and agency comments in a public forum regarding the proposed project alternatives to be fully analyzed in the EIR/EIS and those proposed to be eliminated from detailed analysis.	February 5 -9, 2007
Alternatives Conclusion Notice		Presents information on the alternatives retained for or eliminated from full analysis in the EIR/EIS resulting from input from the public and agencies.	March 26, 2007
Scoping Report (Part 2)		Updates Scoping Report to include public and agency comments on the proposed project alternatives and environmental issues of concern to the public and agencies from second round of scoping meetings.	April 2, 2007
Draft EIR/EIS	Release of Draft EIR/EIS	Presents impacts and mitigation for the Proposed Project and its alternatives	July 13, 2007
	Public Review Period	CEQA: 45-day minimum review period for State agencies. NEPA: BLM requires a 90-day when Plan Amendment is required.	July 13, 2007 to October 2007 (90 days)
	Draft EIR/EIS Public Meetings	Allows for public comment on the draft document	Summer 2007
Final EIR/EIS	Release of Final EIR/EIS	Final EIR/EIS, with response to comments, issued by CPUC and BLM Final EIR/EIS is filed with U.S. EPA	November 20, 2007
	Public Review Period	BLM requirements require 30-day period of public review before ROD (BLM Handbook, Chapter VIII)	November 20 to December 20 2007 (30 days)
Certification of Final EIR/EIS and Project Decision		Commission certifies EIR/EIS and issues a Proposed Decision BLM issues the Record of Decision; 45-day appeal period	Early 2008