

8. Draft EIR/EIS Comments and Responses

8.1 Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS

Table 8-1 lists the persons, agencies, and organizations that provided comments on the Draft EIR/EIS during the public review period, which ended on October 3, 2006. The comments are grouped into sets and each comment set has been assigned a designation (A, B, C, D, or E) that indicates whether the comments are from public agencies, groups or organizations, individuals, verbal comments received at public meetings, or comments provided by the Applicant (SCE). Public meetings on the Draft EIR/EIS were held on August 28, 29, and 30, 2006, and are described in Section F.4.

Table 8-1. Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS				
Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
<i>A. Public Agencies</i>				
A.1	California Department of Transportation, District 7	Cheryl J. Powell, IGR/CEOA Program Manager	04-Aug-06	07-Aug-06
A.2	Department of Toxic Substances Control	Jennifer Jones, Unit Chief, Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch	23-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
A.3	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, Environmental Review Office	Laura Fujii, CED-2 Communities and Ecosystems Division	06-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
A.4	County of Los Angeles Fire Department	David R. Leininger, Chief, Forestry Division – Prevention Services Bureau	08-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
A.5	State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit	Terry Roberts, Director	07-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
A.6	United States Department of the Interior	Patricia Sanderson Port, Regional Environmental Officer	11-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
A.7	City of Palmdale	Laurie Lile, Director of Planning	25-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
A.8	City of Santa Clarita	Paul Brotzman, Director of Community Development	29-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
A.9	City of Lancaster	Jocelyn Swain	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
A.10	County of Los Angeles, Board of Supervisors	Michael D. Antonovich, Mayor; Gloria Molina, 1st District Supervisor; Yvonne B. Burke, 2nd District Supervisor; Zev Yaroslavsky, 3rd District Supervisor; Don Knabe, 4th District Supervisor	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
A.11	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, Environmental Review Office	Laura Fujii, CED-2 Communities and Ecosystems Division	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
A.12	Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	Paul Edelman, Deputy Director Natural Resources and Planning	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
A.13	County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation	Bryan Moscardini, Park Project Coordinator	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
A.14	State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit	Terry Roberts, Director	4-Oct-06	9-Oct-06
A.15	U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration	William J. Alcalá, Manager, Engineering Services, WSA	27-Jul-06	4-Aug-06
<i>B. Groups, Organizations, and Companies</i>				
B.1	Varner & Brandt LLP, on behalf of B & C Land and Water, LLC	Sean S. Varner	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
B.2	Agua Dulce Civic Association, Board of Directors	James Jennings, President	04-Sept-06	07-Sept-06
B.3	B & C Land and Water, LLC	Dennis Bushore, Project Manager	05-Sept-06	07-Sept-06

Table 8-1. Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS				
Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
B.4	Jackson-DeMarco-Tidus-Pekenpaugh Law Corporation, representing Leona Valley residents and the Leona Valley Town Council	Alene M. Taber	07-Sept-06	07-Sept-06
B.5	Leona Valley Town Council	Terrence D. Kenney, Member	05-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
B.6	Jackson-DeMarco-Tidus-Pekenpaugh Law Corporation, representing Leona Valley residents and the Leona Valley Town Council	Alene M. Taber	07-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
B.7	Self	Carol and Lawrence Brunet, et. al	09-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
B.8	Agua Dulce Town Council	Donal MacAdam, President	13-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
B.9	Acton / Agua Dulce Trails Council	Al Huber, President	18-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
B.10	Residents of Agua Dulce	Multiple Parties – Form Letter	23-Sept-06	23-Sept-06
B.11	Lauren Development, Inc. - operating manager for Valley Vineyards, LLC	John L. Allday	3-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
B.12	Antelope Valley Archaeological Society	Mark Campbell, Environmental Review Committee Chair	1-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
B.13	ADAPT (Agua Dulce Against Power Towers)	Mary Johnson, Chair	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
B.14	Greater Antelope Valley Assoc. of Realtors	Edward Luman, President	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
B.15	Agua Dulce Town Council	Donal MacAdam, President	1-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
B.16	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Delaine W. Shane	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
B.17	Pacific Crest Trail Association	Suzanne Wilson	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
B.18	Jackson-DeMarco-Tidus-Pekenpaugh Law Corporation, representing Leona Valley residents and the Leona Valley Town Council	Alene M. Taber	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
B.19	B&C Land and Water, LLC	Dennis Bushore	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
B.20	ADAPT (Agua Dulce Against Power Towers)	Julianne Feuerhelm	1-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
B.21	Wasserman, Comden, Casselman L.L.P, representing ADAPT	David B. Casselman, Esq. and Melissa M. Harnett, Esp.	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C. Individuals				
C.1	Self	Fred Moss	15-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
C.2	Self	Karl Percy	24-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
C.3	California State Senate, 17 th District	Senator George Runner	25-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
C.4	Self	Ralph A. Ciaramella	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
C.5	Self	Ingrid Welch	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
C.6	Self	Gail DeJongh	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
C.7	Self	Bernhard Staschik	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
C.8	Self	Yoshihisa Yamashita	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
C.9	Self	Glenda Tumin	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
C.10	Self	Rodney Jacobson	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
C.11	Self	Susan Tarr	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
C.12	Self	Joseph and Dawn Ludico	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
C.13	Self	Randall and Glenda Becker	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
C.14	Self	Mike Sproul	30-Aug-06	30-Aug-06
C.15	Self	Karen Crawford	30-Aug-06	30-Aug-06
C.16	Self	Kathy and Steve Owen	30-Aug-06	30-Aug-06
C.17	Self	Roger and Karen Blackwell	30-Aug-06	30-Aug-06
C.18	California State Assembly, 36 th District	Assemblywoman Sharon Runner	28-Aug-06	31-Aug-06
C.19	Self	Vance and Juanita Kirkpatrick	29-Aug-06	31-Aug-06
C.20	Self	Gerald and Karen Meunier	31-Aug-06	31-Aug-06
C.21	Self	Lyle and Ann Rancier	31-Aug-06	31-Aug-06
C.22	Self	Jeff and Nancy Hauth	31-Aug-06	31-Aug-06
C.23	Self	Norman and Rosemarie Davis	31-Aug-06	31-Aug-06

Table 8-1. Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS

Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
C.24	Self	John E. Rayburn	31-Aug-06	31-Aug-06
C.25	Self	Wendy Larsen	31-Aug-06	31-Aug-06
C.26	Self	Mary Johnson	31-Aug-06	01-Sept-06
C.27	Self	Mrs. Carol Roth	31-Aug-06	05-Sept-06
C.28	Self	Brian and Terry Bruck	02-Sept-06	05-Sept-06
C.29	Self	Mr. and Mrs. Al Huber	04-Sept-06	05-Sept-06
C.30	Self	Diane Ciaramella	04-Sept-06	05-Sept-06
C.31	Self	Dan Wangness, Virginia Deaton, Michael Allen	04-Sept-06	05-Sept-06
C.32	Self	Eunhee Anne Son and Young T. Son	04-Sept-06	05-Sept-06
C.33	Self	Steve Blanchard and Rae Tinagon	04-Sept-06	05-Sept-06
C.34	Self	Suzette and Mike Hester	06-Sept-06	06-Sept-06
C.35	Self	Bill and Jeanette Glancy	06-Sept-06	06-Sept-06
C.36	Self	William Larry Tyler	06-Sept-06	06-Sept-06
C.37	Self	Linda Whitaker	05-Sept-06	06-Sept-06
C.38	Self	Joseph and Dawn Lucido	29-Aug-06	07-Sept-06
C.39	Self	Nubia Hulse	01-Sept-06	07-Sept-06
C.40	Self	Ruth E. Perkins	07-Sept-06	07-Sept-06
C.41	Self	Marcella Mahan, Beatrice Bolin, Linda Wickerd, Larry M. Wickerd	07-Sept-06	07-Sept-06
C.42	Self	Gene and Nina Mason	03-Sept-06	08-Sept-06
C.43	Self	Ronald and Violet Barrett	07-Sept-06	08-Sept-06
C.44	Self	Laurie Ostrom	07-Sept-06	08-Sept-06
C.45	Self	Rodney Jacobson	29-Aug-06	11-Sept-06
C.46	Self	Sarah Y. Jacobson	01-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.47	Self	George, Lori, Michelean, Angelean, and Jolean Wejbe	08-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.48	Self	Tom and Betty Wade	08-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.49	Self	Gail A. MacDonald	09-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.50	Self	Shane and Deen Van Sickle	09-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.51	Self	David Baral (#1)	09-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.52	Self	David Baral (#2)	09-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.53	Self	Rolf Linden	10-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.54	Self	Richard Johnson	10-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.55	Self	Louis I. Bell	11-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.56	Self	David Baral (#3)	11-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.57	Self	Don and Mary Ann Mandy	11-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
C.58	Self	John Michael Medicis	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.59	Self	David Baral (#4)	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.60	Self	David Baral (#5)	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.61	Self	Gaylen and Judy Bartlett	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.62	Self	Charles Brink, c/o David Baral	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.63	Self	J. Duzick	05-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.64	Self	Peg Spry	05-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.65	Self	Gregory Smith	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.66	Self	Kary Smith	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.67	Self	Quinn Smith	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.68	Self	Eunhee Anne Son and Young Son	11-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.69	Self	Laurie Ostrom (#2)	12-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.70	Self	Juan Alonso	12-Sept-06	12-Sept-06
C.71	Self	Terry and Aleta Dupuis	07-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
C.72	Self	Unsigned (G4Horse@aol.com)	07-Sept-06	13-Sept-06

Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
C.73	Self	Christopher Jon Brown	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
C.74	Self	Jerry and Ellen Jacobson	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
C.75	Self	Roger Williams	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
C.76	Self	David Baral (#6)	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
C.77	Self	David Baral (#7)	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
C.78	Self	Jeanne Pickering	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
C.79	Self	John Michael Medicis (#2)	11-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
C.80	Self	Donald Hobart	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
C.81	Self	Ralph Clarkson	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
C.82	Self	Damie Poonosamy	13-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.83	Self	Pastor Mike and Jan Sheridan	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.84	Self	Jennifer Rohletter	13-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.85	Self	Patti and Jack Cutlip	13-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.86	Self	Mary Lou Apple	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.87	Self	Joseph Starke	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.88	Self	Andria Witmer	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.89	Self	Patti and Jack Cutlip (#2)	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.90	Self	Rod Nisperos	11-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
C.91	Self	Ken Morris	18-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.92	Self	Nicole Glancy	16-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.93	Self	Dale and Delores Burton	17-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.94	Self	Bob Turek and Carnetta Turek	17-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.95	Self	William N. Farris	17-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.96	Self	Susan McCartney	16-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.97	Self	Charles Crandall	15-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.98	Self	Roberta Reilley	28-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
C.99	Self	Carol Brunet	28-Aug-06	18-Sept-06
C.100	Self	Frank Schroeder	16-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.101	Self	Alice Wollman	17-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.102	Self	Richard T. Johnson	18-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
C.103	Self	David Baral	25-Sept-06	27-Sept-06
C.104	Self	Marilyn Alvarez	18-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
C.105	Self	Craig McConnachie	18-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
C.106	Self	Melody Swartz	18-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
C.107	Self	Dale and Delores Burton	17-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
C.108	Self	Carole Groate	19-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
C.109	Self	Nancy Baltad	19-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
C.110	Self	Steve and Susan Neva	18-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
C.111	Self	Harley Neva	18-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
C.112	Self	William and Sherry Rucker	20-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
C.113	Self	Marcella E. Mahan	20-Sept-06	21-Sept-06
C.114	Self	Kimberly Dwight	22-Sept-06	22-Sept-06
C.115	Self	John and Lana Seymour	20-Sept-06	22-Sept-06
C.116	Self	Kenneth and Donna Thompson	21-Sept-06	25-Sept-06
C.117	Self	Alexis C. Upton-Knittle and Lloyd J. Cook	22-Sept-06	22-Sept-06
C.118	Self	Riley and DeAnna Ritterbusch	21-Sept-06	25-Sept-06
C.119	Self	Donna L. Evans	22-Sept-06	25-Sept-06
C.120	Self	David L. and Susan C. Baral	22-Sept-06	25-Sept-06
C.121	Self	Julianne Feuerhelm	25-Sept-06	25-Sept-06
C.122	Self	Marcy Watton	25-Sept-06	26-Sept-06

Table 8-1. Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS

Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
C.123	Self	Terri Valentine-Duarte and Family	20-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
C.124	Bohl & Associates	Thomas M. Bohl, on behalf of Roger and June Reitano and the Reitano Family Trust	25-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
C.125	Self	John Hargraves	25-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
C.126	Self	Deborah A. Hargraves	25-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
C.127	Self	Rhiannon M. Walker	25-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
C.128	Self	Aryana Gilani	27-Sept-06	27-Sept-06
C.129	Self	David Baral	26-Sept-06	27-Sept-06
C.130	Self	Greg Buteyn	27-Sept-06	27-Sept-06
C.131	Self	Gitte Gilani	27-Sept-06	27-Sept-06
C.132	Self	Corry De Robertis	27-Sept-06	28-Sept-06
C.133	Self	John and Barbara Stegman	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.134	Self	Melissa Dickey	25-Sept-06	28-Sept-06
C.135	California State Senate, 17 th District	Senator George Runner	27-Sept-06	28-Sept-06
C.136	Self	Cindy Corn	27-Sept-06	28-Sept-06
C.137	Self	David Baral	25-Sept-06	28-Sept-06
C.138	Self	Kathy Randall	29-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
C.139	Self	Alan W. Novak	27-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
C.140	Self	John and Irene Hammons	29-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.141	Self	Rolf W. Linden and Janna Smith-Linden	1-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.142	Self	Linda Whitaker	1-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.143	Self	Ron Howell	29-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.144	Self	Sherry Howell	28-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.145	Self	Daniel and Christina Rodriguez	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.146	Self	Kelley Michel	9-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.147	Self	Ronald Michel	9-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.148	Self	Toby and Melinda Janowitz	27-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.149	Self	Maureen M. Hendren	28-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.150	Self	Dan and Emilie Fouts	27-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.151	Self	Gail and George MacDonald	30-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.152	Self	Michael Danis	30-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.153	Self	John Whitaker	1-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.154	Self	Steve Essayan	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.155	Self	Kelley Michel	9-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.156	Self	William Herriott	30-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.157	California State Assembly, 38 th District	Assemblyman Keith Richman	29-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
C.158	Self	Alexis Upton-Knittle	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.159	Self	Matt Kellerman	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.160	Self	Jim and Geri Duzick	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.161	Self	Gary Hebdon and Darlene Mailhes	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.162	Self	Tim Orteg	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.163	Self	Simon and Cheryl Yeo	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.164	Self	Warwick and Karen Bryan	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.165	Self	Robert and Laurie Glaser	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.166	Self	Marcy Watton	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.167	Self	Ron and Sherry Howell	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.168	Self	Leilani R. Hall	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.169	Self	Winfred L. and Melody Henson	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.170	Self	Dr. David and Janice Gantenbein	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.171	Self	Diane A. and Michael W. Terito	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06

Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
C.172	Self	Bryce and Cathy Worthington	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.173	Self	Robert and Relinda Fisher	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.174	U.S. House of Representatives, 25 th District	Howard P. "Buck" McKeon	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.175	Self	Gitte Gilani	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.176	Self	Art & Caryl Whiting	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.177	Self	Randy Banis and Kyra Sundance	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.178	Self	Tom Simcox	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.179	Self	Gary and Beth Warford	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.180	Self	Robert Hempe	29-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.181	Self	Kathryn Stanley	Undated	3-Oct-06
C.182	Self	Debbie Weilbacher	21-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.183	Self	Keith, Mary, and Keith Wyrostek, and John Trainer	Undated	3-Oct-06
C.184	Self	Geral Dickey	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.185	Self	Jennifer Beeler	Undated	3-Oct-06
C.186	Self	Dan Wangsness, Virginia Deaton, Michael Allen	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.187	Self	Susan Beck	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.188	Self	James P. Lewandowski	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.189	Self	Laurie De Santis-Staschik and Family	29-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.190	Self	Jim, Mary, Christopher, Matthew, and Michelle Nores	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.191	Self	Amanda Benatar	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.192	Self	Robert and Teresa Izquierdo	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.193	Self	Nita Levin	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.194	Self	Rick and Jennifer Fuller	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.195	Self	Beverly and Walt Gale	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.196	Self	Walter and Rose Ann Gates	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.197	Self	Chris and Norm Jacobson	1-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.198	Self	Kenneth A. and Colleen M. Price	1-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.199	Self	Lyle and Ann Rancier	26-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.200	Self	Tammy and Kelly Birrer	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.201	Self	Mary and Joseph Dymerski	Undated	3-Oct-06
C.202	Self	Leo Rohaley	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.203	Self	Virginia Sue Rohaley	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.204	Self	Karl Percy	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.205	Self	Peter Kaye	Undated	3-Oct-06
C.206	Self	Robert and Elayne Raksnys	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.207	Self	Caroline and Scott Christlieb	27-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.208	Self	Richard and Susan Cull	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.209	Self	Judy Rankin	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.210	Self	Patrisha Hodgman Heller and Steven Heller	1-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.211	Self	Robert R. Mallicoat	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.212	Self	Terry and Sally Zinger	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.213	California State Assembly, 37 th District	Assemblywoman Audra Strickland	27-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.214	Vanguard News	Charles Brink	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.215	Self	Jacqueline Ayer	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.216	Self	Keith Bobrosky	17-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.217	Self	Bryan Bobrosky	17-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.218	Self	Steven Bobrosky	17-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.219	Self	Sandy Bobrosky	17-Sept-06	3-Oct-06

Table 8-1. Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS

Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
C.220	Self	Allen and Laurie Keillor	2-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
C.221	Self	Richard A. Monstein	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
C.222	California State Assembly, 36 th District	Assemblywoman Sharon Runner	14-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
C.223	Self	Leonard Rohaley	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
<i>D. Public Meetings</i>				
D.1	Self	Randy Banis	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
D.2	Self	Pete Kennedy	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
D.3	Self	Bill and Sue Farris	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
D.4	Self	Richard J. Floyd	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
D.5	Self	Bardy Azadmard	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
D.6	Leona Valley Improvement Association	Leta Schay	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
D.7	Leona Valley Improvement Association	Harry Schay	28-Aug-06	28-Aug-06
D.8	Santa Monica Industrial and Development Corporation	Celestina T. Naguiat	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
D.9	Self	Harold Landau	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
D.10	Self	Brian Smith	29-Aug-06	29-Aug-06
D.11	Self	Susan Tarr	30-Aug-06	30-Aug-06
D.12	Self	Roger and Karen Blackwell	30-Aug-06	30-Aug-06
D.13	Self	Aleta Dupuis	30-Aug-06	05-Sept-06
D.14	Self	Richard and Nancy Bunner	31-Aug-06	05-Sept-06
D.15	Self	Richard and Guyla Clayton	31-Aug-06	05-Sept-06
D.16	Self	Cyndee Donato	31-Aug-06	05-Sept-06
D.17	Self	Mark and Sandy Buchholz	05-Sept-06	07-Sept-06
D.18	Self	Susan Tarr	07-Sept-06	07-Sept-06
D.19	Self	Gary and Judy Naeve	05-Sept-06	08-Sept-06
D.20	Self	Patrick E. Hood	07-Sept-06	08-Sept-06
D.21	Self	Jennifer Beeler	05-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
D.22	Self	Kerri Acker	08-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
D.23	Self	Harry Acker	08-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
D.24	Self	Robyn Gerlich	09-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
D.25	Self	Mark Pickering	10-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
D.26	Self	Jeanne Pickering	10-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
D.27	Self	Cara Callaway	11-Sept-06	11-Sept-06
D.28	Self	Nancie Crannell	28-Aug-06	12-Sept-06
D.29	Self	Jeffrey A. Hale	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
D.30	Self	Stefany Hale	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
D.31	Self	Lisa Hale	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
D.32	Self	Jason Allstead	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
D.33	Self	Scott Marquart	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
D.34	Self	David Zavala	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
D.35	Self	Richard Long	13-Sept-06	13-Sept-06
D.36	Self	Kevin Murphy	13-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.37	Self	Judy Boswell-Hudspeth	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.38	Self	Pedro Flores	02-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.39	Self	Robert Koch	10-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.40	Self	Bradley S. Drake	12-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.41	Self	Deborah A. Drake	12-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.42	Self	Barbara Hartzler	12-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.43	Self	Lois Rohletter	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.44	Self	Drew Austin Marquart	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.45	Self	José Angel Lugo	14-Sept-06	14-Sept-06
D.46	Self	Mary Esquibel	13-Sept-06	14-Sept-06

Table 8-1. Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS				
Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
D.47	Self	Aurora V. La Madrid	13-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.48	Self	Richard Ricci	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.49	Self	Danny H.	15-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.50	Self	Jeff Gordon	15-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.51	Self	Jeff Wright	10-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.52	Self	John Helton	12-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.53	Self	Kimberly Wright	13-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.54	Self	Laura Wright	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.55	Self	Curtis Wright	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.56	Self	Blake Comeaux	14-Sept-06	15-Sept-06
D.57	Reitano Family Trust	Roger and June Reitano	14-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.58	Self	Sharon Chin	16-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.59	Self	Kenny Chin	16-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.60	Self	Allen and Jeannine Nachowitz	18-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.61	Self	Gary Hoppe	11-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.62	Self	Scott F. Clark	14-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.63	Self	Erik Kott	14-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.64	Self	Steven and Tamara Reaves	14-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.65	Self	Joel Crannell	14-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.66	Self	Leon Thompson and Mary Thompson	15-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.67	Self	Tony and Rhonda Rhodes	15-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.68	Self	Daniel P. Fierro	15-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.69	Self	Joan M. Tyler	16-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.70	Copeland's Cherry Ranch	Chari Copeland and David Copeland	18-Sept-06	18-Sept-06
D.71	Self	David and Elizabeth Hamm	18-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.72	Self	Caroline and Scott Christlieb	19-sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.73	Self	April Rodela	17-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.74	Self	Linda Love	15-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.75	Self	Bruce and Jeana Rogers	15-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.76	Self	Linda L. Bennett	18-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.77	Self	Regina Alvarez	18-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.78	Self	Mike and Joanne Karlis	18-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.79	Self	Ronald Esquibel	14-Sept-06	19-Sept-06
D.80	Self	Kimberly J. Dunham and Steve Cronk	16-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
D.81	Self	Michael Hester	18-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
D.82	Self	Suzette Hester	18-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
D.83	Self	Mike and Joanne Karlis	18-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
D.84	Self	Allen and Jeannine Nachowitz	18-Sept-06	20-Sept-06
D.85	Self	Don and Pat Raisch	21-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
D.86	Self	Bert J. and Lema Maxine Torrey	25-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
D.87	Self	Greg and Shannon Spinrad	27-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
D.88	Self	Jerry and Katherine Sturdy	29-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
D.89	Self	Edith and Pedro Leiva	26-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
D.90	Self	Enrique Altamirano, Jr.	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
D.91	Self	Susan Woodruff	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
D.92	Self	Gilda Connelly	3-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
D.93	Self	Emilie Martens	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
D.94	Self	Nancy Shelley	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
D.95	Self	Al and Robin Gregg	29-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
D.96	Self	Barbara R. Hempe	29-Sept-06	3-Oct-06
D.97	Self	Jason Woodruff	30-Sept-06	3-Oct-06

Table 8-1. Comments Received on the Draft EIR/EIS				
Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name/Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
D.98	Self	Scott McInteer	2-Oct-06	3-Oct-06
Verbal Comments Received during Public Meetings				
DD.1	Oral Comments by the General Public Public Scoping Meeting: Santa Clarita, CA; Tuesday, August 29, 2006; 2:30PM – 4:30PM			
DD.2	Oral Comments by the General Public Public Scoping Meeting: Santa Clarita, CA; Tuesday, August 29, 2006; 6:30PM – 8:30PM			
DD.3	Oral Comments by the General Public Public Scoping Meeting: Agua Dulce, CA; Wednesday, August 30, 2006; 7:00PM – 10:00PM			
DD.4	Oral Comments by the General Public Public Scoping Meeting: Quartz Hill, CA; Monday, August 28, 2006; 6:30PM – 9:30PM			
<i>E. Applicant (Southern California Edison) – received October 3, 2006</i>				
E.1	Global Comments			
E.2	Executive Summary			
E.3	Introduction			
E.4	Project Description - Proposed and Alternatives			
E.5	Air Quality			
E.6	Biological Resources			
E.7	Cultural Resources			
E.8	Geology, Soils, and Paleontology			
E.9	Health and Safety			
E.10	Forest Management			
E.11	Hydrology and Water Quality			
E.12	Land Use and Public Recreation			
E.13	Noise			
E.14	Public Services			
E.15	Socioeconomics			
E.16	Traffic and Transportation			
E.17	Utilities and Service Systems			
E.18	Visual Resources			
E.19	Comparison of Alternatives			
E.20	Other Federal Requirements and CEQA Considerations			
E.21	Appendix 1- Alternatives Screening Report			

In addition to the comments and letters listed in Table 8-1, letters to various selected officials regarding the Project were sent by concerned parties as denoted in Table 8-2.

To: Agency/Affiliation	From: Agency / Affiliation	Name / Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received
Linda Lambourne, Field Representative, Office of Congressman McKeon	Leona Valley Town Council	Terrence D. Kenney	25-Sept-06	26-Sept-06
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger	Agua Dulce Town Council	Donal MacAdam	27-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger	Agua Dulce Against Power Towers (ADAPT)	Mary Johnson, Chair	27-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger	Agua Dulce Senior Citizens Club	Peg Spry, Secretary/Treasurer	27-Sept-06	29-Sept-06
Honorable Audra Strickland		Gregory Fritz	23-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
Linda Lambourne, Field Representative, Office of Congressman McKeon		Jim & Carol Cabernoch	29-Sept-06	2-Oct-06
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger	Agua Dulce Civic Association	Scott Griffin	1-Oct-06	2-Oct-06
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger	Self	Laurie Ostrom	27-Sept-06	27-Sept-06
Congressman Buck McKeon		Robert R. Mallicoat	2-Oct-06	5-Oct-06

Table 8-3 lists the persons, agencies, and organizations that provided comments on the Draft EIR/EIS that were received after the public review period ended on October 3, 2006. The comments are grouped into sets and assigned designations similar to the comments in Table 8-1.

Comment Set	Agency / Affiliation	Name / Title of Commenter	Date of Comment	Date Received/ Postmarked
A. Public Agencies				
A.16	Department of Fish and Game, South Coast Region	Michael J. Mulligan, Deputy Regional Manager	13-Oct-06	20-Oct-06
A.17	County of Los Angeles, Fire Department	David R. Leininger, Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Services Bureau	19-Oct-06	24-Oct-06
B. Groups, Organizations, and Companies				
B.10	Residents of Agua Dulce	Multiple Parties – Form Letter (8 letters)	23-Sept-06	5-Oct-06, 10-Oct-06, 11-Oct-06
C. Individuals				
C.224	Self	Jan and Jay Thomas	3-Oct-06	12-Oct-06
C.225	Self	Joshua Stewart	29-Sept-06	12-Oct-06
C.226	Self	Darin and Amber Readmond	12-Oct-06	12-Oct-06
C.227	Self	Linda Wissmath	15-Oct-06	15-Oct-06
C.228	Self	Sherry Wissmath	15-Oct-06	15-Oct-06
C.229	Self	Amjad Hanbali	16-Oct-06	16-Oct-06
C.230	Self	Karen Crawford	15-Oct-06	16-Oct-06
C.231	Self	Jean and Alan Varden	14-Oct-06	14-Oct-06
E. Applicant (Southern California Edison) – received October 6, 2006				
E.22	Review/Approval of Documents			

8.2 General Responses to Major Comments

The following responses address common concerns raised by multiple commenters. These General Responses have been prepared in order to provide complete and comprehensive responses to many similar comments rather than repeating the same information multiple times in response to each individual comment. As needed, more detailed responses are provided to individual comments in the following section. The General Responses address the following topics:

- GR-1 Effects on Property Values
- GR-2 Property Acquisition
- GR-3 Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF)
- GR-4 Alternatives Identification, Screening, and Analysis
- GR-5 Noticing Procedures, Draft EIR/EIS Review Period
- GR-6 Underground Construction

GR-1: Effects on Property Values

A number of letters expressed concern about the potential effects of the Project on property values. Although there is evidence that transmission lines may have affected property values in some cases, the effects are generally smaller than anticipated, and greater detailed studies on the subject are required to establish a correlation between the siting of industrial facilities (such as transmission lines) and property values.

In general, claims of diminished property value through decreased marketability of a subject property are based on the concerns about hazards to human health and safety; and increased noise, traffic, and visual impacts associated with living in proximity to locally unwanted land uses, such as power plants, freeways, high voltage transmission lines, landfills, hazardous waste sites, etc. The issue of property value effects associated with such industrial facilities has been given much attention over the past 20 years and, as a result, has been the subject of extensive study. The 1992 *Analysis of Property Value Impacts of the Crockett Cogeneration Project*, submitted by the applicant for the Crockett Cogeneration Project cites several studies that examine the impacts on property values of very large industrial facilities. The 2003 Wolverton-Bottemiller paper, *Further analysis of transmission line impact on residential property values*, looked at some of the variables examined in the Crockett paper. Similar to the Crockett analysis, the 2005 Kinnard-Dickey paper, *A Primer on Proximity Impact Research: Residential Property Values Near High-Voltage Transmission Lines*, provides a comprehensive examination of the methodology and outcomes of previous studies on the effects of property value in the vicinity of transmission lines.

The Kinnard-Dickey paper and the Crockett analysis cite several examples of proximity impact analyses, methodologies used to measure impacts, and types of possible proximity impacts on residential property values. Further, both studies conclude that differing, sometimes conflicting, findings have emerged from market studies. Despite the fact that many technical and conceptual issues remain untested and unresolved, the Kinnard-Dickey paper supports the use of the MRA in the Hedonic Pricing Model format, when a large data set of appropriately screened property sales is used.

The 2003 Wolverton-Bottemiller paper used a paired-sale methodology to look at difference in the sale price of a large sample of homes abutting transmission ROWs and homes away from transmission ROWs. This study looked at similar variables to the Crockett analysis, including lot size, lot configuration, topography, landscaping, age, number of bedrooms, number of bathrooms, and garage size. Similar to the Kinnard-Dickey

paper and Crockett analysis, the Wolverton-Bottemiller paper finds that the data do not support home prices being affected by their proximity to transmission lines.

While nearby property owners may have the perception that their homes will diminish in value because of a nearby industrial project, the actual loss of property value and potential effects can only be tested through data from home sales. The MRA method, as supported by the Kinnard-Dickey paper, requires that data be collected on as many market sales transactions as possible within the impact area and within one or more similar control areas over a few years prior to an awareness of a project to accurately reflect what buyers and sellers actually do as opposed to what potential buyers say they might do under specified hypothetical circumstances. The Wolverton-Bottemiller paper suggests that understanding the effects of transmission lines on home prices is a dynamic process, requiring on-going study, identification of accurate and reliable sources of data, consistency in measurement, and rich data sets, allowing for variety in analytical methods. To assess what particular environmental and physical changes associated with the proposed Project could affect property values within an immediate distance, a market study of current and future values of properties potentially affected by the proposed Project would have to be conducted to evaluate property values with and without the proposed Project being constructed. This type of market study would reflect what buyers and sellers actually do as opposed to what potential buyers say they might do under specified hypothetical circumstances. This type of data collection and study is beyond the scope of an environmental review document under CEQA or NEPA.

While it may be possible to ascertain that particular physical environmental changes can affect property values within an immediate distance of the proposed Project, at this time a definitive assessment of any potential impacts to nearby property values is not possible. The data that would be required to conduct a more detailed analysis are unavailable, consequently, the conclusions of the Kinnard-Dickey paper and Crockett analysis are applied to this analysis. It is expected that the proposed Project would not generate effects that would significantly impact property values.

There is no available information to positively and conclusively determine that the proposed Project would negatively impact property values. Although there is evidence that transmission lines may have affected property values in some cases, the effects are generally smaller than anticipated and greater detailed studies on the subject are required to determine a direct correlation between the siting of industrial facilities (such as transmission lines) and property values.

GR-2: Property Acquisition and Compensation

A number of commenters expressed concern over possible use of the power of eminent domain to acquire rights to construct the proposed Project across private property. The construction and maintenance of electric transmission lines is considered a “public use” for purposes of California eminent domain law. Public electric utilities, including SCE, are therefore authorized by Public Utilities Code § 612 to exercise the power of eminent domain in order to acquire property or easements necessary to construct and maintain electric transmission lines. SCE therefore could resort to eminent domain proceedings to acquire property or easements necessary to complete the Project, if the Project is approved by the PUC along the proposed Project route or one of the alternatives, and if voluntary negotiations for required property or easements is unsuccessful. Although the details of eminent domain proceedings are beyond the scope of this EIR/EIS, affected property owners would have the right to contest the necessity of condemnation of their land, as well as to present evidence as to the true fair market value of the property or property interests taken. The actual amount of just compensation paid would be determined in the eminent domain proceedings.

Some commenters offered general objections to the taking of private property for the Project. Such objections may be considered by the CPUC in making its ultimate decision on the proposed Project and in evaluating project alternatives. However, use of eminent domain proceedings is a traditional method of acquiring property for public utility projects where voluntary means of acquiring property fail. Generally it is to the advantage of both SCE and the public to minimize or avoid construction across privately owned property where feasible alternative routings exist, as the costs of acquiring rights to cross private land (whether by voluntary agreement or by condemnation) tend to increase the overall costs of the project as a whole. These costs are a factor which the CPUC will consider along with other relevant factors (e.g., environmental considerations, technical feasibility, public necessity for the project, and costs of alternative routing) in selecting among project alternatives and determining which, if any, will be approved.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, no financial compensation would be legally due to property owners whose property is arguably affected by the Project, but whose property is not directly within the project ROW. Under California and federal constitutional law, “just compensation” is due only where public utility projects result in direct invasion or damage to legally recognized property interests. Compensation would thus be due to property owners who suffered some physical invasion (e.g., landslide) as a result of the project, as well as to any property owners whose land was condemned for ROW or for other purposes related to the project. Compensation could also be required if noise impacts of the project on a particular property were sufficiently severe as to amount to a legal nuisance, such as that which would interfere with normal use and enjoyment. However, the evaluation of potential noise impacts in the EIR/EIS indicates that impacts would not exceed accepted regulatory standards on affected private property anywhere except on the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch, and therefore, certainly would not rise to the much more drastic type of noise impact which might constitute a nuisance requiring compensation.

California law does not recognize any vested property right in existing views or other physical or aesthetic qualities of areas located outside the private property owner’s property lines. Therefore, no compensation would be due for effects on private property values caused solely by location of the Project near the affected private property. For the same reason, effects on private property values resulting merely from location of the Project nearby would not constitute uncompensated “takings” or violations of due process under the California or United States Constitutions as suggested by some commenters.

GR-3: Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF)

A number of commenters stated a concern about EMF as a potential health hazard. This issue is addressed in Section C.6 of the EIR/EIS, Public Health and Safety. To date, there have been hundreds of studies conducted related to the health effects of exposure to EMF from electric transmission lines. Some of these studies identify biological effects but not health effects based on measured exposure to electric and magnetic fields or in some instances based on surrogates of EMF exposure intended to emulate EMF conditions, such as proximity to transmission or distribution lines. The often cited Wertheimer and Leeper 1979 study, which is seen as establishing widespread public attention on the EMF issue, was based on review of wire codes for electric distribution lines, not transmission lines such as that proposed and evaluated in this EIR/EIS. Researchers continue to explore whether EMF affects human health; to date, they have not been able to demonstrate a health effect, nor have they been able to prove that EMF is not a health risk. Lacking proof that EMF is not a risk, the public’s perception of EMF as a health risk remains the strongest driver behind continuing research in this area.

The EIR/EIS in Section C.6.3 summarizes the results of scientific review panels that have considered the body of EMF health effects research. However, Section C.6 states that it does not consider magnetic fields in the

context of CEQA/NEPA and determination of environmental impacts, first because there is not consensus within the scientific community that EMF creates a potential health risk, and second because there are no defined or adopted CEQA/NEPA standards for defining health risk from EMF. As a result, EMF information is presented for the benefit of the public and decision makers.

As stated in Section C.6.2, the CPUC initiated a decision (D.93-11-013) that requires that utilities use “low-cost or no-cost” mitigation measures for facilities requiring certification under General Order 131-D.¹ The decision directed the utilities to use a four percent benchmark on the low-cost mitigation. This decision also implemented a number of EMF measurement, research, and education programs, and provided the direction that led to the preparation of the DHS study described in Section C.6.3. The CPUC has not adopted any specific limits or regulation on EMF levels related to electric power facilities. Most recently, the CPUC issued Decision D.06-01-042, on January 26, 2006, affirming the low-cost/no-cost policy to mitigate EMF exposure from new utility transmission and substation projects. This decision also adopted rules and policies to improve utility design guidelines for reducing EMF. The CPUC stated “at this time we are unable to determine whether there is a significant scientifically verifiable relationship between EMF exposure and negative health consequences.”

GR-4: Alternatives Identification, Screening, and Analysis

An important aspect of EIR/EIS preparation is the identification and assessment of a reasonable range of Project alternatives. Both CEQA and NEPA provide guidance on selecting alternatives for evaluation in an EIR and EIS. The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(a)) state that:

An EIR shall describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decisionmaking and public participation.

Per the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA Regulations (40 C.F.R. 1502.14), the EIS must present the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives in comparative form, defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice by decision makers and the public. The alternatives analysis in an EIS must:

- a) *Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.*
- b) *Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.*
- c) *Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.*
- d) *Include the alternative of no action.*
- e) *Identify the agency’s preferred alternative or alternatives, if one or more exists, in the draft statement and identify such alternative in the final statement unless another law prohibits the expression of such a preference.*
- f) *Include appropriate mitigation measures not already included in the proposed action or alternatives.*

¹ General Order 131-D is entitled “Rules Relating to the Planning and Construction of Electric Generation, Transmission/Power/Distribution Line Facilities and Substations Located in California.”

The CEQ has stated that “[r]easonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applicant” (CEQ, 1983).

In addition to the above regulations, the USDA Forest Service Manual (FSM), Section 2703 - Policy, states that a special use proposal to use and occupy federal lands, including National Forest System (NFS) lands, which the Project would require (except the No Project Alternative), may be denied if it “can reasonably be accommodated on non-NFS lands...”. Furthermore, a special use of NFS lands should not be authorized “just because it affords the applicant a lower cost and less restrictive location when compared to non-NFS lands”. At the same time, however, per the direction given in the USDA Forest Service letter dated January 24, 2003, “the use and occupancy of federal lands, including National Forest System (NFS) lands, is an important element in facilitating the exploration, development, and transmission of affordable and reliable energy to meet [these] NEP [(National Energy Policy)] goals”, which include increasing domestic energy supplies, modernizing and improving the nation’s energy infrastructure, and improving the reliability of the delivery of energy from its sources to points of use, and “should be an important consideration when responding to proposals for the siting of energy and energy related facilities on NFS lands”.

As described in the Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project EIR/EIS Alternatives Screening Report (Appendix 1 of this EIR/EIS), SCE submitted applications to the CPUC and USDA Forest Service seeking authorization to construct and operate the Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project. The Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (PEA) submitted by SCE as part of the application to the CPUC included alternatives to the proposed Project suggested by SCE. In addition, potential alternatives were derived from investigations conducted by the Tehachapi Collaborative Study Group (TCSG). Potential alternatives were also developed by the EIR/EIS preparers at the direction of and in coordination with the CEQA Lead Agency (the CPUC) and the NEPA Lead Agency (USDA Forest Service), and through comments made during the Scoping period (June-July 2005) by the general public.

A total of 15 alternatives to the proposed Project were initially considered for evaluation in the EIR/EIS, of which five were carried forward for detailed analysis (i.e., equivalent to SCE’s proposed Project in accordance with NEPA) in the EIR/EIS. The alternatives identified covered a broad range of options, including:

- minor routing adjustments to SCE’s proposed 500-kV project route;
- entirely different transmission line routes, including alternatives that would not cross NFS lands to meet Forest Service direction (FSM Section 2703);
- alternative voltage concepts, such as 220-kV and double-circuit transmission lines; and
- alternative system designs, such as underground transmission lines.

A comprehensive screening analysis, which is summarized in Section B.3 and described in detail in the Alternatives Screening Report (Appendix 1), was conducted to focus on alternatives that would meet CEQA, NEPA, and Forest Service requirements. After initial screening, if a potential alternative was unable to meet the project objectives, purpose, and need or was demonstrated to be infeasible (from economic, environmental, legal, social, or technological standpoint), then it was eliminated from full evaluation. A list of the alternatives that were considered but subsequently eliminated is provided below. Full descriptions of the range of alternatives considered, including the rationale for elimination of alternatives, is presented in Appendix 1 of this EIR/EIS.

Design Variations to the Proposed Project/Action

- Antelope-Pardee Forest Underground Alternative
- Antelope-Pardee 220-kV Single-circuit Partial Underground Alternative
- Antelope-Pardee 220-kV Double-circuit Partial Underground Alternative
- Antelope-Pardee Relocation of Towers off Del Sur Ridge (Mid-slope) Alternative
- Antelope-Pardee – Tubular Steel Poles in the Antelope Valley and City of Santa Clarita Alternative

Alternate Corridors

- Antelope-Vincent 500-kV Line in New Corridor Alternative
- Parallel LADWP ROW Alternative
- Antelope-Vincent 500-kV Line in Existing Antelope-Vincent Corridor Alternative
- Antelope-Vincent 220-kV Double-circuit in New Corridor Alternative

Other Transmission Alternatives

- Antelope-Mesa Replacement Alternative
- Big Creek-Fresno Phase-Shifted Tie

The alternatives that met the CEQA/NEPA alternatives screening criteria and/or Forest Service requirements (FSM 2703) were retained for full analysis in the EIR/EIS. These include the five alternatives listed below in addition to the proposed Project and the No Project Alternative.

- Alternative 1: Partial Undergrounding of Antelope-Pardee Transmission Line;
- Alternative 2: Antelope-Pardee East Mid-Slope (Option B of “mid-slope” alternative discussed above);
- Alternative 3: Antelope-Pardee Single-Circuit 500-kV Towers between Haskell Canyon and Pardee Substation;
- Alternative 4: Antelope-Pardee Re-Routing of New Right-of-Way along Haskell Canyon; and
- Alternative 5: Antelope-Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-Route.

As described above, a wide range of potential alternatives were considered and evaluated in order to establish a reasonable range of alternatives to be evaluated in detail in this EIR/EIS.

GR-5: Noticing Procedures, Draft EIR/EIS Review Period

Section F of this EIR/EIS (Public Participation and Notification) provides details on the CEQA and NEPA legal and procedural requirements for public involvement activities associated with the environmental review process. Section F also proceeds to describe the specific public outreach methods that were used for this EIR/EIS in order to comply with these CEQA and NEPA requirements. For the specific public outreach activities associated with the Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project environmental review process, the reader is referred to Section F. However, this General Response provides a summary of those activities.

A number of comments were received during the public comment period regarding the public notification conducted to announce the release of the Draft EIR/EIS and to solicit participation at the public meetings. Some residents expressed concern that although they lived near the Project and alternative routes they did not receive notice of the public meetings or of the Project, and questioned the adequacy of the public involvement efforts. To address this concern we have outlined the NEPA, CEQA, and agency noticing requirements, and provided a summary of the actions taken to involve the public on this Project. As demonstrated in Section F (Public Participation and Notification) and below, applicable State and federal requirements were exceeded in conducting the proposed Project’s public noticing and public outreach efforts. For additional detail regarding

the public participation efforts conducted for the environmental review process for the proposed Project, see Section F (Public Participation and Notification) of this EIR/EIS.

Public Notification

The proposed Project was noticed consistent with NEPA and CEQA requirements (see Table below). The noticing conducted for the Antelope-Pardee Project included three methods of public notification – direct mail notices, newspaper advertisements, and publication of notices and documents on the Project website. In addition, public notification occurred at key Project milestones consistent with State and federal requirements, and included a phone information line, fax line, and email address where the public could ask questions about the Project and receive direct responses as well as provide comment.

In addition to the NEPA and CEQA requirements, the regulations and requirements of the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC were considered in planning public participation. USDA Forest Service requirements are the same as those identified in NEPA. The CPUC requirements (CPUC Rule 17.1) differ from the CEQA requirements in the requirement that notice be given by direct mail and that it be published in newspapers not less than once a week or two weeks successively in a newspaper or newspapers of general circulation.

NEPA Requirements - Noticing	CEQA Requirements - Noticing
<p>National Environmental Policy Act Council of Environmental Quality Regulations: <i>40 CFR 1506.6 Public Involvement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Make diligent effort to involve public b. Provide public notice of NEPA-related hearings, public meetings, and the availability of environmental documents • Publish Notice of Intent (NOI) (CFR Sec. 1508.22) in Federal Register (CFR 1507.3) • Send NOI to individuals who have requested it [40 CFR 1506.6(b)(1)] • actions of primarily local concern may include notice to: State and areawide clearinghouses; tribes; affected State's noticing procedures; publication in local newspapers; local media; community organizations; newsletters; direct mailing to owners and occupants of nearby or affected property; and posting of notice on and off site in the area where the action is to be located. 	<p>California Environmental Quality Act <i>Section 15087 Public Review of Draft EIR (PRC §21092)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lead agency shall provide public notice of the availability of the draft EIR at same time it sends notice of completion to the Office of Planning and Research. Notice shall be given by at least one of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. publish at least one time in a newspaper of general circulation. If more than one area is affected then notice in newspaper of largest circulation in the areas. 2. post notice on or offsite in project area 3. direct mailing to owners/occupants of property contiguous to the parcel or parcels on which the project is located.

To be consistent with these requirements, the Project team developed an initial Project notification list to use for sending Project notices during each phase of the environmental review process to property owners, agencies, and community and interest groups. Property owners were identified through the list provided by SCE as part of its CPCN application to the CPUC. The property owner list included in their application was based on the requirement in CPUC's General Order 131-D (Item 1.b Section XI) that requires public utilities to notify property owners within 300 feet of a project route (not alternatives) when an application has been filed with the CPUC, which applied when SCE filed its application. Therefore, the notification list prepared for this Project included:

- Property owner list provided by SCE for the proposed route (submitted as part of the CPCN application and included property owners within 300 feet of the proposed Project route)
- CPUC Service List
- USDA Forest Service mailing list (federal agencies and interest groups)
- Government officials and community interest groups
- Responsible and Trustee agencies, as required by CEQA and NEPA.

This notification list was updated after completion of the EIR/EIS scoping process and prior to the release of the Draft EIR/EIS to incorporate individuals and agencies that signed in at the scoping meetings, individuals and agencies that participated in the scoping meetings, those individuals and agencies that submitted written comments, and to include property owners along the Alternative 5 route. The notification list was used to distribute the Notice of Preparation, Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS, and the Draft EIR/EIS public comment period extension notice. In addition, the Project distribution list, which is a subset of the larger notification list, was used to mail hardcopy and electronic versions (on CD) of the Draft EIR/EIS, and the Executive Summary, as described below (Details in Section F).

- **Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Notice of Intent (NOI).** Seventy-seven (77) copies of the NOP were distributed to federal, State, regional, and local agencies, and elected officials. The USDA Forest Service issued a NOI for the proposed Project, which was published in the Federal Register on June 28, 2005. A public scoping meeting notice was mailed to over 2,500 individuals in the Project area;
- **Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR/EIS.** The Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR/EIS was mailed to approximately 2,726 addresses, including community organizations, interest groups, and property owners in the vicinity of the proposed Project route, and the NOA was also sent to property owners along the Alternative 5 route;
- **Draft EIR/EIS.** Copies of the full Draft EIR/EIS were sent to 147 interested parties and agencies, and to information repositories, which include eight area libraries, three City offices, three community organizations, and two USDA Forest Service offices. Twelve copies of the Executive Summary, 120 emails with the NOA, and 110 CDs (pdf version of the Draft EIR/EIS) with the NOA were also sent out;
- **Extension Notice.** An extension notice was distributed to everyone on the Project notification list, which included over 3,400 individuals, that announced that the public comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS was extended from September 18 to October 3, 2006; and
- **Newspaper Notices.** Notices were published in local and regional newspapers to announce the public scoping meetings, the release of the Draft EIR, the Draft EIR/EIS public meetings, and the extension of the public comment period. The newspaper advertisements included information on the Project website address, phone information line, email address, and when applicable, the dates, locations and times of the public meetings. The notices were published as noted below.

Newspapers	Publication Dates and Events			
	Public Scoping	Release of Draft EIR/EIS (NOA)	Draft EIR/EIS Public Meetings	Comment Period Extension
Antelope Valley Press	June 26, 2005	July 28, 2006	August 21, 2006	September 15, 2006
Daily News	June 26, 2005	July 28, 2006	August 21, 2006	September 15, 2006
Los Angeles Times, Valley Edition	June 26, 2005	July 28, 2006	August 21, 2006	September 15, 2006
Signal Newspaper	June 26, 2005	July 28, 2006	August 21, 2006	September 15, 2006
Acton/Agua Dulce News		July 31, 2006	August 21, 2006	September 18, 2006
Antelope Valley Journal		July 28, 2006	August 18, 2006	September 15, 2006
Agua Dulce/Acton Country Journal	July 9, 2005			September 16, 2006
Los Angeles Times, General Edition		August 5, 2006		September 17, 2006

Availability of Project Documents

Since the release of the NOP (June 2005), Project documents have been available for public review at local libraries, local agency offices, and local Forest Service offices as well as the Project website. The repository sites were advertised in public documents and on the website. The website included full-text electronic copies of all Project documents that have been completed to date and is, and will continue to be, updated after each Project milestone.

- **Document Repositories** were set up at 16 locations throughout the proposed Project area;
- Establishment of an **electronic mail address and a telephone/fax hotline** for Project information;
- **CPUC Website.** The Project application, NOP, NOI, Draft EIR/EIS, and Project-related maps were posted on the Project website on the Internet at:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/aspen/antelopepardee/antelopepardee.htm>

Public Meetings

Public meetings were held during the public review periods to provide another opportunity to involve the public in the environmental review process and provide another avenue for submitting formal comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. Two public comment periods were held on this Project. The public scoping period was held from June 28 to July 29, 2005, and the public comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS from August 5 to September 18 and extended to October 3, 2006. Although public comment periods are requirements of environmental regulations, public meetings are not required as part of the environmental review process. Both State and federal requirements encourage but do not require public meetings. The table below summarizes NEPA and CEQA requirements for public meetings.

Federal Requirements –Public Meetings	State Requirements – Public Meetings
<p>National Environmental Policy Act Council of Environmental Quality Regulations: <i>40 CFR 1501.7 Scoping (b)(4)</i> As part of scoping, the lead agency <i>may</i> hold early scoping meeting or meetings. <i>40 CFR 1506.6 Public Involvement (c)</i> Hold or sponsor public hearings or meetings whenever appropriate; criteria include substantial public controversy and request for hearing by another agency with authority over the action.</p>	<p>California Environmental Quality Act <i>Section 15083 Early Public Consultation</i> Encourages early consultation but does <i>not</i> specify the need for a public meeting. <i>Section 15087 (PRC §21092) Public Review of Draft EIR</i> Public hearings are encouraged but not required. (No mention of public meetings.)</p>

Dates and locations of the Draft EIR/EIS public meetings were advertised in local and regional newspapers as described above, on the website, and in the public documents distributed on the proposed Project. For instance, the NOP included information on the scoping meetings, and the NOA included meeting locations, dates, and times for the public meetings on the Draft EIR/EIS. The information below presents a summary of the five public meetings held to date on this Project:

- During the Scoping period **two public scoping meetings** were held on the following dates and locations:
 - June 29, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. at the Desert Inn Hotel, Lancaster
 - July 14, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Santa Clarita Activities Center, Santa Clarita.
- During the public comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS, **four public meetings** were conducted by the CPUC and USDA Forest Service at the following dates and locations:
 - August 28, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. at George Lane Park Auditorium, Quartz Hill;
 - August 29, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. and again at 6:30 p.m. at the City of Santa Clarita Activities Center, Santa Clarita;
 - August 30, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. at the Agua Dulce Women’s Club Clubhouse, Agua Dulce.

In addition to the public meetings mentioned above, there were other publicly advertised avenues to provide public comment on the Project. Comments were accepted at the public meetings and by mail, email, or phone/fax. All of the materials that advertised the Project included information on where and how comments could be provided on the Project. In addition, in response to public concern on the Project, the comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS was extended from September 18 to October 3, 2006, to allow the public more time to comment.

Opportunities to Provide Further Comment

In addition to the public involvement and participation activities outlined above, there will be other opportunities for public involvement as part of the CPUC's proceedings and the USDA Forest Service decision-making process on the Project. After completion of the Final EIR/EIS, the CPUC will hold public hearings as part of the Commission's proceedings, which will be advertised and noticed separate from any activities associated with the environmental review process for the proposed Project, and will provide additional opportunities for public comment on this Project. The USDA Forest Service will prepare a Record of Decision, which has a public appeal period.

GR-6: Underground Construction

While underground installation would reduce the visual impacts of a 500-kV transmission line, there are other impacts associated with underground transmission lines to consider, as well as technical challenges that must be overcome before implementing such a system. For a 500-kV installation, various aboveground facilities would be needed in addition to the underground components. Visible aboveground components associated with a 500-kV underground transmission line include transition stations, approximately 80 feet high and with a footprint of approximately 2 to 3 acres, at each end of the underground segment to transfer the 500-kV transmission lines from overhead to underground and vice versa. These transition stations, as shown in Figure B.4-8 of the EIR/EIS, are quite large (similar to a small electrical substation) and would be highly visible facilities that would create visual contrasts with natural landscapes in the Project area. Furthermore, the transition stations would require outdoor lighting, which would adversely affect nighttime views. The underground transmission line would also need to be served by an all-weather access road, and access hatches for underground vaults would be needed every 1,200 to 1,800 feet for each of three parallel sets of buried transmission cable.

Technical issues associated with installing a 500-kV transmission line underground include: (1) selection of appropriate and feasible 500-kV technology; (2) installation considerations, which may effect the reliability of the system (e.g., seismic conditions and slopes), and the area of impact; and (3) maintenance requirements.

Feasibility. As discussed in detail in Appendix 1 of the EIR/EIS, there are four underground technologies for 500-kV transmission that are commercially available; however, of the four underground cable technologies, XLPE technology is considered the preferred technology for underground construction. XLPE underground transmission cable has been available for system voltages up to 138 kV since the early 1970s; however, there was a lack of widespread acceptance in this country because of reliability problems with these "first generation" systems. XLPE systems have recently begun to have installations with long enough service life to increase utility confidence in their reliability. Currently, the number of 220-kV solid dielectric cable installations in the United States is increasing with approximately 50 circuit miles in service.

The first long-distance 500-kV XLPE lines were installed in Tokyo, Japan in 2000. As only one 500-kV XLPE system has been installed in the world, and was specially installed in a cable tunnel (and ducts), XLPE technology has scant operating history that can serve as a basis for demonstrating reliability at this voltage. However, XLPE cable has been successfully installed and operated for long lengths at lower voltages and has been shown to be technically feasible for a 500-kV installation since the fundamental technology is the same.

Installation Considerations. Underground transmission lines are more at risk for damage from earthquakes and landslides than overhead lines. As noted in Section C.5, Geology, Soils, and Paleontology, the transmission line would traverse the San Andreas Rift Zone, which is a seismically active region. A seismic event would expose the buried cable to potential fault rupture, local ground cracking, and groundshaking,

which could damage the underground cable and render it inoperable. As such, serious reliability concerns exist for underground installations near an active fault zone. Furthermore, landslides have been mapped in the Project vicinity (Pelona Schist), and unmapped landslides and areas of localized slope instability may be encountered in the hills traversed by the proposed transmission route. The occurrence of one of these events after construction could adversely affect the reliability of the system in a serious way.

In addition to earthquakes and landslides, burying cables within a slope for any significant distance is of concern as there is a risk of movement of the cable down slope due to either gravity or contraction and expansion effects. While there are no definitive limitations on maximum gradients for installations within slopes, cable grappling or retention systems would need to be considered if the cable slope is in excess of five percent for distances greater than 500 feet. Significant cable slopes with cable retention systems are rarely used due to the potential for the attachments to introduce physical, electrical, and thermal stress points that can result in cable failures. As such, system reliability becomes an issue when dealing with sloped terrain.

Elevations along the proposed Project alignment range from about 1,060 feet at the Pardee Substation to approximately 4,200 feet above mean sea level (msl) in the Liebre-Sierra Pelona Mountains near where the alignment crosses the Grass Mountain Leona Divide Road, and then back down to 2,470 feet above msl at the Antelope Substation (Delorme, 1999). Elevations along the Alternative 5 alignment range from about 1,060 feet at the Pardee Substation to approximately 5,000 feet above msl in the Sierra Pelona Mountains where the alignment crosses near Mount McDill, and then back down to 2,470 feet above msl at the Antelope Substation (Delorme, 1999). As such, considerable slopes are present in the Project area, which would become a potential feasibility and reliability issue for an underground transmission line.

Another consideration for underground cables is the area of impact required for installation. The primary infrastructure components for underground transmission lines are substantially different than for overhead lines and include:

- XLPE cables and duct banks;
- splicing vaults;
- thermal fill to cover the buried facilities; and
- transition stations (described above).

As described in Section B.4.1.2, and in detail in Appendix 1, XLPE cable consists of three independent cables per phase. For an underground segment, each phase (consisting of three cables for a total of 9 cables) would be individually buried in a duct bank (see Figure B.4-5). A set of three splicing vaults, one for each set of cables, would be buried every 1,200 to 1,800 feet. Each underground splicing vault would measure approximately 10 feet by 10 feet by 35 feet. Up to eight feet of thermal fill may be required over the top of all buried facilities and infrastructure (duct banks and splicing vaults). During construction an approximately 85-foot wide area would be disturbed to install the three duct banks and associated splicing vaults. Not only would underground construction have greater biological impacts, but it would also increase traffic impacts associated with truck trips to remove debris and import materials, such as concrete for the duct banks and thermal backfill, and increase the overall length of construction (and other associated impacts, such as noise).

Maintenance. Maintenance of underground transmission lines is more difficult than overhead lines because when a problem occurs underground it can be very difficult to identify the exact location of the problem. When the problem is located, the segment (length between two splicing vaults) of cable on which the problem occurred must be removed and replaced. This process involves additional excavation and construction. In addition to the environmental implications, this process would cause circuit restoration to take substantially longer than with overhead transmission lines. Furthermore, underground lines have been found to have a

shorter overall lifespan than overhead lines due to the degradation of the insulation surrounding the cables. Replacement activities, assuming an empty parallel duct is not provided, would include removal and replacement of the cable system, which would have substantial environmental consequences.

Cost Considerations. As a result of the considerable construction activities associated with underground construction of transmission lines, the associated costs are substantially greater than the cost of installing overhead transmission lines (approximately 10 times more expensive). The cost of undergrounding the transmission line for long distances could be cost prohibitive. Furthermore, these costs would be passed on to SCE customers as approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (112 FERC 16,014, Docket No. EL05-80-000). In addition to the cost of construction, costs associated with maintenance of underground lines also has the potential to be excessive due to the need to excavate and reconstruct if a segment fails.

Conclusion. In light of the reliability issues related to underground construction discussed above, potential for significantly more biological impacts, as well as the additional construction and potential maintenance costs, underground construction, except under specific conditions and for short distances, is generally not used in practice. Based on this limited application of underground construction, placement of underground transmission lines within the Forest along the steep slopes of Del-Sur Ridge is not practicable. While meeting the Forest's intentions of reducing visual impacts, this construction technique would cause for greater biological impacts and would permanently alter the topography in the area, which would ultimately result in visual impacts in spite of the efforts to reduce visual impacts.

8.3 Responses to Individual Comments

The following pages present the written comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS during the public review period. Each of the comment documents has been given a number designation and the comments in each document have been numbered. Responses correspond to the comment numbers and immediately follow each comment document.