

## **C. Transcripts from Public Meetings**

This section provides responses to verbal comments received from individuals during public meetings about the Draft EIR held on July 15 and 16, 2009. A transcript of the July 15 meeting is provided below and responses to comments follow. A transcript is not provided for the July 16 meeting because no individual from the public attended the meeting to submit a comment either verbally or in writing.

## C1 to C12 Comments

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING  
VALLEY-IVYGLEN SUBTRANSMISSION LINE  
AND FOGARTY SUBSTATION PROJECT  
183 North Main Street, Lake Elsinore, California  
Wednesday, July 15, 2009  
Brooke Silvas, CSR No. 10988, RPR

1 LAKE ELSINORE, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 2009

2 6:04 P.M.

3  
4 MS. LADD: Good evening, everyone. My name is  
5 Karen Ladd. And I will serve as the moderator for  
6 this public hearing. We are here tonight to hear  
7 your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact  
8 Report for the Valley-Ivyglen Subtransmission Line  
9 and Fogarty Substation Project.

10 I have Sylvia Yanez here, who is a Spanish  
11 speaker. If any of you would want to provide  
12 comments in Spanish during the meeting, Sylvia will  
13 help you.

14 (Translator speaking in Spanish.)

15 MS. LADD: So before we begin, I would like to  
16 explain the procedures we will be using so you know  
17 what to expect. We will begin the meeting with  
18 brief presentations from our panelists, staff from  
19 the Public Utilities Commission and the  
20 environmental contractor responsible for preparing  
21 the Draft Environmental Impact Report. After that,  
22 we will spend the rest of the time taking the rest  
23 of your comments.

24 There is a court reporter over here  
25 recording the proceedings. That will become part of

3

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

**BARKLEY**  
Court Reporters

1 the public record. I will call the names of those  
2 that registered to speak. I will ask you to come up  
3 to the podium, where you will have three minutes to  
4 provide your comments to the panelists.

5 The purpose of the meeting is to hear your  
6 comments. The panelists will not be responding to  
7 comments or questions. If you would like to make  
8 oral comments, please make sure that you signed up  
9 at the registration table so I have my list. The  
10 registration cards look like this. I would also  
11 point out that providing oral comments is only one  
12 of the ways to comment on the prepared document. If  
13 you prepared written comments, you can submit them  
14 at the registration or give them to me directly.  
15 You're welcome to submit written comments by mail,  
16 fax or e-mail. All comments given during the public  
17 comment period will be given equal consideration.  
18 Information on how to submit comments is available  
19 at the registration table as well.

20 We don't have any elected officials or  
21 government agency representatives. So I will be  
22 just calling the names from the list of people who  
23 registered on a first-come/first-serve basis. When  
24 I call on you to provide your comments, please come  
25 forward to the podium and begin by stating your

1 name, as well as the name of any agency or  
2 organization that you are representing. Please  
3 speak clearly into the microphone to make sure that  
4 we have an accurate record of your comments. I will  
5 ask you to conclude your comments within three  
6 minutes. After two minutes, I will hold up this  
7 yellow card to let you know that you have one more  
8 minute. If you have not concluded your comments by  
9 the end of your three minutes, I will ask you to  
10 stop, and I will invite the next person up to the  
11 podium. If you're not finished with your comments  
12 when your time is up and there is time left over  
13 after other registered speakers have commented, then  
14 you will be allowed to return to the podium to  
15 continue.

16 Just a little housekeeping before we  
17 start. We would appreciate it if you would turn  
18 your cell phones and pagers off. The exits are  
19 here, here, and through the double doors. And the  
20 rest rooms are also through the double doors.

21 So now I would like to introduce you to  
22 our panelists. You will hear first from Nick  
23 Figone. He is the third-party contractor  
24 responsible for preparing the Draft Environmental  
25 Impact Report. Following Nick's opening remarks,

1 Jensen Uchida, who is the project manager for the  
2 California Public Utilities Commission, will  
3 describe CPUC's role and explain the environmental  
4 review process. Nick will then briefly describe the  
5 project and summarize the potential environmental  
6 impacts.

7 Let the record show that it is now 6:07,  
8 and we are ready to begin.

9 MR. FIGONE: Thank you very much, Karen.

10 Again, welcome. And by way of  
11 introduction, I will just go through what we will be  
12 discussing, the purpose of the public comment  
13 meeting, the CPUC and environmental review process,  
14 and then just a brief description of the proposed  
15 project. Then we will hear your comments from the  
16 public agencies. And we will address where to send  
17 additional comments and the repositories.

18 So as Karen mentioned, the purpose of the  
19 public comment meeting is to solicit information  
20 from you, the public, and the residents of the area  
21 to address key concerns that will be addressed in  
22 the Final Environmental Impact Report that will be  
23 coming out in a couple weeks. It will be addressed  
24 in writing.

25 With that, I'm going to turn it over to

1 Jensen Uchida, who will briefly go through the  
2 permit to construct which is the application that  
3 Southern California, the applicant, is seeking from  
4 the California Public Utilities Commission to  
5 construct the project.

6 MR. UCHIDA: What I will do is go through the  
7 process of when the CPUC receives an application for  
8 a project. Who does the CPUC regulate? It  
9 regulates utilities that provide telephone  
10 communications, natural gas, water and some  
11 transportation companies. The purpose of the CPUC  
12 is to insure that these services are provided in a  
13 safe and reliable manner.

14 Slide 2. When a utility proposes to build  
15 an infrastructure in California, the utility files  
16 an application with the CPUC for a permit to  
17 construct or a certificate of public convenience and  
18 necessity. This project falls into the first  
19 category. The utility of Southern California Edison  
20 has applied for a CPUC to build the Valley-Ivyglen  
21 project.

22 The CPUC process is twofold. It shows how  
23 it will affect rates, market competition, market  
24 structure, and if it meets the needs of the people  
25 of California, and to ensure the environmental

1 review complies with the California Environmental  
2 Quality Act. The purpose of this review is to make  
3 the public aware of the possible environmental  
4 impacts of the proposed project.

5           Once the utility submits an application,  
6 the CPUC staff reviews the application for  
7 completeness. The CPUC hires an environmental  
8 consultant, in this case E&E, with qualifications to  
9 assist and review in the preparation of the  
10 environmental document. The first major step in the  
11 process is the scoping meeting, which we held in  
12 February of 2008. Based on the input that we  
13 received from the scoping meeting and environmental  
14 analysis in the field and the agency consultation, a  
15 Draft Environmental Impact Report is prepared. Once  
16 prepared, the draft EIR is circulated to the public  
17 for 45 days.

18           At the conclusion of this review period,  
19 all substantive comments on the Draft EIR are  
20 considered and responses to all such comments are  
21 incorporated into the Final EIR. The Final EIR is  
22 forwarded to the commission's administrative law  
23 judge, who incorporates the measures identified in  
24 the Final EIR into a proposed commission decision.

25           The draft decision is circulated for 30



1 days to parties on the commission service list. And  
2 comments on the proposed decision to the proceeding  
3 are considered and addressed in the proposed final  
4 decision. And then commissioner -- commissioners  
5 finally vote on the proposed decision in the  
6 commission public meeting.

7 MR. FIGONE: Thank you, Jensen.

8 Again, by way of review, the key players  
9 and their roles are the California Public Utilities  
10 Commission, which is the lead agency set to regulate  
11 all utility companies in the state of California,  
12 including Southern California Edison, which is the  
13 applicant for this project; and my company, Ecology  
14 and Environment, Inc., which is the independent  
15 third-party environmental contractor hired by the  
16 CPUC to do a review of this project and the  
17 application put forth by Edison.

18 So briefly, many of you know what the  
19 project is. The draft was sent to your homes.  
20 Again, we have copies for you in both hard copy and  
21 electronic copy. But the Valley-Ivyglen 115  
22 kilovolt subtransmission line is a line that is 25  
23 miles long between the Valley and Ivyglen  
24 Substations, which includes a fiber optic cable for  
25 communications between these two substations, as

1 well as a new Fogarty Substation as a component of  
2 this project.

3           The project location map here just briefly  
4 shows where it is. We also have additional posters  
5 in the back that highlight the route and its  
6 alternatives, as well as some visual simulations and  
7 proposed pole simulations as well.

8           On the next slide, we'll talk about the  
9 project objectives as identified by the applicant.  
10 And it served the electrical needs area in the  
11 community, while maintaining system reliability to  
12 provide a direct connection between two major  
13 substations and, again, to increase the system  
14 reliability in the area.

15           On the next slide, we talk about improving  
16 operational maintenance and flexibility. Additional  
17 goals include meeting the project needs, while  
18 minimizing environmental impacts, doing so in a  
19 cost-effective manner and doing so within  
20 applicant-owned property, where possible.

21           The Draft Environmental Impact Report that  
22 was circulated, the findings of that Draft  
23 Environmental Impact Report, after reviewing 16  
24 different resource areas, four of the resource areas  
25 were concluded to be environmentally significant

1 impacts. That is, even with mitigation  
2 incorporated, it was still determined that they  
3 would be significant impacts. Those would be air  
4 quality, land use, visual resources and mineral  
5 resources.

6 Air quality impacts is determined -- go  
7 back one slide actually. Air quality impacts  
8 determine that nitrous oxide and particulate matter  
9 due to construction and operation of the project,  
10 because this is in a non-attainment area of the  
11 South Coast Air Quality Management District, would  
12 be a significant environmental impact, even with  
13 mitigation incorporated, as well as greenhouse gas  
14 mitigation for carbon emissions. Offsets were --  
15 will be required for construction of this project.

16 In addition, land use conflicts is a paper  
17 conflict with the Riverside County General Plan.  
18 That the visual impacts from the highway would be  
19 considered a conflict with the land use general plan  
20 from Highway 15 and 79. Additionally, for similar  
21 reasons visual resources were identified as impacts.  
22 And mineral resources, the recovery site at the  
23 mining facility is an active clay mining production.  
24 And a proposed transmission route would go through  
25 that active clay mining facility and remove clay

1 from production.

2           Because of that, alternatives were  
3 identified. In the next slide, we have some of the  
4 alternative routes as well listed on the poster  
5 behind. And it was concluded that Alternate 5 is  
6 the environmentally superior alternative because of  
7 its avoidance of the mineral resource recovery site  
8 and maintaining the active clay mining facility in  
9 production.

10           On the next slide, we, again, want to  
11 highlight the opportunities for public input. This  
12 evening, you have the opportunity to give your  
13 comments in oral form, which you may also do so in  
14 writing at the -- by mail or by e-mail or fax. The  
15 public comment period will close on July 30th.  
16 Again, response to comments will be issued in the  
17 Final Environmental Impact Report, which will come  
18 out in the coming weeks.

19           And on the last slide, we have listed  
20 where again you can send your comments. And we have  
21 information available to take home for your written  
22 comments if you choose not to speak this evening.

23           So with that, I will turn it over to Karen  
24 Ladd, who will open it up for public comment.

25           MS. LADD: Thank you. So the first speaker to

1 provide comments is Mary R. Appleman Thompson.

2 MS. THOMPSON: I am Mary Appleman Thompson.

3 I'll give you the short version. I am a resident in  
4 the grove where this proposed alternative is. And  
5 I'm sorry, but your environmental impact has  
6 excluded a number of our endangered species.

C1-1

7 Kangaroo rat was the only one, to my knowledge, that  
8 was even acknowledged. We have the red tail hawk.  
9 We have the fairy shrimp and a number of others.

10 You're putting it in a densely populated  
11 area. What are you thinking? It impacts our

C1-2

12 safety, our health, and property values. These are  
13 substandard -- the road that you're proposing is a  
14 substandard road grandfathered in. It does not have  
15 sufficient right-of-way to accommodate you. If you  
16 get additional right-of-way, you are going to impact  
17 our safety as far as health because then you're  
18 going to make these lots inhabitable where their  
19 septic are going to fail.

C1-3

C1-4

20 Now, I've already put in and gave you my  
21 opinion before. You know what it is. I am not for  
22 this. I do not see any benefit you're going to get  
23 by going through this community. You have  
24 sufficient right-of-way north of us that you can go  
25 through, but you don't want to. Big parcels,

C1-5

C1-6

1 commercial. It's not going to impact the number of  
2 people that you're going to impact us. C1-6  
3 Thank you. Cont.

4 MS. LADD: You have one more minute.

5 MS. THOMPSON: I don't want to say something  
6 and get in trouble.

7 MS. LADD: Okay. Thank you.

8 Just a reminder, when I hold up the yellow  
9 card, you just have one more minute. It's just to  
10 let you know that you need to start to think about  
11 concluding.

12 The next commenter is Terrence Smith. C2-1

13 MR. SMITH: My name is Terrence Smith. I'm at  
14 28281 Rostrata in section -- Segment 3C. I believe  
15 you all a copy of a protest letter from residents  
16 that live in sections C-3 and C-4 that you have in  
17 front of you. The study is incomplete and C2-2

18 inconclusive. It does not show the area that you're  
19 trying to go through. If you went by the study, you  
20 would think that nobody lives in any of this area.

21 C-3 and C4, if you drove down Rostrata, Mermack and  
22 Stonehouse and Old El Toro, you would find there's  
23 more than 50 to 60 residents that live directly  
24 underneath these power lines. Anyone that would say C2-3

25 that you can replace a 26-foot pole with a 65-foot

1 pole that buzzes all the time and it's not going to  
2 affect your property value, I don't know how you can  
3 put that in black and white. Does anybody here want  
4 a 65-foot pole in their front yard? I don't think  
5 so.

C2-3  
Cont.

6 Also, to census phase D.4-29, the census  
7 species chart shows segment C-1 and C-6, kangaroo  
8 rats, owls and other species noted. As soon as you  
9 turn to C-3 and C-4, they disappear. It's exactly  
10 the same terrain in C-1. How do the species all of  
11 a sudden disappear?

C2-4

12 Also on your photos, page D.3 -- 13, 14,  
13 15, you show photos of wide open streets. There's  
14 not one photo showing one house in the whole route.  
15 If you drive down, take a picture from Conard going  
16 towards Rostrata, there's houses on both sides of  
17 the street. There's trees all the way down  
18 Rostrata. You showed one pick sure on 14 that shows  
19 trees. There's people that live down that street.  
20 Same thing on Rostrata, when you go down the road.  
21 When you go down Mermack road. There's residents on  
22 both sides. They weren't going down the streets and  
23 doing it. They took pictures, and that's it, of the  
24 whole area. You go down Stonehouse, it's a  
25 15-foot-wide street. You put a 100-foot pole down

C2-5

C2-6

1 it. The report states that you're going to put  
2 poles where needed. They don't tell you where the  
3 poles are going. They know where they're going.  
4 Why don't they tell us?

C2-6  
Cont.

5 So -- also the segment C3 -- C-4, C-3 on  
6 figure B.3-4 is a 20-year-old picture. It doesn't  
7 show anything of what is actually there. So the  
8 whole study that they have done needs to be redone.

C2-7

9 Plus, they have changed the whole scope of the  
10 project and the parameters. Now, they are trying to  
11 say it's 150kV at the substation when before it was  
12 115. The original thing was 115. They're trying to  
13 do away with 115. So --

C2-8

14 MS. LADD: Okay. The next speaker is -- is it  
15 Tim or Tom Fleming?

16 MR. FLEMING: Tim.

17 MS. LADD: Tim.

18 MR. FLEMING: Good evening. My name is Tim  
19 Fleming. I live at 17970 Lake Shore Drive,  
20 Lake Elsinore. I have been familiar with the  
21 general plan update four and a half years. And I  
22 have specific questions regarding this project, only  
23 because this has been discussed two and a half,  
24 three years ago. I also had the San Francisco  
25 consultant come to my house to discuss some of the



1 alternative routes. I'm very familiar with the  
2 Romoland substation and some of the other  
3 transmission lines that actually are traversing a  
4 lot of this terrain to begin with.

5 First of all, the main thing with my  
6 concerns are the esthetics of this project. Just to  
7 make that clear, I oppose Alternative 3 and 5 only  
8 because it really doesn't make a lot of sense, other  
9 than possibly tying in Lake Elsinore Unified -- or  
10 the EVMWD, Elsinore Valley Municipal Water Works,  
11 connected to the Leaf's project. I don't know if  
12 that's because some of the transmission lines are  
13 going to tie into that possible project through High  
14 Grove or if this is something -- it just looked like  
15 it was more environmentally pleasing to have the  
16 transmission lines going down Collier lane, Collier  
17 Drive and through our -- through the I-15 corridor.  
18 Alternatives 3 and 5 don't make a lot of sense to  
19 me. The original proposal is the one that was taken  
20 away two years ago and then brought back again. So  
21 now we have this in front of us again. So that  
22 seems to be the preferred line.

23 And one of my questions is, you have  
24 transmission towers through the BLM property to the  
25 north. It's called north peak. That goes directly

C3-1

C3-2

C3-3

1 almost to Ivyglen. No one has ever answered my  
2 questions regarding is that available to this  
3 particular transmission line, to take the power from  
4 one -- from Romoland to the Ivyglen substation.

C3-3  
Cont.

5 So is this project -- in summing it up, my  
6 concern really is this EIR being tied into Lake  
7 Elsinore's EIR general plan as far as the alternate  
8 routes and the esthetics that may be taking place  
9 with Elsinore Valley Water Municipal District that  
10 you have as Alternates 3 and 5. Again, if you could  
11 answer some of those questions, I certainly would  
12 appreciate it. I do oppose the Alternate 3 and 5.  
13 Thank you.

C3-4

C3-5

14 MS. LADD: The next commenter is Jerry Rector.

15 MR. RECTOR: My name is Jerry Rector. And I  
16 own lots 1 and 2 of the eucalyptus grove. And the  
17 way you have that map drawn in red, that's cutting  
18 right through my property. I bought that property  
19 in 1969 and put a home up there. And I'll be darned  
20 if I want to look down and see a bunch of telephone  
21 or electric wires running right through my property.  
22 I have a daughter and a son both living down right  
23 where the lines are going to go right across. You  
24 have no right-of-way to go through my property at  
25 all. And I don't want them there. And I think

C4-1

1 you've got other -- other places that you can put  
2 that. You can put it north. It seems like you  
3 purposely went right down through my property. You  
4 had to zigzag around all over the place to get them  
5 there. I don't see the purpose in that.

C4-2

6 That's about all I have to say. Thank  
7 you.

8 MS. LADD: Thank you.

9 That concludes the commenters who we had  
10 that signed up. Is there anyone who came in who  
11 didn't have a chance to register but who would like  
12 to provide oral comments tonight?

13 Would you like to use the microphone?

14 MS. LANE: My name is Merrily Lane. I live at  
15 18285 Don Juan in the eucalyptus grove. I have been  
16 there since '79. None of my neighbors nor myself  
17 want those lines increased or any services run on  
18 your proposed route. If you can use a northern  
19 route that might be available, we would greatly  
20 appreciate all your efforts.

C5-1

C5-2

21 MS. LADD: Thank you.

22 Is there anyone else who would like to  
23 provide comments or if I cut you off and you would  
24 like to come back up.

25 Please state your name again when you get

1 to the podium.

2 MR. SMITH: I'm Terrence Smith. The other C6-1  
3 thing, on the whole route that they have, they're  
4 saying they have a right-of-way. The right-of-way  
5 that they're trying to use down Rostrata was a  
6 right-of-way that we had to give them 40 years ago  
7 so we could get power down to the lines. There was  
8 never any implication that they could use it for  
9 high power -- high voltage power lines. They buzz C6-2  
10 all the time. It's also going to devalue our  
11 property, not to mention wreck our visual view of C6-3  
12 the whole valley. The main thing is how can they  
13 come in and say they have a right-of-way when we C6-4  
14 gave them a 10-foot right-of-way to run power to our  
15 house, not high voltage through there.

16 The study needs to be redone because they C6-5  
17 have got no pictures of the neighborhoods that  
18 they're going through. You would think nobody lives  
19 where we live right now. So they also -- the best C6-6  
20 direct route would be go straight down 74 until you  
21 hit the 15 and jump over the 15 over by -- route it  
22 that way.

23 Also, the route is eventually going to tie C6-7  
24 into downtown Elsinore. So they're going that way  
25 anyhow. They would have to double back to the

1 substation through Elsinore. There's no point --  
2 they're trying to break it into different segments  
3 and not showing the true overall picture of the  
4 project.

5           If you read the whole project as a whole,  
6 it's going to go down Elsinore. Why do they want  
7 it -- Elsinore wants them to bury the lines. And  
8 that would mean the way to go is underground so  
9 nobody has to look at them. Nobody lives there. It  
10 wouldn't affect their health. It's down a  
11 commercial area and next to the freeway. So the  
12 whole scheme of things doesn't make any sense to  
13 zigzag through our neighborhood.

14           So -- and that's -- and also, I tried  
15 calling CPUC all week. Nobody returned my phone  
16 call. I tried to get more information on how to  
17 file the right paperwork to protest this. I'm  
18 already on the list as a -- the lead people against  
19 it. But they won't even return my phone call  
20 anymore. I would like to know how I can get ahold  
21 of the CPUC so they will return my phone call.  
22 That's it.

23           MS. LADD: Thank you.

24           Please come on up. State your name again,  
25 please.

21

C6-7  
Cont.

C6-8

C6-9

C6-10

1 MR. FLEMING: Tim Fleming, Lake Elsinore. I do  
2 apologize. Alternate 3 is the preferred. I was  
3 saying 3 and 5. 3 is the preferred. 5 is the one  
4 that I object to. Thank you.

C7-1

5 MS. LADD: We have another speaker coming up.  
6 Are there any others that would like to provide  
7 comment or speak again? Okay.

8 MR. LANE: Good evening.

9 MS. LADD: Good evening. Please step up to the  
10 podium and say your name. And you'll have a few  
11 minutes to give your comments.

12 MR. LANE: My name is Jason Lane. I'm a  
13 resident of the area of Springs Valley. I have not  
14 had a chance to go over your proposal. However, I  
15 have had a chance to see the outline as to where  
16 your proposed locations for the lines could go. And  
17 one proposed area that looks really good runs right  
18 along the Lake Elsinore runoff drain.

C8-1

19 Now, what I need to bring to your  
20 attention is that -- I'm sure that it's been  
21 mentioned -- fire dangers of our area for the grove.  
22 What may not have been brought to your attention is  
23 that when eucalyptus trees reach 1200 to 1500  
24 degrees, the sap inside actually boils, and the  
25 trees can explode, spreading out that fire to the

C8-2

1 surrounding trees. And those trees will, in turn,  
2 do the same at those temperatures. And it was told  
3 to us over 25 years ago that if the grove ever did  
4 catch on fire and did reach those degrees, that the  
5 entire grove would burn down in under ten minutes.

C8-2  
Cont.

6 Also, the power poles are known to cause  
7 brain tumors. I know that there's a lot of  
8 speculation as to whether or not this is true. I,  
9 however, don't want to take a chance because of the  
10 fact I have a pituitary tumor. It is a form of  
11 brain tumor. I have no reason to want to exacerbate  
12 a preexisting condition.

C8-3

13 I live on Don Juan. It's not that far  
14 from your location that you want to run the lines.  
15 If we can create an alternative where it would be  
16 further from my home, I would really appreciate  
17 that.

18 Now, the poles that we're talking about,  
19 from what I understand, are 60 to 120 feet tall. Is  
20 this correct? That's what I understand so far by  
21 what I read. But I also understand that those in  
22 the future can be replaced with larger steel towers.  
23 Now, I'm not sure how you guys are going to do this  
24 or what exactly we're going to have. But that's  
25 going to become a public eyesore through our area.

C8-4

1 It will definitely take up residential space. And  
2 with the tight area that we have for the residents,  
3 many of these people don't want to give up property.  
4 And I can understand their concerns.

C8-5

5 I'm sorry. I'm trying to stay focused.  
6 But it's hard. So I'm going to go ahead and say  
7 thank you. You have a good night.

8 MS. LADD: Thank you.

9 Is there anyone else who would like to  
10 come up and give comments or if you've already given  
11 comments and you would like to say a few more words?  
12 We'll be here for a little while if you think of  
13 something. Or if other people show up, we'll still  
14 be here.

15 MR. SMITH: My name is Terrence Smith. Also,  
16 the -- not one time has a project manager been to  
17 any of these meetings so that we can ask him any  
18 questions about the project. They have already  
19 changed commissioners twice on us. So we're getting  
20 different people to listen to what's going on, so  
21 they have no idea what happened last February when  
22 we had a meeting.

C9-1

23 The meeting in February, they tried making  
24 the lines 200 kV. I brought up the fact that it was  
25 meant for 150. And now they dropped it back down to

C9-2



1 115. So what's going to stop them as soon as they  
2 get them in to say we need 200 kV now, which is a  
3 whole different parameter and changes the whole  
4 project. None of you guys were here last time, so  
5 you don't even know about that apparently because  
6 it's not being brought up. So the change in  
7 numbers, substation now is 115 kV. The original was  
8 150. They already changed the parameters on that  
9 and the whole scope of the project. So they need to  
10 redo the studdie and start from square one. They  
11 need to change the parameters and the scope of the  
12 project. Nobody wants to bring that up. But they  
13 can't just start changing numbers whenever they feel  
14 like it without changing the whole scope of the  
15 project. So I would like to see something done with  
16 that.

C9-2  
Cont.

17 They changed project managers twice since  
18 we started this thing. And we can't ask them any  
19 questions because they keep changing them. How do  
20 you -- who do you know to trust because they keep  
21 changing the project and the project managers. They  
22 keep changing the commissioners. There's a  
23 different set of people every time. So there's no  
24 continuity in this whole project. They need to  
25 start it over and do it right this time.

C9-3

1           That's all I got.

2           MS. LADD: Thank you.

3           I have been through the list of people who  
4 have registered to speak. But if you would like to  
5 come up and provide comments, you're welcome to do  
6 that. If you did give comments but you haven't  
7 filled out one of these cards, I would ask you to  
8 see Conor Doyle back there, and he will help you  
9 fill out a card so we have it for the record. If  
10 anyone has additional comments they would like to  
11 come up and provide, you're welcome to do that.

12           I think we will just take a break then.  
13 And we will be here if people come and they would  
14 like to provide comments, we will receive them. So  
15 let the record show that it is 6:40, and we will  
16 take a break.

17           (A recess was taken.)

18           MS. LADD: Good evening again, everyone. I  
19 have another speaker that registered. If you have  
20 additional comments, you can come up. After we hear  
21 from everyone who would like to speak, we're  
22 planning to call the meeting to an end.

23           Right now, I have Bernard Rockwood.  
24 Please when you come up to the podium, state your  
25 name.

1 MR. ROCKWOOD: My name is Bernard Rockwood. I  
2 live on Welch Drive. What I'm concerned about is  
3 the routing of the alternative segment, route  
4 segment. And that's at C-9A and C-9C. I think the  
5 better alternative is C-8A, which runs right on down  
6 the main highway there and gets it out of  
7 everybody's hair and keeps it away from everything.  
8 There's houses that are going to interfere. And I  
9 think that's probably the best routing.

C10-1

10 And then also the other thing that I'm  
11 concerned about is the magnetism of the high wires.  
12 That creates a lot of magnetism around the wires and  
13 it creates a magnetism that is a dangerous thing to  
14 be around all the time. If you're just passing  
15 through, it's not a bad thing. But if you're  
16 staying around there for any long length of time,  
17 it's not a good thing. Cancer can be formed from  
18 that.

C10-2

19 So I'm completely in favor of the C-8A  
20 routing, clear down to C-9E. And on from there.  
21 But I'm really objecting to that C-9A, in that  
22 direction. It's just not a good route, period.

C10-3

23 Thank you.

24 MS. LADD: Thank you.

25 Are there any others who would like to

1 provide comment?

2           Please step up to the podium and state  
3 your name.

4           MS. APPLEMAN: My name is Catherine Appleman.  
5 And I want to go on record that I'm against this  
6 proposal of going down Rostrata. I think it's  
7 dangerous. And I think there's other alternatives.  
8 We should go down El Toro.

C11-1

C11-2

9           Okay. That's it. Thank you.

10          MS. LADD: Thank you.

11                  For those of you just coming up, I'm going  
12 to ask you afterwards if you would fill out a  
13 registration card for me.

14          MS. SMITH: What was the -- give me the map.  
15 That one. Sorry.

16          MS. LADD: Please state your name.

17          MS. SMITH: My name is Valerie Smith. I also  
18 live on Rostrata. I am opposed to the proposed  
19 route that is going to be going right down Rostrata.  
20 That goes in direct line with my house. I do agree  
21 that -- I believe either the alternate 3 or 5 would  
22 probably be the best solution.

C12-1

23          MS. THOMPSON: Not 5.

24          MS. SMITH: The 3 route. That's all. I am  
25 against that. Thank you.

1 MS. LADD: Thank you.

2 Are there any others that would like to  
3 provide comments?

4 Thank you all for coming and participating  
5 and providing us with your comments tonight. We're  
6 going to call the meeting to a close. Let the  
7 record show that it is 7:06. Thank you.

8 (Public meeting was adjourned at  
9 7:06 p.m.)

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
2 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE ) ss.

3  
4 I, Brooke Silvas, Certified Shorthand  
5 Reporter, Certificate No. 10988, for the State of  
6 California, hereby certify:

7 The foregoing is a true and correct copy of  
8 the original transcript of the proceeding taken before  
9 me as thereon stated.

10  
11 Dated July 21, 2009.

12  
13  
14 Brooke Silvas  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



## Responses to C1 Comments

Mary Appleman Thompson

- C1-1** A number of wildlife and plant species were addressed in the Draft EIR. Birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 United States Code 703–712, as amended), including raptors, were analyzed in the Draft EIR. The Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, ferruginous hawk (wintering), burrowing owl, and golden eagle were among the raptors reviewed. Additional descriptive information was added to the Final EIR pertaining to reptiles (Northern red diamond rattlesnake, San Diego Coast lizard), riparian birds (Southwestern willow flycatcher, yellow-breasted chat, and least Bell's vireo), vernal pool invertebrates (fairy shrimp), and several special status plant species. Refer to Section D.4.1.6 of the revised Biological Resources section (Chapter 5 of the Final EIR).
- C1-2** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.
- C1-3** The comment refers to a road that is “substandard” and without “sufficient right-of-way” to accommodate the Project. The name of the road is not mentioned, however, and it is unclear from the context of this comment and the other comments received during the public meeting which road is being addressed.
- C1-4** The Applicant is legally obligated to apply for excavation permits at the city and county levels (Table B.6-1 of the Draft EIR) and to contact the Underground Service Alert of Southern California (DigAlert 2006) prior to commencing excavation activities.

The Applicant is also responsible for discussing with private landowners the location of underground facilities that may be affected by the installation of Project infrastructure. As stated on page D.13-2 of the Draft EIR, “as the proposed subtransmission line route would potentially require acquisition of property used for existing leach fields, the Applicant would need to utilize the appropriate legal channels in order to avoid rendering an existing property’s septic system and leach field unusable.” To ensure that septic systems and associated leach fields as well as other underground facilities on private land are avoided or minimally impacted, mitigation measure MM HAZ-2a has been revised. Please refer to the revisions to page D.8-17 of the Draft EIR (Final EIR Section 4.5).

- C1-5** See response to comment C1-2.
- C1-6** See response to comment C1-2.

## Responses to C2 Comments

Terrence Smith

- C2-1** The letter was received. See comment set B4.
- C2-2** Please refer to page D.3-14 of the Draft EIR. Photo view point #14 looks northeast up Rostrata Avenue and #15 looks west down El Toro Drive. The two view points both show residences and the proximity of residences to electrical facilities. Additionally, please refer to the response to comment B4-2.

- C2-3** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project. Regarding the comment about power line “buzzing,” please refer to Impact NOISE-1 and Impact NOISE-3 in the Draft EIR.
- C2-4** See response to comment B4-3.
- C2-5** See response to comment B4-2.
- C2-6** It is acknowledged that Stonehouse Road is narrow, see page D.12-2 of the Draft EIR. There is an existing 12-kV distribution line along this road. The existing wood poles would be replaced with steel poles. The Project would increase the height of existing poles along this segment, see page D.2-5 of the Draft EIR.
- C2-7** See response to comment B4-2.
- C2-8** The Fogarty Substation would be a 115-kV 56 mega volt-ampere substation. An electronic search was conducted of the Draft EIR for the following keywords using both uppercase and lowercase letters: 150kV, 150 kV, and 150-kV. This rating is not used in the Draft EIR.

### **Responses to C3 Comments**

Tim Fleming

- C3-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.
- C3-2** Please refer to page B-1 of the Draft EIR for a description of the proposed Project. Alternative 5 is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.
- C3-3** Please refer to page E-6 of the Draft EIR, which analyzes Alternative 2. Alternative 2 follows the existing Valley-Serrano 500kV line in North Peak area the commenter mentions. Alternative 2 would not reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Project to less than significant levels.
- C3-4** See response to comment C3-1.
- C3-5** See response to comment C3-1.

### **Responses to C4 Comments**

Jerry Rector

- C4-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.
- C4-2** See response to comment C4-1.



## Responses to C5 Comments

Merrily Lane

**C5-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

**C5-2** See response to comment C5-1.

## Responses to C6 Comments

Terrence Smith

**C6-1** The comment refers to the right-of-way adequacy to replace existing electrical facilities with higher-voltage facilities on Rostrata Avenue. The Applicant's right-of-way is sufficient to construct the subtransmission line. Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

**C6-2** See response to comment C2-3.

**C6-3** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

**C6-4** See response to comment C6-1.

**C6-5** See response to comment C2-2.

**C6-6** See response to comment C6-3.

**C6-7** See response to comment C6-3.

**C6-8** See response to comment C6-3.

**C6-9** See response to comment C6-3.

**C6-10** Public participation is an essential part of the EIR process, which is directed by the California Environmental Quality Act. Public hearings were held on July 15 and July 16, 2009, during the 45-day comment period. Formal responses are made to all comments received during this period. Additionally, the Draft EIR and other documentation, key dates, and project status information are available on the Internet at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/ene/ivyglen/ivyglen.html>.

Public comments received outside of the 45-day comment period are still acknowledged even though no formal response may be made. The final decision about the Project is based on a vote by the California Public Utilities Commission. This vote cannot occur until release and certification of the Final EIR.

## Responses to C7 Comments

Tim Fleming

**C7-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

## Responses to C8 Comments

Jason Lane

**C8-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

**C8-2** The potential for fire in the vicinity of the Project is discussed in Section D.8.1.5 and the analysis of Impact HAZ-8. Though eucalyptus trees are not specifically addressed in these sections, the high potential for fire in the project area is well documented in the Draft EIR. See also applicant proposed measures HAZ-SCE-2 and HAZ-SCE-3.

**C8-3** Electric and magnetic fields are discussed in Section D.8.3.4 of the Draft EIR.

**C8-4** The majority of new poles required for the proposed subtransmission line would be light-duty steel. These poles would be up to 75 feet long, but approximately 10 feet of each pole would be buried. Tubular steel poles would also be used. These poles would range from 80 to 100 feet in height (above the concrete footing), depending on the location where they are installed. Please refer to Section B.3.1.1 of the Draft EIR for further information about the poles required for construction of the Project.

**C8-5** See response to comment C8-1.

## Responses to C9 Comments

Terrence Smith

**C9-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

**C9-2** The Project, as documented in the Draft EIR, is for the construction of a new 115-kV subtransmission line. No changes to this voltage have been proposed by the Applicant for evaluation in the Final EIR. The Applicant is legally required to construct and operate the Project as documented in the EIR. In addition, an electronic search was conducted of the Draft EIR for the following keywords using both uppercase and lowercase letters: 150kV, 150 kV, 150-kV, 200kV, 200 kV, and 200-kV. These ratings are not used in the Draft EIR with the exception of one reference to electric and magnetic field regulations in Minnesota (Table D.8-3). This reference, however, does not relate to the description of the Applicant's proposed 115-kV subtransmission line.

**C9-3** See response to comment C9-1.

## **Responses to C10 Comments**

Bernard Rockwood

**C10-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

**C10-2** See response to comment C8-3.

**C10-3** See response to comment C10-1.

## **Responses to C11 Comments**

Catherine Appleman

**C11-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

**C11-2** See response to comment C11-1.

## **Responses to C12 Comments**

Valerie Smith

**C12-1** Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.