



Scoping Report

**Environmental Impact Report
Pacific Gas & Electric
Permit to Construct the Santa Cruz 115-kV
Reinforcement Project**

March 2014

PANORAMA
ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Scoping Report

Environmental Impact Report Pacific Gas & Electric Permit to Construct the Santa Cruz 115-kV Reinforcement Project

Lead Agency:

California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102
Contact: Lisa Orsaba, (415) 703-1966

Prepared by:

Panorama Environmental, Inc.
One Embarcadero Center, Suite 740
San Francisco, California 94111
(650) 373-1200

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.1	Project Background.....	1-1
1.2	Scoping Report.....	1-2
2	Summary of CEQA Scoping Process	2-1
2.1	Overview	2-1
2.2	Draft IS Public Review.....	2-1
2.3	EIR Scoping.....	2-2
3	Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments	3-1
3.1	Draft IS Commenters	3-1
3.2	Scoping Period Commenters	3-8
4	Summary of Comments	4-1
4.1	Comments Received	4-1
4.2	Issues to be Addressed in the EIR from Scoping comments.....	4-26
4.3	Issues Outside the Scope of the EIR.....	4-29
5	Summary of Future Steps in the CEQA Process.....	5-1

List of Tables

Table 2-1:	Summary of CEQA NOI Requirements and CPUC Noticing	2-1
Table 2-2:	Summary of CEQA NOP Requirements and CPUC Noticing	2-2
Table 3-1:	Agency and Organization Draft IS Commenters	3-1
Table 3-2:	Individual Draft IS Commenters	3-1
Table 3-3:	Agency and Organization Scoping Period Commenters	3-8
Table 3-4:	Individual Scoping Period Commenters	3-9
Table 4-1:	Overview of Public Comments	4-1
Table 4-2:	EIR Issues to be Addressed.....	4-26
Table 4-3:	Issues Outside the Scope of the EIR	4-29
Table 5-1:	Future Steps in the CEQA Process.....	5-1

Appendices

- Appendix A: Notices
- Appendix B: Newspaper Advertisements
- Appendix C: Draft IS Public Review Meeting Materials
- Appendix D: Scoping Meeting Materials
- Appendix E: Scoping Meeting Transcript
- Appendix F: Comments Received During the Draft IS Review Period
- Appendix G: Comments Received After the Draft IS Review Period
- Appendix H: Comments Received During the Scoping Period
- Appendix I: Comments Received After the Scoping Period

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Description

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), a regulated California utility, filed an application with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on January 25, 2012, for a Permit to Construct (PTC) the Santa Cruz 115-kilovolt (kV) Reinforcement Project (proposed project). The project would be located in southern Santa Cruz County, between the communities of Aptos and Watsonville. PG&E proposes to:

- Rebuild approximately 7.1 miles of the existing Green Valley-Camp Evers 115-kV Power Line (**Northern Alignment**) from a single-circuit line to a double-circuit line by replacing the existing wood power poles with tubular steel poles (TSP) and installing new conductors on both circuits.
- Construct an approximately 1.7-mile long single-circuit 115-kV power line in an existing distribution right-of-way (ROW) (**Cox-Freedom Segment**) from the Northern Alignment to Rob Roy Substation.
- Install new components at **Rob Roy Substation** in order to accommodate the new 115-kV circuit and install TSPs to accommodate the interconnection of the existing Green Valley-Rob Roy 115-kV Power Line and Rob Roy-Paul Sweet 115-kV Power Line into the modified Rob Roy Substation.

The proposed project would improve the reliability of the transmission system in the Santa Cruz area and thereby prevent potential large-scale service interruptions if there are outages in the existing local electricity supply system.

1.1.2 CEQA Review

The CPUC is the lead agency for review of the proposed project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed project, *i.e.*, it must decide whether to approve or deny the PTC.

The CPUC released a Draft Initial Study (IS) pursuant to CEQA for a 49-day public review period on October 18, 2013. After a review of comments received on the Draft IS, the CPUC determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared in accordance with CEQA. The CPUC released a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR on January 17, 2014, for a 30-day review period ending on February 18, 2014.

1.2 SCOPING REPORT

1.2.1 Purpose

This scoping report describes the CPUC's CEQA scoping process and contains the comments received on the proposed project during the EIR scoping period. The scoping report also includes comments received during the 49-day public review period for the Draft IS, as the CPUC is taking these comments into account in the scope of the Draft EIR. The CPUC will use scoping comments and prior comments received on the Draft IS to:

- Define the range of issues and alternatives for the proposed project
- Focus the environmental analysis
- Identify potential environmental impacts
- Determine mitigation for environmental impacts

1.2.2 Organization

This scoping report is organized into the following sections:

- **Section 1 (Introduction):** provides an overview of the scoping report
- **Section 2 (Summary of CEQA Scoping Process):** describes the CEQA EIR scoping process
- **Section 3 (Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments):** lists commenters for the Draft IS and EIR scoping period
- **Section 4 (Summary of Comments):** summarizes topics of scoping comments and explains which comments will be and will not be considered in the EIR
- **Section 5 (Summary of Future Steps in the Planning Process):** describes in brief the future steps in the planning process

The scoping report appendices contain materials and documents used in and received during the Draft IS review period and the EIR scoping period. Appendices include:

- **A (Notices):** Copies of the October 2013 Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and current EIR NOP
- **B (Newspaper Advertisements):** Newspaper advertisements for the NOI and current NOP
- **C (Draft IS Public Review Meeting Materials):** Meeting agenda, written comment form, public review meeting presentation, public review meeting sign-in sheets
- **D (Scoping Meeting Materials):** Written comment form, scoping meeting presentation, scoping meeting sign-in sheets
- **E (Scoping Meeting Transcript):** Transcript of scoping meeting, including verbal scoping comments
- **F (Comments Received During the Draft IS Review Period):** Comment letters received during the Draft IS review period

SCOPING REPORT
Introduction

- **G (Comments Received After the Draft IS Review Period):** Comment letters received after the close of the Draft IS review period
- **H (Comments Received During the Scoping Period):** Comment letters received during the scoping period
- **I (Comments Received After the Scoping Period):** Comment letters received after the close of the scoping period

2 SUMMARY OF CEQA SCOPING PROCESS

2.1 OVERVIEW

The CEQA process provides opportunities for agencies, organizations, and individuals to provide input. This section describes the scoping process and how CPUC provided notice to the public on how to participate in the CEQA process.

2.2 DRAFT IS PUBLIC REVIEW

The CPUC issued an NOI on October 18, 2013 (see Appendix A). The NOI solicited comments on a Draft IS during a 49-day public review period. The review period ended on December 6, 2013. Table 2-1 contains NOI CEQA requirements and describes how the CPUC distributed the NOI.

Table 2-1: Summary of CEQA NOI Requirements and CPUC Noticing	
CEQA Requirement	CPUC Noticing
To public, responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and the county clerk of each county within which the proposed project is located (CEQA Guidelines § 15072).	√
To the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who have previously requested notice (CEQA Guidelines § 15072).	√
In at least one of the following ways (CEQA Guidelines § 15072): (a) Publication at least one time in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area is affected, the notice shall be published in the newspaper of largest circulation from among the newspapers of general circulation in those areas.	√ Santa Cruz Sentinel: October 19 and November 1, 2013 Register-Pajaronian: October 19 and November 2, 2013 See Appendix B.
(b) Posting of notice on- and off-site in the area where the project is to be located.	
(c) Direct mailing to the owners and occupants of contiguous property shown on the latest equalized assessment roll.	√ Extended direct mailing notice considerably beyond contiguous properties. The NOI was sent to properties within 500 feet of the proposed project alignment and to parties who had requested notification.
N/A	Posted on CPUC project website

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of CEQA Scoping Process

The CPUC held a public meeting on November 6, 2013, at the Corralitos Grange Hall (165 Little Corral Way, Watsonville, California 95076). The CPUC presented the project description and the environmental analysis at the meeting. The public was given time to make verbal comments. Appendix C contains materials from the Draft IS public meeting.

2.3 EIR SCOPING

The CPUC determined, after review of comments on the IS, that preparation of an EIR would be appropriate. The CPUC issued an NOP on January 17, 2014, to inform the public and agencies of its intention to prepare an EIR (see Appendix A). The NOP also solicited comments on the scope of the EIR during the 30-day scoping period. The scoping period ended on February 18, 2014. Table 2-2 contains CEQA NOP requirements and describes how the CPUC distributed the NOP.

Table 2-2: Summary of CEQA NOP Requirements and CPUC Noticing	
CEQA Requirement	CPUC Noticing
To each responsible ¹ and trustee agency ² advising them of its intention to prepare an EIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15082).	√
Consultation with persons and organizations prior to completing the draft EIR is optional under CEQA. When such scoping occurs, it should be a part of agency consultation under Section 15082 to the extent that combining agency consultation and public scoping is feasible (CEQA Guidelines § 15083).	√ Provided newspaper notice (Santa Cruz Sentinel and Register-Pajaronian: January 18, 2014), posted NOP to CPUC project website, and conducted direct mailing well beyond requirements of CEQA. The NOP was mailed to all properties within 500 feet of the proposed project and conceptual alternative alignments, to parties who had requested notification or submitted their address at the Draft IS meeting, and to parties who submitted comments on the Draft IS.

The CPUC held a public scoping meeting on January 29, 2014 at the Corralitos Grange Hall (165 Little Corral Way, Watsonville, California 95076). The CPUC described the proposed project and potential alternatives and impacts that would be addressed in the EIR. The CPUC also accepted verbal and written comments at the scoping meeting. Appendix D contains materials from the scoping meeting. The transcript from the scoping meeting is provided in Appendix E.

¹ Any public agency, other than the lead agency, which has discretionary approval power over a project (CEQA Guidelines § 15381)

² State agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of California (CEQA Guidelines § 15386)

3 AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS PROVIDING COMMENTS

3.1 DRAFT IS COMMENTERS

Table 3-1 summarizes the state agencies, local agencies, and organizations that provided comments on the Draft IS. No federal agencies submitted comments on the Draft IS. Table 3-2 lists individuals who submitted written comments on the Draft IS.

Table 3-1: Agency and Organization Draft IS Commenters	
Commenter	Date Received
State Agencies	
Mark Stone, California State Assembly	12/6/2013
Local Agencies	
Amy Clymo, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District	12/2/2013
Dave Garibotti, County of Santa Cruz Department of Public Works	11/22/2013
Ralph Bracamonte, Central Water District	12/5/2013
Zach Friend, County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors	12/6/2013
Organizations	
Pacific Gas and Electric Company	12/5/2013
Late Commenters	
Neal Coonerty, County of Santa Cruz, Board of Supervisors	12/10/2013, 12/13/2013

Table 3-2: Individual Draft IS Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Aaron Ashley	11/24/2013, 12/2/2013	Amy Merrill	12/6/2013
Abigail Allen	11/27/2013	Andrew Singleton	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013
Adele Miller	12/3/2013	Ann Farrier	12/5/2013
Alan Blanchette	12/6/2013	Anne Pitman	11/27/2013
Amanda Magallanes	12/6/2013	Antares E. Olson	11/27/2013
Amine Bouchti	12/6/2013	Anthony Marden	12/6/2013
Amita Kuttner	12/6/2013	Anuck Zoll	12/6/2013

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-2 (Continued): Individual Draft IS Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Ariel Stonebloom	11/6/2013, 12/6/2013	Cathy Guiley	12/6/2013
Arthur Templeman	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013, 12/6/2013	Carol Bessermin	11/26/2013
Andrea Sifton	11/27/2013	Cathy Mayer	12/5/2013
Andrew Newitt	12/6/2013	Cathy McDowell	12/6/2013
Ashley Halderman	12/2/2013	Celestial C. Smith	12/6/2013
Barbara Dillingham	11/27/2013	Chaise Lathrop	12/3/2013
Barbara Grant	12/6/2013	Charles Mackh	12/3/2013
Barry Gleaton	12/4/2013	Charles Singer, RN	12/6/2013
Becky Neagley	12/1/2013	Charlie Staka	12/6/2013
Becky Peters	12/5/2013	Chris and Joyce Magallanes	11/27/2013
Berkeley Ashby	11/27/2013	Chris Ilar	11/27/2013
Bernard Blanchette	12/6/2013	Chris Magallanes	12/6/2013
Betty H. Black	11/27/2013	Christina Lucchesi	11/25/2013
Bill Bray	12/6/2013	Christine Bracceri	12/5/2013
Bob and Susan Postle	11/27/2013	Christopher Hall	11/7/2013
Bonnie Minardi	12/6/2013	Christy Leach	11/27/2013
Brad Paquin	11/6/2013	Cindy Lerma	12/6/2013
Bradley Ashby	12/6/2013	Claire Etienne	12/6/2013
Brian C. Mathias	12/6/2013	Colleen Sloan	12/6/2013
Britt Haselton	10/21/2013	Craig Matthews	12/6/2013
Brock Standal	11/27/2013	Cynthia and Scott Haines	11/27/2013
Bruce Adamson	11/26/2013	Cynthia Haines	12/6/2013
Bruce Brodie	11/27/2013	Cynthia Rind	12/6/2013
Bruce Feinberg	12/5/2013	Dan Stark	12/6/2013
Bruce Hermansen	12/5/2013	Dana Bland	12/5/2013
Carla Mulder	11/26/2013	Daniel Stonebloom	11/6/2013, 12/6/2013
Caroline Cooke Carn	12/6/2013	Darrick Gitomer	12/6/2013
Carolyn Williams	12/5/2013	Dave Osland	10/24/2013, 11/7/2013
Carrie Osland	12/6/2013	David Black	11/26/2013

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-2 (Continued): Individual Draft IS Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
David Cantu	11/27/2013	Elizabeth Romanini	12/5/2013
David Delucchi	12/6/2013	Earle Petaik	11/27/2013
David Farguhas	12/6/2013	Elizabeth Wong	12/5/2013
David Gloata	12/6/2013	Ellen Chandra	12/6/2013
David Kurzer	11/26/2013, 12/6/2013	Ellen Kureshi	12/6/2013
David Schwartz	11/19/2013	Eric Whitfield	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013
Dayna Fisher-Postle	12/6/2013	Eric Wiggins	12/4/2013
Deanna Morden	12/2/2013	Erin Whitfield	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013
Debbie Singleton	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013	Eryk McGill	11/27/2013
Deborah Wiggins	12/4/2013	Ethel Griffin	11/26/2013
Dena Hope	12/3/2013	Evan Wood	11/27/2013
Dennis Tamura	12/6/2013	Eve Kienitz	12/6/2013
Diana Wicekewieg	12/6/2013	Eve Lundsten	12/6/2013
Diane Delucchi	12/6/2013	Evelyn Sharp	12/5/2013
Dianne Bermingham	12/5/2013	Frank Miller	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013
Don Bronwell	12/5/2013	Frank Prevedelli	12/3/2013
Don Dillingham	11/26/2013, 12/2/2013, 12/6/2013	Fred Chris Smith	12/6/2013
Don Hilbert	12/6/2013	Gabe Houston	12/6/2013
Donald Schwartz	11/6/2013	Gabriel Solomon	12/6/2013
Donald Sweeney	12/6/2013	Gail Adams	12/4/2013
Donna Saposnek	12/6/2013	Gail Evans	11/26/2013
Doreen Salvatore-DeMars	12/6/2013	Garie Lynn King	12/6/2013
Douglas Ronan	12/3/2013	Gary B. Niblock	12/6/2013
Dustin Blanchard	11/27/2013	Gary Bloom	12/6/2013
Dylan Shay	12/5/2013	Gary Minardi	12/3/2013, 12/3/2013
Ed Moya	12/6/2013	Gary Nolan	12/4/2013, 12/5/2013
Ed Murphy	12/4/2013	Gary P. Evans	11/27/2013
Edward C. Murphy	11/27/2013	George DeMars	12/6/2013
Edward Shimizu	12/6/2013	George J. Lucchesi	11/25/2013, 11/26/2013, 11/27/2013, 11/27/2013

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-2 (Continued): Individual Draft IS Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
George Myers	12/6/2013	Jerry Hoffman	12/6/2013
Gerald Carlin	12/6/2013	Jess Allen	12/6/2013
Geraldine Prevedelli	12/3/2013	Jesse Boise	12/6/2013
Glenn R. Farrier	12/6/2013	Jilian Matajcek	11/7/2013
Gregory Audino	12/5/2013, 12/6/2013	Jim Burns	12/6/2013
Gretchen L. Werner	12/6/2013	Joanna Hall	12/6/2013
Hal Dahlmeier	12/6/2013	Joe Paige	12/6/2013
Heidi Sifton	11/27/2013	John A. Morris	12/6/2013
Helen Carr	12/3/2013	John Hall	12/3/2013, 12/6/2013
Henry Van Siden	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013	John R. Benich	11/27/2013
Ian Parker Swindell	12/6/2013	John Randolph	11/20/2013
Ian Rusconi	12/6/2013	Jolene Burns	12/6/2013
Jacquellene Cooper	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013	Jose Angel Contreras	12/6/2013
Jaime Londono	11/27/2013	Josh Gitomer	12/6/2013
James D. Harper	11/26/2013	Josie Moss	12/6/2013
James Kerr	10/25/2013, 12/6/2013	Joyce Magallanes	12/6/2013
James Quienan	12/6/2013	Judith E. Mohler	12/6/2013
Jan Stuertevant	12/6/2013	Judith K. Harger	12/6/2013
Jane P. Miller	12/6/2013	Julie F. Skromm	12/6/2013
Janet Byers	12/3/2013	Julie Lolmaugh	12/4/2013
Janice Spichtig	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013, 12/4/2013	Julie Misseroni	11/27/2013
Jean Shimizu	12/6/2013	Julie Thayer	11/27/2013
Jeanne Heinsohn	11/26/2013	Kalman Weinfed	12/6/2013
Jeanne Herrick	12/4/2013	Karen M. Barigian	11/27/2013
Jeff Randolph	11/25/2013	Karen Robey	12/6/2013
Jeff West	12/5/2013	Kathenne King	12/6/2013
Jeffrey Young	12/6/2013	Katherine Brooks	12/4/2013
Jennifer Munter	12/5/2013	Kathie Stark	11/10/2013, 12/6/2013
Jennifer Spurlock Richman	12/5/2013	Kathleen Mroczynski-Minor	12/6/2013

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-2 (Continued): Individual Draft IS Commenters

Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Kay Wood	12/6/2013	Marcia Stew	12/6/2013
Keith F. Wood	12/6/2013	Marco Romanini	12/5/2013
Keith Hardy	12/6/2013	Margaret E. M. Ronan	12/6/2013
Keith Jones	11/27/2013	Margaret Lacy	11/27/2013
Kelley Filbin	12/6/2013	Margaret Pierce	11/3/2013
Kelly Allari	11/27/2013	Marilou Moschetti	11/6/2013, 12/3/2013
Kelly Kerr	12/5/2013	Marilyn Garret	12/6/2013
Kent Wiggins	11/24/2013	Mariposa Kercheval	11/26/2013
Klo Ann Curtis	11/27/2013	Mark Bidelman	12/6/2013
Kristen Totah	12/3/2013	Mark Block	12/6/2013
Kristin Stevens	12/6/2013	Mark Shute	12/6/2013
Larry Chin and Liz Wang	12/5/2013	Mark Swindell	12/4/2013, 12/6/2013
Larry Payne	12/6/2013	Martin Jackson	12/3/2013, 12/5/2013
Laura Miller	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013	Mary Staka	12/6/2013
Laura Schanzer	12/6/2013	Mary-Pat Pumfrey	12/6/2013
Lawrence Lane	12/2/2013	Mason Barker	12/4/2013
Leah Ashley	12/6/2013	Matthew King	12/2/2013
Linda Walker	12/6/2013	Maureen Brandi	12/5/2013
Linda Zebari	12/6/2013	Megae Boise	12/6/2013
Lisa Palacio	11/27/2013	Michael A. Russell	11/27/2013
Logan Tschantz	12/6/2013	Michael Grant	12/6/2013
Lonny Lundsten	12/6/2013	Michael Hollen	12/6/2013
Loreen Borelli	11/27/2013	Michael Honig	11/26/2013, 12/2/2013
Lori Perry	12/6/2013	Michael Maler	12/6/2013
Lorna Young	11/27/2013	Michele A. Rousli, Ph.D.	12/5/2013
Loucinda Blanchette	12/6/2013	Michelle Vorhees	12/6/2013
Madelene Coke	12/5/2013	Mike and Kayce Wilkinson	11/27/2013
Mahnaz Reihani	11/27/2013	Mike Dillingham	12/6/2013
Malene Kristensen	11/27/2013	Mike Mekis	12/6/2013
Manuel Dermer	11/27/2013	Mike Sitton	11/27/2013
Marcia Smith	12/6/2013	Misty Courtney	12/6/2013

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-2 (Continued): Individual Draft IS Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Molly Tacka	11/27/2013	Peter Pearson	12/4/2013
Monica Matthews	12/6/2013	Rachel DK Clark	12/6/2013
Monica Meyer	12/3/2013	Rachel Wedeen	12/6/2013
Nancy Bensen	12/5/2013	Ralph B. Griffin	11/26/2013
Nancy Petersen	12/2/2013	Ralph Carney	12/4/2013
Nancy Waite	12/6/2013	Randall Naess	12/5/2013
Nevin Hongardy	11/27/2013	Rex Boyes	12/6/2013
Nick Prevedelli	12/3/2013	Richard Bessermin	12/6/2013
Nicole Culbertson	11/27/2013	Richard Chalgren	12/3/2013
Nicole Maler	12/6/2013	Richard Faggioli	12/6/2013
Nicole Rinaldi	11/27/2013	Richard Smith	12/6/2013
Noelia Johnson	11/27/2013	Richard Wicekewieg	12/6/2013
Norman R. Cook Jr.	11/26/2013	Rick Ulrick	12/5/2013
Olivia Ronan	11/27/2013	Robert Culbertson	11/27/2013
Pam Hardy	12/6/2013	Robert Gleaton	12/2/2013
Pat Manning	12/6/2013	Robert Halderman	12/2/2013
Patricia Bowden	12/6/2013	Robin West	12/5/2013
Patricia Fischer	12/6/2013	Robynn Smith	12/6/2013
Patrick Dickens	11/27/2013	Rocco Corsalli	12/6/2013
Patrick Kretsch	12/6/2013	Ronald Morris	12/2/2013
Patrick Sharp	12/5/2013	Ronda Williams-Kniffin	12/6/2013
Paul Lerma	12/6/2013	Rosalyn Hilbert	12/5/2013
Paul Lewis	12/6/2013	Rosanne Ilar	11/27/2013
Paul Myer	11/27/2013	Rose Marie McNair	12/3/2013, 12/6/2013
Paula Cook	11/27/2013	Ruth Barker	11/6/2013, 11/6/2013, 11/19/2013, 11/26/2013, 12/4/2013
Paula Mekis	12/6/2013	Ruth Berney	11/6/2013
Paula Miera	12/6/2013	Ryan Matthews	12/6/2013
Penelope Burton	12/6/2013	Sam Courtney	12/6/2013
Peter Carr	12/3/2013	Sam Lathrop	12/3/2013

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-2 (Continued): Individual Draft IS Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Samuel T. Jackson	12/6/2013	Teri Marchese	12/6/2013
Sandon Ashley	12/6/2013	Theresa Buckley	11/27/2013
Sandra Staka	12/6/2013	Thomas Barker	12/4/2013
Sara M. Minor	11/27/2013	Thomas Moschetti	12/3/2013
Sarai Fox	12/6/2013	Tim and Cara Appleton	11/27/2013
Sascha and Maxine	12/6/2013	Tim and Susan Fitzhenry	12/6/2013
Sean and Susy Alums	11/27/2013	Tim Fitzhenry	12/2/2013
Seth Cohen	12/6/2013	Tom Barker	11/6/2013
Sharon Lucchesi	11/7/2013, 11/26/2013, 11/27/2013, 11/27/2013	Tricia Brodie	12/6/2013
Sheillan Sweeney	12/6/2013	Tricia Kerr	12/4/2013
Sid Chandra	12/6/2013, 12/6/2013	Valera Templeman	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013, 12/6/2013
Silvia Prevedelli	12/3/2013	Vanessa Lewis	12/6/2013
Spencer Hays	12/6/2013	Vic Morvay	12/6/2013
Stanley Ziegler	12/6/2013	Victoria Wiggins	12/4/2013
Stephanie Cook	11/27/2013	Walter Spichtig	11/20/2013, 11/27/2013, 12/5/2013, 12/6/2013, 12/6/2013
Stephen Ronan	11/27/2013	Ward Pittman	12/6/2013
Steven Harper	11/27/2013	Wendy Mathias	12/6/2013
Steven Harper	12/6/2013	William and Christy Licken	12/6/2013
Suelynn Estby	12/6/2013	William C. Howe	11/27/2013
Susan Brooks	12/4/2013	William P. Parkin	12/6/2013
Susan Davis	12/6/2013	William S. Haines	12/6/2013
Susan Howe	12/6/2013	William Woldren	12/6/2013
Susan Kerr	12/2/2013	Willie Honig	12/6/2013
Susan Murphy	12/3/2013, 12/5/2013	Yanti Blanchard	11/27/2013
Susanna Honig	12/2/2013	Zeke Moya	11/27/2013, 12/6/2013
Susie Sha	11/27/2013	Unknown	12/5/2013
Tamara Brown	12/6/2013	Unknown	12/5/2013
Teresa Roman	11/27/2013	Unknown	11/27/2013

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-2 (Continued): Individual Draft IS Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Late Commenters			
AJ Brede	12/9/2013	Janet Byers	12/9/2013
Ariel Byers	12/9/2013	Jolene Guth	12/9/2013
Cindy Oliver	12/12/2013	Marion Lyng	12/9/2013
Denise Torpstra	12/9/2013	Nathan Evans	12/10/2013
Genea Sparks	1/2/2014	Pamela Hicks	12/9/2013
James Kerr	12/8/2013	Tom Voorhees	12/9/2013

3.2 SCOPING PERIOD COMMENTERS

Table 3-3 summarizes the federal agencies, state agencies, local agencies, and organizations that provided comments in response to the NOP. Table 3-4 summarizes the individuals who commented in response to the NOP.

Table 3-3: Agency and Organization Scoping Period Commenters	
Commenter	Date Received
Federal	
Richard Casale, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service	1/29/2014, 2/18/2014
State	
Dave Singleton, California Native American Heritage Commission	1/29/2014
Serge Glushkoff, California Department of Fish and Wildlife	2/14/2014
Local	
Carol Monkerud, Central Water District	2/14/2014
Ralph Bracamonte, Central Water District	1/29/2014
Zach Friend, County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors	1/29/2014
Organizations	
Bonny Hawley, Friends of Santa Cruz State Parks	2/18/2014
Dennis Doss, Aptos Ridge Homeowner's Association	2/17/2014
Richard Casale, Martha's Way Homeowners Association	1/29/2014, 2/17/2014

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-4: Individual Scoping Period Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Adele Miller	2/15/2014	Dana Bland	2/17/2014
Alan Brown	2/17/2014	Daniel Lester	2/24/2014
Alan Wright	2/17/2014	Daniel Stonebloom	2/19/2014
Ann Cavanaugh	2/14/2014	Darcey Angelo	2/24/2014
Ann Fay	2/13/2014	David Black	2/14/2014
Annamarie Dugger	2/14/2014	David Casterson	2/5/2014
Annie Pittman	2/14/2014	David Gelpman	1/30/2014
Ashok Shevde	2/18/2014	Denise McClune	2/13/2014
Barbara Ambler	2/18/2014	Diane Evans	2/13/2014
Betty Black	2/14/2014	Don Hirschaut	2/3/2014
Bob Mize	2/19/2014	Don Hordness	2/13/2014
Brad Asmus	2/18/2014	Donald Saposnek	2/19/2014, 2/19/2014
Brad Paquin	1/29/2014	Donald Schwartz	1/31/2014, 1/31/2014
Brian Courtney	2/13/2014	Donna Saposnek	2/19/2014, 2/19/2014
Britt Haselton	2/18/2014	Douglas Ronan	2/17/2014
Bruce Adamson	1/29/2014	Ed Murrer	2/17/2014
Candace Calsoyas	2/17/2014	Ed Shimizu	2/14/2014, 2/14/2014
Carol Bailey	2/17/2014	Elizabeth Fischer	2/18/2014
Caroline Carney	2/18/2014	Elizabeth Romanini	2/19/2014
Cathy McDowell	2/16/2014, 2/17/2014, 2/19/2014	Ethel Griffin	2/18/2014
Cathy Rose	2/13/2014	Evelyn Sharp	2/19/2014
Chaise Lathrop	2/18/2014	Fabio Baum	2/10/2014
Charles Mackh	2/18/2014	Fallon Atkins	2/19/2014
Charles Singer	2/18/2014	Fran Bruce	2/13/2014
Chris Magallanes	2/18/2014	Frances Whitney	2/17/2014
Christine Kelsey	2/13/2014	Francesca Voegelin	2/18/2014
Craig Chatterton	2/18/2014	Frank Prevedelli	2/18/2014
Curt Abramson	2/18/2014	Frederick Voegelin	2/14/2014, 2/18/2014
Dan Stark	2/17/2014	Gail Wright	2/17/2014

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-4 (Continued): Individual Scoping Period Commenters

Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Gary Niblock	1/29/2014, 2/18/2014	Joe Pendry	2/13/2014
Gavin O'Riordan	2/24/2014	John Benich	2/19/2014
Gay Nichols	2/18/2014	John Blauvelt	2/13/2014
George Lucchesi	2/19/2014	John Hall	2/19/2014
Georgia Mackh	2/18/2014	Josip Madar	2/18/2014
Gonzalo Rodriguez	2/13/2014	Joyce Magallanes	2/18/2014
Gregory Audino	2/18/2014	Julie Lolmaugh	2/18/2014
Gretchen Werner	2/17/2014	Julie Thayer	2/24/2014
Guadalupe Char	2/18/2014	Karell Reader	2/15/2014
Gweneth Brown	2/17/2014	Karen Lansing	2/13/2014
Harriet Wrye	2/11/2014	Karen Robey	2/24/2014
Heather Nagel	2/18/2014	Karen Slater	2/18/2014
Heidi Wegner	2/13/2014	Karlene Dahlmeier	2/19/2014, 2/19/2014
Henvy Van Siclen	2/18/2014	Karrin Hoban	2/13/2014
Holly Keller	2/19/2014	Katherine Brooks	2/14/2014
Inez Henderson	2/13/2014	Katherine Gleaton	1/29/2014, 2/18/2014
Irene Rodriguez	2/13/2014	Kathie Stark	2/17/2014
Jacqueline Cooper	2/18/2014	Kathryn Hermansen	2/24/2014
James Harper	2/24/2014	Keith Wood	2/19/2014
James Kahl	2/17/2014	Ken Stearns	2/18/2014
James Kerr	2/18/2014	Kris Sheehan	2/16/2014
Jan Candau	2/13/2014	Kristen Kristich Madar	2/18/2014
Jane Miller	2/18/2014	Kristen Totah	2/15/2014
Janeth Firth	2/18/2014	Kristo Kristich	2/3/2014, 2/18/2014
Janice Spichtig	2/18/2014	Laurie Scurich	2/19/2014
Jeanne Herrick	2/17/2014	Leslie Fitinghoff	2/16/2014, 2/16/2014
Jeanne Shimizu	2/15/2014, 2/18/2014	Leslie Jones	2/13/2014
Jeanne Yablonsky	2/18/2014	Linda McNair	2/19/2014
Jeff Harper	2/19/2014	Linda Murrer	2/17/2014
Jess Allen	2/19/2014	Linda Ponzini	2/13/2014
Joanna Hall	2/19/2014	Lisa Oram	2/13/2014

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-4 (Continued): Individual Scoping Period Commenters

Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Liza Morell	2/18/2014	Michelle LeClair	2/19/2014
Lleni Carr	2/19/2014	Mike Keifer	2/13/2014
Lon Dugger	2/14/2014	Mike Lee	2/18/2014
Lori West	2/17/2014	Mike Ronzano	2/13/2014
Lucas LeClair	2/19/2014	Monica Meyer	2/16/2014
Maggie Guild	2/19/2014	Nancy Abramson	1/29/2014
Marco Romanini	2/19/2014	Nancy Goudarzi	2/13/2014
Margaret Kristich	1/29/2014, 2/3/2014, 2/3/2014, 2/6/2014, 2/7/2014, 2/14/2014, 2/18/2014	Nancy Keller	2/19/2014
Margaret Lacey	2/19/2014	Nancy Mauro Bensen	1/29/2014, 2/19/2014
Margaret Pierce	2/17/2014	Nina Audino	1/29/2014, 2/18/2014
Marian Allen	2/20/2014	Parker Marchese Swindell	2/19/2014
Marilou Moschetti	2/20/2014	Patricia Lester	2/19/2014, 2/19/2014
Marilyn Garrett	1/29/2014	Patricia Meyer	2/16/2014
Mariposa Kercheval	2/18/2014	Patrick Sharp	2/17/2014
Mark Block	2/17/2014	Paul Schoellhamer	2/13/2014, 2/14/2014
Mark Munger	2/17/2014	Peter Carr	2/20/2014
Mark Scurich	2/19/2014	Peter McNair	2/19/2014
Mark Shute	2/14/2014	Ralph Carney	2/18/2014
Mark Swindell	2/24/2014	Ralph Griffin	2/18/2014
Mary Wood	2/19/2014	Randall McClune	2/13/2014
Mato Kristich	2/18/2014	Randall Naess	2/18/2014
Matt Fusco	2/13/2014	Richard Klevins	1/29/2014, 2/17/2014, 2/19/2014
Maureen Brandi	2/18/2014	Richard Ulrick	2/17/2014
Mehrdad Reyhani	2/24/2014	Robert Oram	2/13/2014
Michael Cronk	2/19/2014	Robey Reyhani	2/24/2014
Michael Holler	2/18/2014	Roger Henderson	2/13/2014
Michael Honig	2/17/2014	Roger Parker	2/13/2014

SCOPING REPORT
Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Providing Comments

Table 3-4 (Continued): Individual Scoping Period Commenters

Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Rose Marie McNair	2/19/2014	Susan Naess	2/18/2014
Ruth Barker	1/29/2014, 1/29/2014, 1/29/2014, 2/18/2014	Susie Courtney	2/11/2014, 2/13/2014
Samuel Lathrop	2/18/2014	Tanya Honig	2/17/2014
Scott Jones	2/13/2014	Tanya Steeves	2/19/2014
Scott Schaaf	2/16/2014	Teri Marchese	2/19/2014
Sean Fitinghoff	2/16/2014, 2/16/2014	Thais Lee	2/18/2014
Sharon Hordness	2/13/2014	Thomas Moschetti	2/19/2014
Sharon Lucchesi	2/24/2014	Tod Williams	2/13/2014
Silvia Prevedelli	2/18/2014	Tom Powder	2/18/2014
Stanley Ziegler	2/16/2014, 2/19/2014	Vicki Devine	2/17/2014
Susan Brooks	2/17/2014	Vijay Char	2/18/2014
Susan Cronk	2/19/2014	Walter Spichtig	2/18/2014
Susan Hoffman	2/14/2014	Ward Pittman	2/14/2014
Late Commenters			
D. Roger Houston	2/25/2014	Marilyn Garrett	2/25/2014
Evan Wood	2/25/2014	Mike Homer	2/27/2014
Gay Hazelwood	2/25/2014	Roberta Houston	2/25/2014
Jan Patrick	2/25/2014	Tira Brown	2/25/2014
Kathleen Mroczynski-Minor	2/25/2014		

4 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

4.1 COMMENTS RECEIVED

Table 4-1 contains an overview of public comments received during the NOP scoping period and the Draft IS public review period.

Table 4-1: Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	Draft IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Project Description		
Discuss how the new, chemically-treated poles would be dealt with; they are taller, so they would need to be put deeper into the ground.		√
Describe what new easements and property would be taken.	√	√
Explain whether helicopter landing zones would be considered easements, whether PG&E needs easements for them, and if PG&E would take residents' property.		√
Specify if all new lines would be located where there are existing lines.	√	
Describe the total voltage of the new lines.	√	
Describe the authority and process used when new easements are required for a project.		√
Identify what private property elements would have to be removed, such as fencing, landscaping, farm, and ranch facilities.		√
Describe the exact placement of poles and how deep the holes would be dug for them.	√	√
Describe the amount of soil that would be removed.		√
Identify heights of poles at specific locations.		√
Describe how much cement would be needed to secure the TSPs.	√	
Provide maps that show existing and proposed poles within the existing utility easements.		√
Describe why transmission poles must be so high.		√
The Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) discusses but does not depict angle poles.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Explain what a tension pull site is, including equipment, procedures, and duration of use.		√
Describe how many helicopter landing sites would be needed.	√	
Describe what helicopters would carry.	√	
Demonstrate and investigate the necessity of helicopter pads, including why they are needed, why a fueling station is needed, and provide assurance that they are not permanent.		√
State whether the project is on public or private land.	√	
Describe how frequently construction air traffic would occur.		√
Describe who would be responsible for maintaining the area around the poles, in particular reinforcing and repairing hillside erosion and private road damage.		√
Describe when and how PG&E would remove the helicopter landing pads, fueling stations, and access roads. Describe how closely the area would be restored to original conditions and in what timeframe that restoration would occur.		√
Describe how long the project would disrupt residents and cause impacts.		√
Describe whether and why or why not old transformers that fail during winter storms would be replaced.		√
Describe whether and why or why not old power lines that have been damaged by winter storms would be replaced.		√
Identify why vegetation must be removed.		√
Describe how long PG&E would use the staging/maintenance area for work, as PG&E is already contracting and directing work at the staging area at Pleasant Valley and plans to use the work area indefinitely.		√
Explain whether it is the intention to use a temporary staging area for future projects if the construction staging area would not be completely removed.		√
Describe which area the power line would serve and whether people in the area of the power line would receive power from the line.		√
The EIR should provide the number and location of trees to be removed.	√	√
Explain whether the scope of the project includes acquiring at least 30 percent of PG&E's energy from green sources.		√
Explain whether the (National Environmental Policy Act) NEPA compliance would be required.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Purpose and Need		
Evaluate the need to increase electrical capacity in the short- and long-term.		√
Explain how the new lines would stop outages.		√
Provide an evidence-based explanation (e.g., outage records) of why the project is necessary.		√
Address how many power outages are due to local problems versus infrastructure concerns (i.e., the cause of the outage) and when and where outages have occurred.		√
Describe how the plan fits with the state's commitment to green energy.		√
The rural community has a population density that is not likely to grow.	√	
Explore the financial necessity of the project.		√
PG&E has not stated the project need. The PEA states the objective is to add a second 115-kV circuit between two substations, which is not an objective but rather is a proposed solution to a yet unstated problem. The EIR should restate the objective in terms of the problems being solved.		√
Alternatives		
Consider undergrounding the existing lines and other utilities, as long as PG&E is putting new lines there.		√
Address undergrounding 0.25 miles on the Valencia Alignment that could form a connection between the Northern and Southern Alignments at Fern Flat Road.		√
Undergrounding should be an alternative.	√	√
Consider extending natural gas service to reduce demand for electricity.	√	√
It would be better to use existing poles and high voltage lines so as not to impinge on views.		√
Explore alternative materials and types for poles.		√
Use existing ROWs.		√
The EIR should address alternatives to removing and replacing poles, such as using existing poles and increasing the voltage using existing poles and lines.		√
Utilize existing infrastructure.		√
Other 115-kV lines exist at a much lower height than the proposed 100-foot poles. Shorter poles would reduce the visual impacts and should be considered.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Explain whether the project could be accomplished by adding transmission wires to the tops of existing poles along the Valencia Alignment.		√
Consider putting power lines in more populated areas, such as along Highway 1 or Freedom Boulevard, so that any bad actors with high-powered guns would be more likely to be spotted.		√
The power line route should match the freeway because there are existing buffers between the freeway and homes, and there would be fewer disturbances to wildlife.		√
There is a possibility of a slightly longer route using portions of the current Southern Alignment and Northern Alignment with a new section much shorter than the proposed and affecting many fewer residents.		√
Explore all nine original alternatives.		√
Look at demand side alternatives like targeted energy efficiency and distributed generation.	√	√
Examine the cost and increased reliability in terms of voltage transmission and reliability with replacing current old technology in substations.		√
Describe the future power needs for the service area and whether the needs and reliability standards can be achieved with a more modest and appropriate project than the one proposed.		√
Describe whether there are alternative routes and/or less obtrusive equipment and materials available that would ameliorate the financial and environmental costs of the project.		√
Explore alternatives such as alternate routes, undergrounding, and alternatives that have not yet been considered.	√	√
The project should be relocated to a more suitable site.		√
Explore scaled down physical and financial alternatives.		√
There should be an alternative to the Northern Alignment.		√
Describe alternative staging sites that have been considered that would be more appropriate to such an industrial operation.		√
Describe whether outages would continue to happen if the project is not completed as planned.		√
Impacts of Alternatives and Comparison of Alternatives		
Identify all ROWs that would be created under each alternative and which properties would be affected.	√	√
The project should be kept in existing easements and ROWs where the project would impact the least amount of people and traffic.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
It is better to use existing ROWs because subsuming wildlands and agricultural land for a new ROW seems like a waste of resources.		√
Provide details on ROWs and any condemnation of property that would be needed for each alternative.		√
Describe why PG&E is choosing a new route when there are existing, more direct routes.		√
Explain how PG&E intends to perform maintenance on alternate routes when endangered species live on all routes.		√
The EIR should quantify impacts for all alternatives and ensure that the chosen alternative minimizes impacts during and after construction. Describe the pros and cons of each alternative.	√	√
Identify trees to be removed for each alternative.		√
Provide a cost analysis of the project as proposed versus undergrounding.	√	√
Commenter is concerned for possible condemnation of homes.		√
Any issues with existing routes should be mitigated if possible rather than making a new route through a neighborhood.		√
The EIR should address the impact involved with replacing all poles on the alternative routes.		√
Examine the Southern and Northern Alignments because they already have a 60-foot ROW.	√	
PG&E has two transmission lines with similar starts and ends to the proposed project. There should be an overwhelming reason that the proposed project cannot be in one of those ROWs in order for the project, as proposed in the IS, to traverse a neighborhood that is not now the location of 115-kV transmission lines.		√
A commenter lives within 25 feet of the current Southern Alignment; a new alignment requiring 100-foot easements would require going through the home or zig-zagging around it.		√
The Southern Alignment would require easements and condemnation.		√
The Southern Alignment is in the Highway 1 view corridor and would be in a protected viewshed.		√
Poles on White Road ridge along the Southern Alignment would be high enough to require flashing red lights, which would disrupt wildlife and be an eyesore.		√
The Southern Alternative would require that one resident on Bens Way and two residences on White road be condemned.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
The Southern Alignment would reduce quality of life due to presence of large transmission lines and larger poles.		√
The Southern Alignment would adversely affect the view and historical setting around the historic Castro Adobe.		√
Construction of the Southern Alignment would affect farmland on Old Adobe Road.		√
The Southern Alignment would require tree removal and would affect biological resources, including nesting birds and general wildlife.		√
The Southern Alignment would go through the Santa Cruz long-toed salamander (SCLTS) refuge, and construction would have adverse impacts on the SCLTS.		√
The Southern Alignment would require removal of several hundred large trees.		√
The Southern Alignment has wetlands for SCLTS.		√
There is a lot of environmentally sensitive wildlife in the area along the Southern Alignment.		√
The Southern Alignment has several active slide areas.		√
There is a high-pressure gas line along Old Adobe Road along the Southern Alignment.		√
Identify gas mains and show new easements that are required for constructing the Southern Alignment.		√
High power lines would add an unfair safety burden along Old Adobe Road in the Southern Alignment.		√
Describe why the Southern Alignment was ruled out as an option.		√
The high-pressure gas line along Old Adobe Road along the Southern Alignment could rupture during an earthquake, and at the same time sparks could fly off upgraded electrical lines, causing an explosion.		√
The Southern Alignment contains the two main natural gas transmission pipelines for the County. Doubling the capacity of the existing 115-kV line in that alignment would necessitate expansion of PG&E's existing property easements in the Old Adobe/Larkin Valley area.		√
Construction may damage year-round spring that is located on the farm's (near Old Adobe Road on the Southern Alignment) property that supplies water to the farm and the surrounding properties.		√
There are areas along the Southern Alignment that were excluded from development because they are water return areas.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
The Southern Alignment has delicate groundwater recharge areas, and puncturing the shallow clay layers would permanently destroy recharge areas.		√
The soils are moving continually. The roads around Aptos Ridge Circle on the Southern Alignment are sliding. It is hard to imagine putting 90-foot poles there.		√
A re-route on the Valencia Alignment forces environmental cost upon nature instead of a developed area.		√
The Valencia Alignment is less developed than the Cox-Freedom Alignment and contains more potentially critical habitat and undisturbed woodlands, soil, and other resources.		√
With regards to the Valencia Alignment, re-routing the power line into a protected wild area (zoned) is inconsistent with the purpose of the zoned wild area.		√
Construction on less developed roads, such as the Valencia Alignment, may result in more disturbances to habitat and the environment.		√
The bulk of the Valencia Alignment is on steep and highly erosive soils; the route threatens soil stability for property owners.		√
If the hillside near Flume Road along the Valencia Alignment fails, material could flow into Valencia Creek.		√
The majority of the Valencia Alignment is not served by developed roads, which may lead to increased costs for construction and maintenance.		√
Explain how the Valencia Alignment could be a solution for the people that live in the area.		√
Fragile water infrastructure should disqualify the route that goes through Day Valley.		√
Explain why PG&E has chosen to use the most densely populated area (Northern Alignment on Freedom Boulevard) for their project.		√
The Northern Alignment is not a viable option because it has wet creek areas where breeding pools could exist, which was also listed as one of the reasons the Southern Alignment was not a viable option.		√
Explain why PG&E can claim that disturbing the Monterey spineflower on the Northern Alignment is more okay than disturbing the robust spineflower on the Southern Alignment.		√
Examine the difference in fire hazards between undergrounding and having above-ground poles.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
The poles are incongruent with the County Plan; there should be an alternative to the currently-proposed 100-foot tall TSPs and the 89-foot-tall wood poles.		√
The EIR should address an alternative of using less impactful construction, such as was done for the upgrade on Soquel Drive between Trout Gulch Road and Freedom Boulevard.		√
Identify the reasons for not utilizing existing infrastructure, such as the current Northern and Southern Alignments, without the need to upscale from existing 69-foot poles to 100-foot TSPs.		√
Indicate in the description of the alternatives what additional easements are needed and what size they may be for undergrounding.		√
Aesthetics		
The original draft of the IS/MND included a proposal to re-landscape around poles to make them more aesthetically pleasing. Explain why this was eliminated as infeasible.		√
The project, including the taller poles, would alter the rural/farm aesthetic of the project area.	√	√
The project would ruin the beauty of the natural landscape, including the natural landscape of Pleasant Valley.		√
New poles would affect designated scenic corridors along Corralitos Road and Amesti Road.	√	√
There should be mitigation for aesthetic impacts, such as reconfiguration of pole placement, the wire pattern, and/or landscaping to conceal poles.		√
The EIR should consider aesthetic impacts not only to viewers in vehicles but also bikers, walkers, and people living in the area.		√
Describe why a commercial project would be put in a rural, agrarian area.		√
The proposed transmission poles would be unlike anywhere else in Santa Cruz County.		√
Uniformity is not the most valuable aesthetic and the IS/MND determined that the mix of land uses is not enough to classify the area as highly aesthetic.	√	√
The study claimed there is no other low-lying infrastructure in the area besides farm buildings.		√
Commenter does not want to see poles from their home.		√
Poles would obstruct views from homes.	√	√
The IS did not model what the area would look like with the new poles and with tree removal.	√	√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
A commenter asked why the simulation in Figure 3.1-12 was of the intersection of Cox Road and Day Valley Road instead of from further down Cox Road from Day Valley Road.	√	
The Cox-Freedom visual simulation in Figure 3.1-12 does not show a pole at the end of the road. It is not an accurate representation of the project.	√	
The EIR should identify all siting, architectural design, and landscaping mitigation for aesthetic impacts.		√
The EIR should discuss aesthetic impacts of vegetation removal.		√
The poles are too tall and the visual impact is too great.	√	
Provide visual simulations of poles on homeowners' properties.	√	
Power lines would dominate the scenic vista.	√	
The view of the power lines would negatively impact local businesses, such as wineries.		√
Unightly poles would be put in a scenic and heavily forested area.	√	√
The project would be an eyesore to tourists in Pleasant Valley.		√
Power lines near the Watsonville Airport would require flashing lights, which would ruin the views.		√
The EIR should consider the regional aesthetic impact, not just the impact within 300 feet.		√
The EIR should discuss tree trimming and removal standards to be used by PG&E and the effects on aesthetics.		√
The IS did not adequately address impacts to neighborhood aesthetics.	√	√
There is inadequate mitigation for the increase in pole heights (e.g., from 50 to 90 feet).	√	
The range of visual simulations is inadequate. Visual simulation locations were selected to minimize the impacts.	√	
Air Quality		
Air quality impacts have not been adequately addressed.	√	√
The EIR should investigate dust impacts, including impacts from driving on soil and using helicopters, and dust control.		√
Quantify pollutants that would be released and their effects on air quality.		√
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should be consulted.		√
Use of water for dust control is a waste of water.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Discuss potential release of chemicals from poles when carried over houses by helicopters.		√
Provide the "cradle to grave" carbon footprint of the proposed project, including tree removal and pole installation.		√
Discuss how using sustainable/renewable materials (such as wood poles) with smaller foundations requiring less vegetation removal would reduce the carbon footprint of the project.		√
Discuss how the carbon footprint of the project would be offset.		√
There is an inconsistency in reporting air quality emissions throughout the document.	√	
Implement measures to reduce nitrogen oxide emissions below the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District's operations threshold of 137 pounds per day.	√	
Biological Resources		
The impact of large-scale tree removal, including heritage trees, is not adequately addressed.	√	√
Discuss whether redwoods would be removed.		√
Discuss loss of trees and habitat for birds, including migratory species.	√	√
Planting saplings in other locations does not mitigate for cutting down trees that are over 100 years old.		√
The current PG&E contractor makes a mess of trimming current trees, and trees have already died from trimming.	√	
Describe impacts to pets and livestock.	√	
Discuss whether a certified arborist would direct tree and vegetation removal and whether they would be independent from PG&E.		√
Consider the effect on local ancient trees.		√
SCLTS and many nesting birds can be found along the electrical power line path.		√
Tree removal is destruction of wildlife habitat.		√
Identify the value of each removed tree as habitat and in providing balance in the local ecosystem.		√
The disruption to native habitat is not adequately addressed.	√	√
The EIR should review effects of vegetation clearing and maintenance of vegetation free zones on wildlife that live in the neighborhood and keep rodents from overwhelming residents.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Discuss vegetation trampling.		√
Identify effects related to invasive species.		√
Vegetation removal impacts on biological resources should be identified.		√
The EIR should identify all vegetation to be removed, not just trees with a diameter of over 12 inches.		√
Address impacts from fuel spills from helicopters on wildlife.		√
Construction and maintenance pose an unacceptable risk to wildlife.		√
Analyze effects the poles would have on water sources for native wildlife.		√
Power lines would pass through nesting bird sites.	√	
Helicopter ingress and egress noise would impact wildlife.		√
Commenter has concern regarding impacts on golden eagles, hawks, and other wildlife.		√
Explore effect of altered habitat on endangered species that may have migrated away and will return after the drought has ended.		√
Explore impacts to nesting great horned owls.	√	
Commenter is concerned for impacts to SCLTS.		√
The project would destroy local animal habitat in Pleasant Valley.		√
Examine impacts of warning lights on TSPs on wildlife.		√
Consult the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.		√
Remove reference to California Department of Fish and Wildlife guidance or support on SCLTS studies because the SCLTS is fully protected.		√
Identify impacts to the Mt. Hermon June beetle.		√
Discuss the impact of the helicopter landing pad at the intersection of Pleasant Valley and Hames Road on removal of bees kept on the staging property.		√
Helicopter noise would affect birds and wildlife.		√
Examine impacts to the golden eagle.		√
Discuss the impacts from helicopters on horses and people riding horses when they are spooked. Discuss liability for injuries.		√
The EIR should include mitigation for the golden eagle population in the project area.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Cox Road is unsafe for animals; animals escaping project noise would be put at a very high risk of being accidentally killed.		√
Discuss impacts of electromagnetic fields (EMF) on flora and fauna.		√
The EIR should address all impacts on threatened and endangered flora and fauna.		√
Commenter has concern for impacts of construction on vegetation and wildlife.		√
Discuss how increased traffic and activity on access trails would impact wildlife and vegetation.		√
Identify impacts to endangered native plant and listed wildlife species.		√
Quantify pollutants that would be released and their effects on vegetation and wildlife.		√
Plant choices in mitigation measures are inappropriate.		√
Commenter is concerned for rehabilitation of areas impacted.		√
Cultural Resources		
The historical significance of Day Valley has not been addressed.	√	√
Geology and Soils		
The disruption to geology and soils is not adequately addressed.	√	√
Address how erosion would be controlled where vegetation is not permitted to grow.		√
Commenter has concern for increased erosion due to proposed wider access trail.		√
Consult with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, for soils information, erosion control consultation, revegetation, reduction of slope instability, and runoff from soil compaction and decreased vegetative cover.		√
The pole at the end of Sand Hill Road would cause erosion of the road.		√
Seismic conditions need to be thoroughly addressed.	√	√
Discuss how the proposed project would affect ground stability.		√
Describe how there would be a 50-foot-taller pole on Cox Road on a hillside and whether it would destroy the road and hillside.		√
Consider increased land instability if there is an earthquake, including impacts due to placing tall poles in sandy soil.	√	√
Examine how heavy equipment would alter soil composition.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
There is no geographic evaluation.		√
Describe what would happen when higher voltage lines fall on roads during an earthquake.	√	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Consult the Department of Forestry and local fire departments.		√
PG&E lines have caused multiple fires in the area	√	
The increase in the number of circuits and lines on poles increases public fire risk.	√	√
Commenter is concerned for 100-foot poles above the natural tree line impeding aerial firefighting equipment.		√
Look at the increased fire risk due to the project, including at staging areas and due to airplane and car accidents.		√
Look at impacts to water and subsequent effects on fire defense.		√
Use Watsonville airport for refueling because refueling at the helicopter pad poses a fire threat.		√
Fire hazards from PG&E employees smoking should be addressed.		√
Consider drought conditions when undertaking a dangerous project on homeowners' front yards.		√
Quantify pollutants that would be released and their effects on human health.		√
Discuss the potential of fuel spillage at fueling stations and the environmental impact of spills.		√
Describe what remediation would occur to remove all seepage of fuel, oil, and maintenance equipment from Pleasant Valley. The area should be fully evaluated and remediated at PG&E's expense.		√
There is a massive PG&E gas leak on Freedom Boulevard where PG&E plans to put the power lines at the Rob Roy junction. This problem should be corrected before construction.		√
Discuss how often CPUC audits PG&E records to evaluate their safety precautions. CPUC declared the Aptos Hills gas transmission line as having dangerously high pressure and ordered PG&E to reduce the pressure by 20 percent. Describe whether the reduction has been achieved.		√
Commenter is concerned for resident health due to previous and future gas leaks from PG&E negligence.	√	√
The EIR should include health impacts discussed in <u>The Great Power-Line Cover-Up: How the Utilities and the Government are Trying to Hide the Cancer Hazard Posed by Electromagnetic Fields</u> by Paul Brodeur.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
EMF should be tested using property equipment instead of data from 1993 and 2006.		√
A meeting attendee asked what low-cost measures are available for reducing EMF.	√	
The EIR should address health impacts, including leukemia, from power lines.		√
Commenter is concerned about increased EMF exposure to community residents.	√	√
Consider the health issues due to larger electrical lines over houses.		√
Expanding the ROWs would increase EMF and affect residents.		√
Commenter is concerned about EMF impacts to human health and pet health at Bradley Elementary School.	√	√
Consider the research findings from electromagnetichealth.org , emsafetynetwork.org , and radiationeducation.com .		√
Commenter is concerned about neighborhood safety.	√	√
Discuss measures that would be taken to ensure public safety during the transportation of poles by helicopter.		√
Commenter inquired about studies regarding the safety of 100-foot poles, especially in wind and lightning storms known to occur in the area.		√
Discuss mitigation of potential damage to persons and property caused by high-velocity downdrafts while helicopters are hovering to deploy metal poles.		√
Analyze the impacts to safety of people, especially those in gated communities, due to other people having access to the gated community.		√
Discuss safety concerns during and after the project.	√	√
Discuss safety concerns for homes, people, animals, pets, recreational users, vehicles, property, livestock, organic farms and gardens, bees, and vegetation.		√
Discuss who would be responsible for potentially fatal accidents occurring to residents, bicyclists, pets, and wildlife during work on the project.		√
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Poles have preservatives that would potentially leach into groundwater and the water supply.		√
Research the effects of water leaching into the ground from old pipes and the toxins and pollutants in groundwater.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Watering down helicopter pads would cause fuel to permeate into the water supply.		√
Discuss what steps would be taken to prevent contamination of groundwater supplies and runoff caused by hazardous materials (e.g., helicopter and construction vehicle fuel, lubricants, solvents).		√
Look at increase in runoff and contamination of surface water.		√
Lasting effects from construction, such as roads, fences, and foundations, disrupt the natural contours of the land and hydrology.		√
Examine impacts to watershed as a result of vegetation removal within 30 feet of the new treated poles and cement foundation.		√
Discuss how local water supplies would be affected.	√	√
Commenter is concerned for whether or not water companies would still be able to deliver safe, reliable drinking water.		√
Inform the Central Water District and private property owners of impacts to water sources on an ongoing basis.		√
Discuss what steps would be taken to endure an uninterrupted supply of safe water to the communities along the project during and after construction.		√
The area is a primary groundwater recharge area.		√
Examine how heavy equipment would impact groundwater recharge.		√
Assess effects to recharge due to tree removal.		√
Addition of 100-square-foot bases would prevent groundwater recharge.		√
Land Use, Agriculture, and Recreation		
The proposed project violates the Santa Cruz County General Plan.	√	√
State and County laws require undergrounding of new power lines such as the proposed transmission line.		√
Commenter wants to know why PG&E is allowed to pursue the project contrary to the Santa Cruz County General Plan, contrary to citizens' desires, and when the County Supervisors, the local water district, and Sierra Club do not support the project.		√
Commenter is concerned about loss of land use.		√
The 100-foot TSPs and 89-foot-tall wood transmission poles are incongruent with the County plan.		√
The area along Cox Road past Day Valley Road is zoned as a Biotic Resource Area.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
The Coastal Commission may not allow for poles that tall.		√
Document in the EIR how the project would meet the goals of the County Master Plan.		√
The area should not be developed more than one house per existing lot.		√
The project would cross designated farmland.	√	√
Loss of agricultural land would mean farmers could not produce crops and farmers' salaries would be reduced.	√	√
Address impacts to organic certification.		√
Cement and leaching from new poles and pole treatment would compromise organic certification.	√	√
The EIR should provide protection to certified organic farms.		√
The EIR should address noise, dust, and construction equipment impacts to farm animals.		√
The EIR should address impacts to farms related to soil and provide erosion mitigation.		√
Address fuel spillage from helicopters on farms.		√
Discuss the impacts to local farms, including noise and dust, from helicopter landing pads at the Hames Road/Pleasant Valley Road intersection.		√
Discuss effects to commercial and private and organic and conventional farms.		√
The Department of Agriculture should be consulted.		√
The IS did not adequately address the disruption of recreational opportunities, such as scenic drives, cycling, jogging, walking, and hiking in the area.	√	√
Discuss whether PG&E would install walking paths or widen roads for recreational uses. The proposed line would take away area available for walking and cycling.		√
Discuss the impacts on recreationalists along project roads due to creation of an industrial-scale construction area, removal of vegetation, and the visual impact of metal power poles.		√
Noise		
Noise impacts were not adequately addressed.	√	√
Discuss how the buzzing sound from high-tension wires would be mitigated.		√
Commenter is not interested in having new noise from power lines disrupt the peacefulness of the area.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
The noise impact, including helicopter noise, is inappropriate for a rural setting.	√	
Describe construction noise impacts in the Day Valley/Pleasant Valley corridor.		√
Acoustic engineer should do a noise report.		√
Address effects on noise due to tree and shrub removal.		√
Discuss whether someone would monitor noise levels during construction to make sure they are legal by environmental standards and whether the monitor would be independent from PG&E.		√
Discuss how neighbors would be compensated if horses need to be moved or if there are riding accidents as a result of helicopter noise.		√
Discuss the expected amplitude of the noise experienced by people and animals at specified distances and altitudes during helicopter take-off, landings, and overflights.		√
Describe the impact on local businesses that operate on the weekends resulting from truck and helicopter noise.		√
Noise from the hum of the wires would negatively impact local businesses, such as wineries.		√
Traffic and Transportation		
Traffic and transportation are not adequately addressed.	√	
Roads do not have adequate shoulders for pedestrians, bike lanes, and bicyclists, and existing distribution lines and wood power poles are located dangerously close to the edge of narrow roadways and many times up against steep banks.	√	√
Perform rough grading and build retaining walls as necessary to provide a safe shoulder for pedestrians and bicyclists.		√
Roadways are already narrow with no curbs or sidewalks and barely handle two-way traffic.	√	√
The project would inhibit the future ability to widen or improve the roadway.	√	√
Set poles back from the road at least 5 feet.		√
Commenter has concern for traffic safety because new poles are larger and closer to the roadbed.	√	√
The pole to be placed at the end of Sand Hill Road would cause a blind spot for drivers existing to Cox Road making the turn very dangerous or impossible. Consider undergrounding near Sand Hill Road to avoid creation of a blind spot and an area where vehicles with trailers could not access.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Three serious car accidents and a pedestrian-versus-bike accident occurred because the roads are too narrow. Widen Cox, Day Valley, and Freedom Road. There needs to be a safe public school bus stop. Extend the footpath from Valencia Road to Freedom Road. Poles should be placed a safe distance from the road. The existing poles prevent upgrading the existing road. Repair the ditches along the roads.	√	
Construction may be difficult on Cox Road given how narrow the road is.		√
Discuss the effects of frequent heavy equipment movement and commuting on roads with regards to traffic safety.		√
The pole at the end of Sand Hill Road would make the turn from Cox Road inaccessible to vehicles with large trailers.		√
Discuss who would be liable for delays in emergency services.		√
Examine impacts to emergency access, including at Hames Road, which is Pleasant Valley Road's only exit point.		√
Connecting Pleasant Valley Road to Day Valley Road would increase traffic problems.		√
Hames Road is heavily used by residents getting to Freedom Boulevard.		√
Commenter has concern for increased traffic.	√	
Commenter is concerned about disruption in roadways and traffic during construction.	√	
Discuss impacts on traffic due to ingress and egress of large delivery trucks, construction equipment, and other vehicles.		√
Describe traffic impacts and construction commuter impacts in the Pleasant Valley/Day Valley corridor.		√
Study the traffic impact and include mitigation for impacts at the intersection of Hames Road and Pleasant Valley Road.		√
Inspect plans to repair and replace road damaged by PG&E vehicles.		√
Meet with County Public Works Department to develop a plan to repair damaged roads.		√
Analyze the potential for damage to roads.		√
Consult with Caltrans.		√
A commenter asked if the project would result in pets and kids being run over.	√	
Discuss impacts to vineyards, wineries, stables, riding academies, and local cottage industries depending on clear, regular ingress and egress to Pleasant Valley.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Document the current traffic conditions on McDonald and Day Valley Roads; the existing study is years out of date.		√
Describe airspace restrictions that would be in effect during the construction phase.		√
The IS does not address vertical requirements of airspace protection for Watsonville Municipal Airport. The project seems to warrant completion of FAA Form 7460-1 for determination regarding protected airspace.	√	
Discuss what agencies would have jurisdiction and oversight of helicopter operations at the construction staging area and whether these agencies have approved the proposed plan.		√
Utilities and Service Systems		
Water mains running along many of the proposed pole locations need to be replaced.	√	√
Pole installation in 10-foot utility easement is concerning for current and future setbacks from water mains in that easement.	√	
The proposed project would increase demand on the water system and associated infrastructure.		√
There is no indication of where the existing water main is or where PG&E is going to put the new main when they have to move the existing one.	√	
Research impacts should the project cause a water main to burst.	√	
Look at impacts to water cost due to PG&E's use of water during construction.	√	
Examine impacts to water pressure due to increased burden on water pipes.		√
Examine impacts of power poles on Central Water District water lines.		√
Setbacks would be required due to utilities sharing easements.		√
Describe construction impacts on sewage and waste disposal.		√
Review the effects of the project on the drainage system of the area.		√
Other CEQA Considerations		
Describe what happens in 30 years when the population doubles in Santa Cruz County—describe whether there would be more wires.		√
Describe whether the scope of the project determined future growth of industrial development in the project vicinity.		√
Describe whether and why or why not the new infrastructure would include new telephone or cable circuits for residents.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
The EIR should address additional PG&E projects that intend to introduce 100-foot TSPs in the same area. PG&E seems to be taking a piecemeal approach to introducing 100-foot-tall poles.		√
Explain whether PG&E would lease some or all of the poles to cell phone companies.	√	√
Analyze new development that would occur as a result of the project.		√
Project Noticing		
More people should be notified than the residents within 300 feet of proposed poles.		√
Misleading notice was given to residents.	√	
There was a lack of proper noticing and public education regarding the project.	√	
Utilities and affected parties should be notified.		√
Commenter was not notified of the project.	√	√
The scoping period was very short for a large project.		√
Commenter wants to know if noticing was within County, State, and federal guidelines.		√
Commenter wants to know why residents along the alternative alignment were just told about the project when those on the Northern Alignment have known for 2 years.		√
Everyone who comments on the project must be included in future correspondence.		√
The notice for the PG&E meeting at the Corralitos Grange was inadequate. The low attendance shows that no one was notified.	√	
PG&E should let people in the project area know about the project through a phone system like the Fire Department's phone system.	√	
Commenter is concerned that people who live close to the lines along Amesti were not notified of the project and wonders how they can comment on the document if they were not notified of the project to begin with.		√
Scope and effects of project go beyond 200 feet and the EIR should reflect that, and the community needs to be directly informed of impacts they can realistically expect to experience.		√
Other Comments on the Scope of the EIR		
The EIR should provide economic reimbursement criteria for impacts.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Describe why the project cannot be done in the future when there is better undergrounding technology.		√
Commenter is concerned about negative impacts to community values.		√
Explain why the project was not proposed 20 years ago when the area was less populated.		√
The EIR should include legal justification to enter on private property and identify all clearly defined easements.		√
EIR should provide studies on future impact to tree removal, grading and soil erosion, and mitigations to protected species, including but not limited to their financial and logistical impediments.		√
Provide a revenue projection for PG&E from selling space to other companies on the poles for internet and whether that revenue changes if PG&E chooses a different route than the Northern Alignment.		√
Describe how significance is measured.		√
Describe how the project would benefit or harm residents on the selected route.		√
Provide proposed profit charts.		√
Specify a reasonable and prudent maximum cost for the project.		√
Discuss the impact of a wildfire on the Aptos Hills gas line during the period that PG&E had a temporary increase in operating pressure.		√
Perform an atheistic evaluation.		√
Describe whether the existing gas line on Aptos Ridge crosses the San Andreas Fault and what measures would be implemented to ensure safety. Specify if the gas line is seamless or welded. Describe how often the CPUC audits PG&E's records		√
Provide economic reimbursement criteria for impacts.		√
State PG&E's bottom line.		
Project Merits		
The scope of the project is unnecessary and inappropriate.	√	
Commenter is opposed to the project.	√	
None of the community residents are in favor of the project.	√	
The project is unnecessary and not a community priority.	√	
There are not enough power interruptions to warrant the project.	√	

**SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments**

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Commenter is opposed to the project because power lines would run adjacent to the property.	√	
Miscellaneous Comments		
An EIR should be prepared.	√	√
Homes and businesses are becoming more energy efficient; therefore, electrical energy usage is reduced.		√
The purpose and need was not addressed at any of the meetings held by PG&E or Panorama.		√
Reliability would not improve.	√	
Using eminent domain to take land is inappropriate.	√	
The project would have a significant impact in the Day Valley Area.	√	
Commenter is opposed to the 100-foot poles.	√	
The goal of delivering more reliable electric service is not addressed with this project. Power outages occur as the direct result of extreme stormy conditions where trees fall or lightning strikes a transformer.		√
PG&E should consider community needs and wants.	√	
The project would benefit greater Santa Cruz, not the neighborhood in which the project would occur.	√	√
The IS lacks insight into impact on neighborhoods and the community at large.	√	
The environmental review is not objective.	√	
CPUC should investigate pros and cons more thoroughly.	√	
Specify whether the public was noticed under CPUC Rule 20(a).	√	
PG&E was required to have public meeting to inform the public.	√	
Rule 20(a) requires undergrounding of the line.	√	
PG&E said the lines would be undergrounded.	√	
IS lacks analysis of potential county-wide ramifications.	√	
The IS is inaccurate and contains factual errors.	√	
There is no schedule of planned increases in ROW, removal of trees, and pole locations available in the IS.	√	
The IS is inaccurate and misleading.	√	

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Commenter would not grant an easement for power lines at the increased height.	√	
Commenter would like to sign a petition to keep the project from happening.	√	
The goal of meeting customers' growing energy demand is unnecessary because the area is built out and there are very few vacant lots on which to build anything.		√
There is no reason for people to accept the project given that PG&E cannot provide natural gas to the area.	√	
CPUC board members should consider this project being done in their neighborhood.	√	
The IS does not address lasting effects on community residents.	√	
The IS does not address impacts on quality of life.	√	√
Having a public meeting without allowing the public to ask questions is unfair.	√	
Another comment period is needed to address all information once it is made available.	√	
All due diligence should be performed.		√
Take the County of Santa Cruz Department of Public Works off the list of notified agencies.	√	
PG&E should contact the Department of Public Works before starting work in the ROW.	√	
Commenter requested better coordination with the Central Water District for future construction efforts.	√	
PG&E wants to save money and fix a problem as fast as possible.	√	
PG&E left an eyesore after a eucalyptus clear-cut.	√	
Project approval is happening before engineering has begun.	√	
Ms. Orsaba should be reevaluated as project manager.	√	
Panorama Environmental is conflicted with former PG&E employees.	√	
Commenter was refused name of the Administrative Law Judge at the CPUC.	√	
Commenter requested NOI mailing list.	√	
Community responses indicate more areas of concern than were originally addressed.		√
It makes no sense that PG&E would consider a new alignment.		√

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments		
Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
Commenter is appalled at PG&E's misleading approaches in planning the project.		√
The Northern Alignment is being forced to bear the burden of this inappropriate project because the neighborhoods are simple and middle class.		√
The area should be subject to more power outages so that electricity is not taken for granted.		√
Increased power availability is bound to hasten congestion and degradation in the valley.		√
PG&E should provide service in a way that sustains people, animals, and the beautiful natural environment.		√
The project would harm the livelihood of businesses in Pleasant Valley.		√
Wineries would lose their appeal due to the project.		√
Brides would be devastated by the loss of the oasis that is Pleasant Valley.		√
Construction in Pleasant Valley would affect businesses.		√
Justify the loss of the microeconomy due to activity and pollutants.		√
Specify whether the Army Corps of Engineers would be involved in the project.		√
Specify if there is a hierarchy to environmental impact areas and whether impacts to certain resources would carry more weight than impacts to other resources.		√
Specify whether there is a threshold or number of unmitigable areas that would stop the project.		√
Describe what can be done to stop the project.	√	
Commenter finds it unacceptable for local residents to be burdened with the intrusion of the staging area at the intersection of Pleasant Valley and Hames Road.		√
The project would take away the things the landowners treasure most.	√	
There is foreseeable risk, and PG&E can and will be held accountable for huge sums of money for foreseeable risk such as fire, auto accidents, and earthquakes.	√	
Comments sent to PG&E in 2012 were ignored; explain when they will be addressed.	√	
Specify when the public can present opposition to the project.		

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
A commenter submitted documents and questions to the Administrative Law Judge, and they went unanswered.	√	
Describe how the public would know that the EIR will not overlook significant environmental effects from the project, as it appeared that Panorama fell short during the IS. If Panorama is not to blame, explain how the public would know that the CPUC would not overlook the potentially significant impacts brought up by the public.		√
The Aptos Library does not have a copy of the Draft IS for review.	√	
Add the impacted roads to the project website.		√
Organic farmer does not want concrete structure from TSP on farm.	√	
CPUC needs to consider all the concerns of the public.		√
Commenter submitted an affidavit that PG&E should be held accountable if this project goes forward if someone gets hurt on the dangerous Cox Road segments that lead into Valencia Road.		√
PG&E is prioritizing profit over safety.		√
PG&E smart meters have pulse modulated frequencies that harm people with pacemakers.		√
Introduction of these power lines opens the door for high voltage lines in the future.		√
Large homes being considered for construction must pass County requirements. This project must also be brought up for County approval.		√
Clarify who holds PG&E accountable for excessive noise, trash, and pollution in the area.		√
Describe how this plan fits with the state's avowed commitment to green energy.		√
Alternatives were not addressed at any of the meetings held by PG&E or Panorama.		√
The cost of undergrounding is probably part of the reason why it is not being considered. Putting the project out to open bid, rather than having PG&E do it, would lower the cost of undergrounding.		√
The project would decrease property values. Provide compensation for loss in property value.	√	√
There is no protection for landowners, and the commenter has no confidence in due process.	√	
The Draft IS meeting should have been recorded.	√	
Communication for the project has been bad.	√	

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-1 (Continued): Overview of Public Comments

Comment	When Received	
	IS Public Review Period	NOP Scoping Period
There is a proliferation of ex-PG&E employees at the firm that authored the Proponent's Environmental Assessment.	√	
PG&E is not trusted.	√	
CPUC will ignore comments for dollar amounts.	√	
Specify whether PG&E had determined the number of people who would be affected by the project.	√	
The Draft IS does not describe benefits resulting from eminent domain.	√	

4.2 ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE EIR FROM SCOPING COMMENTS

Table 4-2 contains a list of issues and impacts to be addressed in the EIR by section of the EIR and according to review of the comments received during the NOP scoping period and the IS public review period. Impacts identified as requiring mitigation in the IS will also be addressed in the EIR.

Table 4-2: EIR Issues to be Addressed

Environmental Issue/CEQA Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
Project Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the installation of new power poles, including pole installation, excavation depths, volume of excavated soil, pole placement, pole appearance and height • Vegetation removal requirements • Removal of structures on private property • Pull and tension site activities • Helicopter use, including necessity and frequency of helicopter pad use, helicopter fueling, and frequency and length of helicopter use • Duration of staging area use • Easement expansion • Construction schedule • Other utilities that could be placed on poles, such as telephone or cable • Project maps that show proposed pole placement • Restoration of helicopter pads, fueling stations, County and private roads, and access roads; logistics, timing, and degree of restoration • Project operation and maintenance, such as equipment replacement from storm damage • Other agencies that would have decision-making authority over the project or elements of it

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-2 (Continued): EIR Issues to be Addressed

Environmental Issue/CEQA Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
Project Purpose and Need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area served by the proposed project • The need for the project, including evidence of outages in the service area • How the proposed project would meet the purpose and need
Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives to the proposed project, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Undergrounding all or part of the alignment – Southern Alignment – Use of existing poles and lines – Valencia Alignment – Undergrounding all utilities – Placing the alignment along Highway 1 – Alternatives discussed in the PEA – Alternative pole materials – Undergrounding a portion of the Valencia Alignment – Upgrading existing substations – An alignment that involves portions of the Northern and Southern Alignments – Using shorter poles – Extending natural gas service to the service area to reduce electricity demand – Targeted energy efficiency • Reasons for rejecting considered alternatives • Comparison of environmental impacts among alternatives • No-project alternative • Alternative staging areas
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on the aesthetic character of the project area, from poles, tree removal, and other project elements • Aesthetic impacts to a range of viewers, including bicyclists, vehicles, homeowners, and walkers. • Obstruction of views • Impacts to designated scenic corridors • Visual simulations of the new poles and tree removal • Potential for aesthetic impacts to have economic effects on businesses and property values
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust creation and dust control • Air pollutant emissions from the project • Greenhouse gas emissions from the project
Biological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree removal impacts on wildlife, including nesting birds • Disruption of native habitat • Impacts on threatened and endangered wildlife and plants, including the SCLTS, Monterey spineflower, robust spineflower, and Mt. Hermon June beetle • Fuel spills impacts on wildlife

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-2 (Continued): EIR Issues to be Addressed

Environmental Issue/CEQA Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activity impacts on ecosystem balance • Noise impacts, including helicopter noise, on wildlife • Vegetation trampling • Animal mortality due to animals trying to escape construction activities and running onto the road • Pollutant effects on plants and wildlife • Tree and vegetation removal
Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical significance of Day Valley
Geology and Soils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slope instability related to placement of poles on steep slopes and on unstable geologic units. • Seismic risks • Erosion due to vegetation removal • Alterations to soil composition
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release of chemicals from project activities, such as transport of poles by helicopter, helicopter refueling, and their impacts on human health • Noise impacts on horses with riders, resulting in injury • Potential for increased wildfire risk • Impacts on firefighting response that could exacerbate a wildfire • EMF impacts • Potential for wind and lightning to cause safety impacts related to 100-foot poles • Remediation of soils contaminated during the project • Fire risk from PG&E employee smoking • Damage and injury from helicopter downdraft • Safety of helicopter transport of poles
Hydrology and Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts of treated poles on groundwater quality • Impacts to groundwater recharge from soil compaction, tree removal, and pole installation • Impacts to local water supplies in quality and quantity • Increase in runoff and contamination of surface water • Impacts of fuel on water quality
Land Use, Agriculture, and Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to designated farmland • Potential for economic impacts on farmers due to effects to farmland • Impacts to organic farmland related to organic certification • Impacts of noise, dust, and construction on farms • Consistency of project with the General Plan • Impacts to recreational activities in the area, including walking, hiking, cycling, jogging, and scenic drives
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corona noise • Helicopter noise • Effects of tree and shrub removal on noise

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-2 (Continued): EIR Issues to be Addressed

Environmental Issue/CEQA Area	Potential Issues or Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for noise to have a negative impact on businesses, such as wineries • Natural amplification of noise in valleys
Transportation and Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential delays in emergency services and impediments to emergency access • Project design safety, including proximity of poles to roads • Increased traffic as a result of the project • Disruption in traffic during construction • Impacts due to large equipment and large vehicle ingress and egress • Airspace protection for Watsonville Municipal Airport • Damage to roads • Economic impacts to businesses in Pleasant Valley from traffic impacts • Impacts to air traffic from helicopter use
Utilities and Service Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicts with existing utilities • Increased demand on water system • Impacts on sewage and waste disposal • Effects on area drainage system
Other CEQA Topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for growth induction

4.3 ISSUES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE EIR

Table 4-3 gives an overview of several broad categories of comments that will not be addressed in the EIR, with examples of comments in each category. Table 4-3 also gives a brief explanation of why comments in these broad categories will not be addressed in the EIR.

Table 4-3: Issues Outside the Scope of the EIR

Issue Area and Example Comments	Reason for Exclusion
Project merits, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am opposed to the project. • The project is not needed. • The community is against the project. • The scope of the project is unnecessary and inappropriate. • Using eminent domain to take land is inappropriate. • The Board of Supervisors and the Sierra Club are not in favor of the project. 	Statements on the project merits will not be considered in the EIR. The scoping period under CEQA is a chance for the public to provide comment on the scope of the environmental document. Comments on the merits of the proposed project—both for and against—do not speak to the scope of the EIR. Comments on the proposed project's merits are therefore outside of the scope of the EIR. Separate meetings will be held on the merits of the project following the environmental review process.

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-3 (Continued): Issues Outside the Scope of the EIR

Issue Area and Example Comments	Reason for Exclusion
<p>Statements on subjects not related to the proposed project, its alternatives, or its impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadways in the project area are narrow, have no sidewalks or curbs, and can barely handle two-way traffic. • Provide legal justification to enter on private property and identify all easements. • State whether the existing gas line on Aptos Ridge crosses the San Andreas Fault, whether the gas line is seamless or welded, and with what frequency the CPUC audits PG&E's records for gas lines. • The project would inhibit future roadway widening or improvement. • PG&E tree trimming leaves a mess/eyesore. • Perform a rough grading and build retaining walls as necessary to provide a safe shoulder for pedestrians and bicyclists. • The area should not be developed with more than one house per existing lot. • There is no indication of existing water mains in the IS or where PG&E is going to put the new main when they have to move the existing one. • Commenter is concerned over previous gas leaks from PG&E negligence. • Describe the impact of a wildfire on the Aptos Hills gas line from a previous temporary increase in operating pressure along an existing PG&E gas line. 	<p>Statements on subjects not related to the proposed project, its alternatives, or its impacts will not be considered in the EIR. Such subjects are outside of topics that must be addressed in the EIR. Public and agency input during the scoping process may influence the content of an EIR; however, public and agency input must focus on the proposed project description, its stated objectives, potential project alternatives, and environmental impacts that could be associated with proposed project components to be considered in the scope of the EIR. Comments on unrelated activities and impacts from current conditions (<i>i.e.</i>, baseline) are therefore irrelevant to the scope of the EIR's impact discussion.</p>
<p>Vague comments on topics to include and items to discuss in the EIR, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss safety before and after the project, including neighborhood safety. • Discuss the effect on the rural residential environment. • New poles may pose a risk to Flume Road because Flume Road is narrow and runs along a steep hillside. • Construction may be difficult on Cox Road. • The IS does not contain a discussion of potential countywide ramifications. • The IS lacks insight into impacts on neighborhood and community at large. • The report does not address lasting effects on community residents. 	<p>Vague comments on topics to address in the EIR will not be considered in the EIR. Vague comments on potential resource topics to be included in the EIR do not provide enough content to allow for meaningful consideration in the EIR. These types of comments often are too broadly stated or are incomplete ideas that require additional detail for the lead agency to address the magnitude and potential significance of impacts at a project- or resource-specific level.</p>

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-3 (Continued): Issues Outside the Scope of the EIR

Issue Area and Example Comments	Reason for Exclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IS does not address impact on quality of life. • The EIR should look at impacts to community values. • Discuss seismic effects. • Discuss how the project fits in with the state’s green energy goals. <p>The project is inconsistent with the General Plan</p>	
<p>Opinions or general statements unrelated to the scope of the EIR, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All visual impacts are the same for Valencia Alignment residents. • CPUC should investigate pros and cons more thoroughly. • The project would have a significant effect in the Day Valley Area. • The IS is misleading and inaccurate. • Community responses indicate more areas of concern than originally addressed. • The Southern Alignment would reduce quality of life. • CPUC must ensure all due diligence has been done • The community needs to be directly informed of the impacts of the project. • PG&E wants to save money and fix a problem as fast as possible. • The project would benefit greater Santa Cruz County, not the area around the project. • People have no reason to accept the project because PG&E cannot provide natural gas to the area. • Misleading, incomplete, or improper noticing was made for the project. • Panorama Environmental, Inc., employs former PG&E employees. • PG&E needs to consider community needs and wants. • Commenter would not grant an easement for project elements. • Commenter would like to sign a petition to prevent the project from occurring. • CPUC board members should consider this project being done in their neighborhood. 	<p>Opinions and general statements will not be addressed in the EIR. Similar to vague comments, opinions and general statements that are unrelated to the scope of the EIR do not provide enough content to allow for meaningful consideration in the EIR. These types of comments often are opinions about impacts, general statements that do not speak to the content of the EIR, opinions about the environmental review process, and opinions about the entities involved in the environmental review process. These comments do not focus on the project or an environmental resource in a way that allows the lead agency to determine the potential magnitude and significance of project impacts.</p>

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Comments

Table 4-3 (Continued): Issues Outside the Scope of the EIR

Issue Area and Example Comments	Reason for Exclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A public meeting without allowing the public to ask questions is unfair. • Project approval is happening before engineering has begun. • Lisa Orsaba should be reevaluated as a project manager. • Commenter was refused name of Administrative Law Judge at CPUC. • The project should be put up for County approval. 	

5 SUMMARY OF FUTURE STEPS IN THE CEQA PROCESS

Scoping is the first step of the EIR process. There are many steps left before completion of the CEQA process for the proposed project. This section describes the steps of the CEQA process that will occur following the conclusion of the EIR scoping period. Table 5-1 shows the completed and next steps in the CEQA process for the proposed project.

Item	Description	Date (Actual or Anticipated)
NOP	Notice that informed agencies and the public of the CPUC's intent to prepare an EIR for the proposed project	January 17, 2014
NOP Public Review Period	Opportunity for the agencies and public to submit comments to the CPUC on the scope of the EIR	January 17, 2014 – February 18, 2014
Scoping Meeting	Meeting to provide agencies and the public information about the project and to hear and accept comments on the scope of the EIR	January 29, 2014
Scoping Report	Report that describes the scoping process, including public comment opportunities, as well as who commented and the substance of comments received during scoping	March 2014
Draft EIR	Document that describes the proposed project, alternatives, impacts and mitigation, project need, and other CEQA topics	Mid-summer 2014
Draft EIR Public Review Period	Opportunity for the agencies and public to submit comments to the CPUC on the content of the Draft EIR	45 days, beginning day of Draft EIR release
Draft EIR Public Meeting	Meeting to provide agencies and the public information about the content of the Draft EIR and to hear and accept comments on the content of the Draft EIR	During the Draft EIR public review period
Final EIR	Document that describes the proposed project, alternatives, impacts and mitigation, project need, and other CEQA topics as well as addresses comments on the Draft EIR	Winter 2014
Certification of EIR	CPUC will certify the EIR as being prepared pursuant to CEQA	Winter 2014

The EIR is an informational document and does not encompass a decision on whether to grant or deny the PTC. The CPUC will make a decision whether to grant or deny the PTC after the completion of the Final EIR. The Administrative Law Judge assigned to the proposed project will draft a proposed decision taking into account the CEQA documentation and party testimony. The CPUC will then decide to adopt that decision or a commissioner's alternative decision.