

APPENDIX C

Summary of All Comments Received

- C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts
- C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies
- C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens
- C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings
- C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations
- C-6. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

APPENDIX C-1

Summary of Written Comments Received from
Government Agencies and Special Districts

Appendix C-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts

Date	From	Comments
County Agencies		
November 2, 2005	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Teresa Tung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An NPDES Construction Activity General Permit from either the State Water Resources Control Board or the California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Colorado and Santa Ana Regions may be required for the DPV2 project. • Sections of the Proposed Project are located with the District's Garnet Wash Master Drainage Plan (MDP), Banning MDP, and Beaumont MDP, and therefore the EIR/EIS should evaluate potential impacts to existing and proposed MDP facilities in the project area. • Any work that involves District ROW easements or facilities would require an encroachment permit from the District. • The construction of facilities within a road ROW that may impact District storm drains should be coordinated with the District. • The EIR/EIS should evaluate potential impacts to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
City Agencies		
December 14, 2005	City of Loma Linda, Department of Community Development Deborah Woldruff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment from the Community Development or the Public Works Departments.
Special Districts		
November 23, 2005	Harquahala Valley Irrigation District William D. Baker (from Baker & Ellis Attorneys at Law)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about lack of notice to people in Arizona. • Harquahala Generating Station is within HVID boundaries so district lands would be impacted. • Request to extend comment period. • Request to be added to mailing list.
November 28, 2005	Harquahala Valley Irrigation District William D. Baker (from Baker & Ellis Attorneys at Law)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with the lack of notice provided to affected entities in Arizona regarding the DPV2 project, and asked for and were denied an extension of the comment period. • The Harquahala West Subalternate Route would impact the residents/landowners of the District in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Destroy rural atmosphere. – Impair visual resources and destroy scenic quality. – Remove cropland from production; interfere with tilling and irrigation practices and crop dusting and defoliating operations. – Adversely impact endangered species and other wildlife. – Devalue land in the District. • Suggested that these impacts could be avoided if the HGC line to Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS) was utilized, and the DPV2 project could use the existing corridor from PVNGS that is currently used for the DPV2 transmission line.
November 29, 2005	Harquahala Valley Power District Jay I. Mores (from Moyes Storey Ltd.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests copies of three maps attached to the NOP, and that he be added to the mailing list. • The DPV2 project would travel through the Harquahala Valley Power District and would have serious impacts on landowners and farmers in the District. • The District had not been notified nor received information regarding the DPV2 project.

APPENDIX C-2

Summary of Written Comments Received
from Private Organizations and Companies

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

Date	From	Comments
November 5, 2005	Matich Corporation Roy Hays	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two power lines cross his property; however the lot numbers on the easement do not seem to agree with those on easement maps. • Suggests abandoning the old wooden pole easement, and revising the steel line easement to cross the correct lots identified in the easement. • Requests that new transmission lines and facilities be placed in the existing steel pole easement area. <p>Attachments: Two (2) transmission line easements, and map of easements on property.</p>
November 14, 2005	Glorious Land Company/ GLC Enterprises, LLC Harvey R. Niskala, AIA, Senior Vice President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner of 7,700 acres in Shavers Valley area of Riverside County where it proposes to develop Paradise Valley, a 6,400-acre mixed-use master-planned community consisting of residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, public facilities, and recreational uses. • Submitted application to BLM for a land exchange on 12/10/01 and discussions/correspondence regarding this issue have continued to the present; however BLM did not notify GLC about the potential expansion and addition of power corridors (e.g. DSWTP, DPV2) through Paradise Valley until March 2005. • Conducted negotiations with USFWS, CDFG, and Riverside County regarding environmental issues associated with Paradise Valley that resulted in an agreement of mitigation of biological resource impacts. • Concerned that the convergence of the existing DPV1 and SCE 230 kV transmission lines with the proposed DPV2 and DSWTP lines in the middle of the proposed Paradise Valley would cause significant adverse impacts that could result in the condemnation of GLC lands making it impossible to develop Paradise Valley. • Convergence of multiple utilities in one location could also make the power system vulnerable to interruption by natural or human causes. • Suggests that the new transmission lines could be constructed immediately south of Paradise Valley within BLM lands and west of Paradise Valley, which would avoid Paradise Valley and prevent or alleviate the potentially dangerous convergence of the existing and proposed transmission lines and the existing Sempra Energy gas lines and pump station. • Proposed corridor alignment is inconsistent with the principles set forth in the Western Regional Corridor Study. • Would like to work with lead agencies to resolve their concerns. • Request that the Department of the Interior delay the completion of the EIR/EIS process until it has reviewed and discussed with GLC their concerns. <p>Attachments: Application submittal letter for land exchange with BLM, and four (4) Paradise Valley maps including a regional vicinity map, Development Area Plan map, power and gas line corridors map, and map of proposed land exchange.</p>
November 28, 2005	Harquahala Valley Farms Valerie D. Melton (from Five Star Inc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that there were no scoping meetings held in Harquahala or in Arizona. The scoping meeting in Blythe, California was not adequate to cover western Arizona. • Concerned that the Harquahala landowners were not provided with notice of the scoping meetings. • Requests scoping meetings also be held in Arizona and that an extension be granted for filing comments. • Concerned that the Harquahala Subalternative Route would cause environmental, aesthetic, and economic impacts to the Harquahala Valley Farms and other landowners in Harquahala. • Requests addition to the project mailing list.

APPENDIX C-3

Summary of Written Comments Received
from Private Citizens

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

Date	From	Comments
November 3, 2005	Julian Veselkov	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strongly opposes the construction of the DPV2 project, which is proposed to be located at north edge of the existing SCE corridor that is on the south end of his property.• Concerned with the health and safety danger associated with high voltage transmission lines, including electrocution, exposure to high voltage electric fields, and death.• Concerned that the transmission line could experience a mechanical failure or that a vehicle or an airplane could hit the towers, and the towers would crush nearby houses.• Concerned that construction of high voltage transmission lines close to his property would make 75% of his property useless, and demands that SCE buy him out and relocate his family.• Suggests an alternative in which the transmission line in the North Palm Springs area be built at the center of the ROW corridor, rather than at the edge. <p>Attachment: EMF Brochure, map of property</p>

APPENDIX C-4

Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Date	From	Comments
Scoping Meeting, November 1, 2005 (6:00 pm – 8:00 pm) – Blythe, CA		
November 1, 2005	City of Blythe Charles Hull, Assistant City Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is cheaper to produce power in Arizona and the project will bring 1,200 MW into California. What about the interconnection into Blythe Energy Project (BEP) I and II? • Is Desert Southwest Transmission Line Project (DSWTP) totally independent of DPV2? • Is there enough desert to put all of these lines? • In the Project Description when it talks about mileages in California and Arizona, it says that H-frame towers will be used in the Palo Verde Valley. Why is this? • Have property owners been contacted? • What is the optical repeater facility located three miles west of Blythe? • Is any of the fiber optic buried? What is Static VAR Compensation? • What is the difference between the 1989 ROW grant versus what's happening with BLM now? • The subalternate routes, listed on page 6 of the NOP, add mileage and seem to deviate from the existing corridor. Why are they of value if they're all longer? • Could the North of Blythe Alternative be employed to pick up BEP I/II power? (to avoid mid-point connection) • Are you aware that 60 days ago the President turned 16,000 acres over to the CRIT? Are CRIT lands a factor in the Proposed Project? • What about CRIT cultural resources in the area? • On page 16 of the NOP, Socioeconomics refers to the employment of personnel. Blythe wrote a letter, which is included in the PEA [Proponent's Environmental Assessment] that said that there are positive socio-economic impacts from the project on the City. However, what does the third bullet mean regarding tax benefits – how is that positive? • The concept of the NOP/Scoping in advance of the project doubles the time to get things done—what is the purpose of it? • Making an interconnection to BEP I/II is important to Blythe. El Paso doesn't pay tariffs so that is how they stay competitive with Arizona. The only new thing that I thought of tonight is looping in the North of Blythe Alternative with BEP I/II to eliminate the 6.7 miles of transmission line from Buck Boulevard to Midpoint Substation.
Scoping Meeting, November 2, 2005 (3:00 pm – 5:00 pm) – Beaumont, CA		
November 2, 2005	The Tanin Group Jack Woude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Beaumont area, is the proposed line north of the existing one and the south ones comes out—will it be within the current easement? What is pole line with respect to existing structures? • Beaumont land use is changing from rural and the traffic patterns are changing so the existing access roads may not be the same. There is already a lot of construction in the area and with increase construction on the narrow streets there could be an impact that needs evaluation. Has anyone looked at conflicts with traffic on residential streets?

Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Date	From	Comments
November 2, 2005	Julian Veselkov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property is 200 feet from the corridor and he is worried about EMF (mostly the electric fields), especially because the middle of the sag is what crosses his property (so it is a few hundred feet from the house and with swing the new line could possibly cross property because it'll be closer). There is corona noise and sparking already (electrocution risk?). Is it possible for SCE to buy out an owner? • I spoke with SCE and my property is within the danger zone for electrocution. That reduces property value. I have a chain link fence that has been measured at 200 volts and the new towers will be even closer (160 feet closer). There are 4 of 5 houses in North Palm Springs and one directly below the lines (near Indian Avenue at Edison Road/Dillon Road). The SCE safety guy said nothing can be done. What plans does SCE have to address safety issues? What is the protection under state law to protect these homes?
November 2, 2005	Matich Corporation Roy Hays	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I own a joint property in the northeast corner of Banning (north of AFB area). There are two easements (SCE and California Electric Company, circa 1945) through the property (both are now probably SCE). The area is used to excavate sand/gravel and make concrete. We are concerned about how construction will affect the property and operations, but we are willing to work with CPUC/BLM/SCE concerning the plans and schedule, etc.
Scoping Meeting, November 2, 2005 (7:00 pm – 9:00 pm) – Beaumont, CA		
November 2, 2005	Ralph Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will project be funded? Will California have to bear the cost? • Will Prop 80 (related to utility companies) impact this project? • Can the information from the meeting be summarized and placed in newspaper for general public?
November 2, 2005	Janet/Richard Winsett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing ROW – will there be a difference/increase in ROW width? Will there be documents from SCE talking about changes in easement? • Proposed CA DPR state park - how will the park be affected, and how?
November 2, 2005	Grace Chi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have vacant land in Cabazon with easement traversing the land. The work will be done within the ROW, but one tower will be moved on the southern side. What would be the affect on ROW set backs be if they re-draw property lines/change in entitlements? Project may affect the setback and EMF if it is built. • What will be the construction schedule after approval for towers in my area? Approval process schedule? • Are there maps (larger scale than NOP) available for posting at city or library?
November 2, 2005	Frank Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and noise are issues in the area. There is also the issue with destruction of landscape and the time it will take to re-do it. Will new development be ruined? Row disturbance?
Scoping Meeting, November 3, 2005 (3:00 pm – 5:00 pm) – Palm Desert, CA		
November 3, 2005	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Coachella Valley Preserve Chris Schoneman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DSWTP biological assessment identified impacts to the Coachella Valley Fringe—toed lizard. Is DPV2 going to have similar impacts? • Are mitigation measures common to projects like this? • Will the USFWS's Carlsbad office have an opportunity for comment? • ROW grant issued in 1989 – are there limits to what can be done in ROW? Are there requirements regarding tower heights, widths, etc. in the grant?

Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Date	From	Comments
November 3, 2005	Julian Veselkov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eight hundred-foot wide ROW next to his property and proposed project would go on north edge of ROW next to his property; can line be moved to middle of the corridor? • Submitted comment letter with map provided. Letter includes brochure provided by SCE on EMF delineating the 200 foot “danger zone.” In Germany it’s required that EMF be shielded. They should buy up affected properties.
November 3, 2005	Israel Esmeralda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 17 of the NOP addresses conversion of agricultural land (farm-land) to non agricultural land. What are they (SCE) going to do with this land? Page 20 of the NOP states that the project might induce growth. Don’t use land for development or convert to other uses or take land for homes. If acquire additional land for towers will simply be additional ROW for farmland. • How is property value appraised; ROW lands acquired by SCE, will the land be appraised at current market value? Fair market value negotiation with property owners? How could my property be appraised? Is it based on surrounding land values?
Scoping Meeting, November 3, 2005 (7:00 pm – 9:00 pm) – Palm Desert, CA		
November 3, 2005	Glorious Land Company/ GLC Enterprises, LLC Harvey Niskala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative for the Paradise Valley development project. Glorious Land Company (GLC) has been in the process of developing the project for the past five years. Has been reviewing the DPV2 project for the past two years. Has met with SCE and not opposed to the line. • Surprised by CPUC process. Filed a protest letter with the CPUC but main concern was with DSWTP and trying to learn more about DSWTP. • Are there alternative routes for all of these projects? Concerned with the number of lines converging all at one location. • Through planning process would like to recommend alternatives. Feel they have some alternatives that they could bring to BLM. • DPV2 not necessarily the main concern. Feel that siting the four different lines in different places would be less impacting. Wants to work with all agencies to help find alternatives. Wants to participate in alternatives that avoid the convergence of four major lines: DPV1, DPV2, Desert South West, and Julian Hines (??). Concern with cumulative effects of all lines coming together. • The Paradise Valley plan includes 50% open space; 40% open space and 10% natural open space. • Provided proposal to John Kalish, but will provide written comments on the project.

APPENDIX C-5

Summary of Agency Consultations

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
Federal		
US Bureau of Reclamation Phoenix Area Office, Lower Colorado River Office (Boulder), and Yuma Area Office	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message left for each office this agency offering to meet with them but no response was received.
US Fish and Wildlife Service	October 6, 2005 (phone call) November 1 and 3, 2005 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting held in Blythe on November 1, 2005 with Refuge Manager for Kofa NWR to discuss the proposed project, potential effects and alternatives that would avoid Kofa NWR land. • Coachella Valley NWR manager attended scoping meeting on November 3, 2005 (see Appendix C-4).
Joshua Tree National Park	October 11, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchanged messages, described project and provided opportunity to comment on the project.
US Department of Defense (Yuma Proving Ground)	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message left for this agency offering to meet with them but no response was received.
Arizona		
Arizona State Land Department, Right of Way Section	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed project and asked about approval process for use of state lands. • Agency will review information packet and request meeting, if necessary.
Maricopa County, Planning and Development	October 6, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns at this time. • Agency will review information packet and will submit concerns if any are identified.
La Paz County, Community Development	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed preference for the project route to remain south of I-10 (speaking specifically of the North of Kofa - North of I-10 Alternative and the North of Blythe Alternative) as it would be disruptive to residential views and plans for new development. • Stated that residents are comfortable with the existing route crossing Highway 95, and by having the route go through Kofa, the transmission lines are hidden behind the hills and mountains.
California		
Riverside County Transportation & Land Management	October 6, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentioned that the only major issue is whether the project would cause a re-zone of any County lands in areas that are zoned other than Rural Residential (RR) or Controlled Development (W-1 or W-2). The RR and W-1/W-2 zones allow for public utilities. However, siting of public utilities in other zones would require a re-zone. • Recommended finding out what APN's are affected and what zones those APNs are in (this info should also be presented in the EIR doc). If any APNs are identified that are in areas zoned other than RR or W-1/W-2, then the County should be contacted.
City of Blythe Planning Department	October 4, 2005 (phone call) November 1, 2005 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received information packet; attended scoping meeting on November 1, 2005 (see Appendix C-4). • Face to face meeting not required; would request additional information if needed. • Keep on mailing list for future information on the project.
City of Coachella Department of Community Development	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message left for the City offering to meet with them but no response was received.
City of Indio Community Development Department	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke with staff in Community Development Department • Referred to Planning Department and left message offering to meet with them but no response was received.

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
City of Cathedral City Planning Department	October 4, 2005 (phone call) November 3, 2005 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke with City staff (10/4/05) and met with staff (11/3/05) • Project route includes areas of the City slated for development. • City proposes to annex unincorporated areas that may also be impacted by the project. • Wanted to understand what alternatives are being proposed that might impact the City. • Good quality development is being proposed in the City that will need to have disclosure about the transmission line. • No development is proposed north of the freeway. Commercial development and travel center being proposed.
City of Palm Springs Department of Planning & Building	October 11, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke with City staff about the project. • No concerns at this time; no need to meet in person.
San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department	October 4 and 11, 2005 (phone calls)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Messages were left for this agency offering to meet with them but no response was received.
City of Banning Community Development Department	October 5, 2005 (phone call) November 2, 2005 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested more information on the Morongo North Alternative shown on the Banning jurisdiction map. • Within Banning, City would like to have some towers relocated because there are places where they bisect properties, and other places where the three separate lines are very far apart where they even further divide properties. • City is processing Specific Plans in the area of the transmission corridor – Banning Bench Specific Plan, which has been completed and the Black Bench Specific Plan, which will be completed within three years. • Additional residential development (Loma Linda) may be impacted by the project.
City of Beaumont Planning Department	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchanged messages with Planning Department staff who indicated that they have no comments at this time but were available to meet with EIR/EIS team.
City of Calimesa Planning Department	October 4, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke with City staff which was aware of the DPV2 project and the future SCE Oak Valley Substation (it will be in Calimesa) and associated transmission line. • City indicated no need to meet at this time.
City of Redlands Community Development	October 11, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchanged messages with City staff, which was aware of the project • City had no concerns at the time and did not need to meet.
City of Loma Linda Community Development	October 10, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke with City staff, which was aware of the project. • City had no concerns at the time and did not need to meet.
City of Grand Terrace Community Development	October 4 and 13, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Messages exchanged with City staff; no direct contact was made but no request was made to meet.
City of Colton Community Development	October 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke with City staff, which indicated that a meeting would not be required at the time. Staff requested information about the project and indicated that further discussion, if any, would be after receipt and review of the NOP.
Tribal Lands		
Morongo Indian Reservation, CA Morongo Band of Mission Indians	November 3, 2005 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIR/EIS team summarized the CPUC and CEQA process that will be followed as part of EIR/EIS preparation and illustrated the project using detailed maps • Tribal attorney explained that timing of tribal decision regarding extension of SCE easements may take longer than the EIR/EIS process. • Discussed pros and cons of Northern Alternative on Morongo Lands.
Special District		
Palo Verde Irrigation District (PVID)	October 11, 2005 (phone call)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposed DPV2 is placed north of DPV1 that poses major problems for PVID, because it would block maintenance of PVID's existing system. • Want to review NOP prior to making comments. • Have contacted SCE regarding their concerns.

APPENDIX C-6

Summary of Comments by Issue Area

Appendix C-6. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

Date	Mode*	Comment (W: written comment, O: oral comment)
Project Description		
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know if the Desert Southwest Transmission Project (DSWTP) is independent of the DPV2 project.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know why H-frames will be used in the Palo Verde Valley.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know the purpose of the Optical Repeater facility and if the associated fiber optic is buried.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know the definition of Static VAR Compensation.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know if the proposed transmission line north of the existing line and the southern lines will be within the current easement. Commenter would also like to know the pole line with respect to existing structures.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know if there will be a difference or increase in width compared to the existing ROW.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know what the approval process and construction schedules will be.
Alternatives		
10/4/05	O	Commenter expressed preference for the project route to remain south of I-10 (speaking specifically of the North of Kofa - North of I-10 Alternative and the North of Blythe Alternative) as it would be disruptive to residential views and plans for new development.
10/4/05	O	Stated that residents in La Paz County are comfortable with the existing route crossing Highway 95, and by having the route go through Kofa, the transmission lines are hidden behind the hills and mountains.
10/4/05	O	Commenter would like to know what alternatives are being proposed that might impact the City of Cathedral City.
10/5/05, 11/2/05	O	Commenter requested more information on the Morongo North Alternative shown on the Banning jurisdiction map
10/11/05	O	Commenter expressed concerned that if the proposed DPV2 is placed north of DPV1 that it would pose major problems because it would block maintenance of PVID's existing system
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know about the Project's interconnection with Blythe Energy Project (BEP) I and II. Commenter would also like to know if the North of Blythe Alternative could be employed to interconnect to BEP I and II power.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know the value of the Subalternate routes (listed on page 6 of the NOP) if all the routes increase the mileage and deviate from the existing ROW.
11/1/05	O	Commenter states that an interconnection to BEP I and II is important. Commenter further suggests an alternative that consists of looping in the North of Blythe Alternative with BEP I and II in order to eliminate the transmission line between Buck Boulevard and Midpoint Substation.
11/3/05	O	Commenter would like to know if the transmission line could be constructed in the middle of the ROW, rather than along the northern edge, through the North Palm Springs area.
11/3/05	O	Commenter discussed the pros and cons of Northern Alternative on Morongo Lands.
11/5/05	W	Commenter would like to know if the project could be constructed through an existing ROW easement on his property, instead of other possible routes.
11/14/05	W	Commenter would like to suggest an alternative that would avoid bisecting the planned master-planned community of Paradise Valley in the Shavers Valley area of Riverside County. The suggested alternative would circumvent the area by relocating south through BLM land and west of the planned development.
11/28/05	W	Commenter would like to suggest an alternative to the Harquahala West Subalternate Route that utilizes the existing DPV1 ROW.
11/28/05 (2), 11/29/05	W	Several commenters expressed concern that the Harquahala West Subalternate Route would cause adverse environmental, aesthetic, and economic impacts to landowners in the Harquahala Valley.

Appendix C-6. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

Date	Mode*	Comment (W: written comment, O: oral comment)
Biological Resources		
11/2/05	O	Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project will destroy the landscape and that restoration will take a long time.
11/2/05	W	Commenter requests that potential impacts to the Western Riverside County MSHCP be evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
11/3/05	O	Commenter states that a biological assessment for DSWTP identified impacts to the Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard. Commenter would like to know if the DPV2 project is expected to have similar impacts.
11/28/05	W	Commenter is concerned that the Harquahala West Subalternate Route would adversely impact endangered species and other wildlife.
Cultural Resources		
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know if there are Colorado River Indian Tribes' cultural resources that could be impacted by the DPV2 project.
Health and Safety		
11/2/05, 11/3/05	O, W	Commenter is concerned about the adverse health and safety effects of increased electric and magnetic fields (EMFs).
11/2/05, 11/3/05	O, W	Commenter is concerned about the risk of electrocution due to close proximity of his property in North Palm Springs to the transmission lines. Commenter states that his property is already within the "danger zone" for electrocution and a chain link fence has been measured to have 200 volts, yet the DPV2 project would place his property even closer to transmission lines.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know what SCE will do to address safety issues such as increased EMF emissions and risk of electrocution. Commenter would also like to know what protection from these safety issues is provided under California law.
11/2/05, 11/3/05	O, W	Commenter would like to know if SCE would buy out a property owner due to the safety issues, such as EMF emissions and electrocution risk, caused by the close proximity of its transmission lines.
11/3/05	W	Commenter is concerned about the risk falling towers and cables due to mechanical failure or collision with large trucks or airplanes.
Land Use		
10/4/05, 11/3/05	O	Commenter stated that the project route includes areas of the City of Cathedral City that are slated for development, and the City proposes to annex unincorporated areas that may also be impacted by the project.
10/4/05, 11/3/05	O	Commenter states that good quality development is being proposed in the City of Cathedral City that will need to have disclosure about the transmission line. No development is proposed north of the freeway. A commercial development and travel center are being proposed.
10/5/05, 11/2/05	O	Commenter states that additional residential development (Loma Linda) may be impacted by the project.
10/6/05	O	Commenter stated that the only major issue is whether the project would cause a re-zone of any Riverside County lands in areas that are zoned other than Rural Residential (RR) or Controlled Development (W-1 or W-2). The RR and W-1/W-2 zones allow for public utilities. However, siting of public utilities in other zones would require a re-zone.
10/6/05	O	Commenter recommended finding out what APN's are affected (in Riverside County) and what zones those APNs are in (this info should also be presented in the EIR doc). If any APNs are identified that are in areas zoned other than RR or W-1/W-2, then the County should be contacted.
11/2/05	O	Commenter is concerned about how construction will affect his business property and his business's operation. Commenter is willing to work with the necessary entities concerning construction plans and schedules.

Appendix C-6. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

Date	Mode*	Comment (W: written comment, O: oral comment)
11/2/05	O	Commenter states that she owns land in Cabazon that contains an easement. Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project could affect the ROW setback and would like to know the effect on the ROW setback if property lines are redrawn or entitlements are changed.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know if new development will be ruined by the DPV2 project. Commenter would also like to know if there will be ROW disturbance associated with the project.
11/3/05	O	Commenter would like to know what SCE will do with land that is converted from agricultural land to non-agricultural land. Commenter requests that converted land not be used for development/homes, or converted to other uses, but rather be used if additional land is acquired for easement that it be used for agriculture.
11/14/05	W	Commenter is concerned that the Proposed Project would prevent the future development of Paradise Valley, a mixed-use master-planned community located in the Shavers Valley area of Riverside County that the DPV2 project would bisect.
11/28/05	W	Commenter is concerned that the Harquahala West Subalternate Route would adversely impact agricultural operations in the Harquahala Valley.
Noise		
11/2/05	O	Commenter is concerned about the existing corona noise at his property.
11/2/05	O	Commenter states that there are existing noise issues in the area (Beaumont).
Recreation		
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know if the proposed San Timoteo Canyon State Park will be affected by the DPV2 project.
Socioeconomics		
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know how "tax benefits" would be a positive impact.
Traffic		
11/2/05	O	Commenter notes that the traffic in Beaumont is increasing and changing due to continued development, and states that construction of the DPV2 project could cause an impact to traffic that requires evaluation. Commenter would also like to know if traffic impacts on residential streets have been evaluated.
Water Resources		
11/2/05	W	Commenter requests that the EIR/EIS evaluate potential impacts to Riverside County Flood Control District and Water Conservation District's MDP facilities.
Cumulative Projects		
11/3/05	O	Commenter is concerned about the Desert Southwest Transmission Project (DSWTP).
11/3/05, 11/14/05	O, W	Commenter is concerned with the cumulative effects of the convergence of four transmission lines (DPV1, DPV2, DSWTP, and an SCE 230 kV line) the planned site of Paradise Valley in the Shavers Valley area of Riverside County. Commenter would like to know if there are alternative routes for these projects, and suggested that siting each of these transmission lines in different locations would result in fewer impacts. Commenter would like to work with the agencies to develop other alternatives.
Mitigation		
11/3/05	O	Commenter would like to know if mitigation measures are common to a project such as DPV2.
Public Involvement		
10/4/05	O	Commenter stated that they are aware of the future SCE Oak Valley Substation (it will be in Calimesa) and associated transmission line.
10/11/05	O	Commenter would like to review the NOP prior to making comments, but has contacted SCE to relate their concerns.

Appendix C-6. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

Date	Mode*	Comment (W: written comment, O: oral comment)
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know if property owners have been contacted.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know the purpose of the NOP and the scoping process as it doubles the amount of time necessary to complete tasks.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know if information from the public scoping meetings can be summarized and published in the newspaper.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know if project maps (at a larger scale than those in the NOP) could be made available at city offices or libraries for public review.
11/3/05	O	Commenter would like to know if the USFWS, Carlsbad office will have the opportunity to comment on the DPV2 project.
11/28/05	W	Commenter is concerned that there was no notice provided to affected entities in Arizona of the DPV2 project or the California scoping meetings.
11/29/05	W	Commenter is concerned that there was no notice provided to affected entities in Arizona of the DPV2 project or the California scoping meetings.
Project Information		
10/5/05, 11/2/05	O	Commenter states that the City of Banning is processing Specific Plans in the area of the transmission corridor – Banning Bench Specific Plan, which has been completed and the Black Bench Specific Plan, which will be completed within three years.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know if there is enough desert (land) to place all of the transmission lines.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know the difference between the 1989 ROW grant and the situation with the DPV2 project.
11/1/05	O	Commenter would like to know if the project team was aware that the federal government recently gave 16,000 acres to the Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT). Commenter would also like to know if CRIT lands are included in the proposed DPV2 project.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know how the DPV2 project will be funded, and if California will have to bear the cost.
11/2/05	O	Commenter would like to know if Prop 80 will impact the DPV2 project.
11/2/05	W	Commenter would like to inform the project team that an NPDES Construction Activity General Permit and possibly a Riverside County Flood Control District and Water Conservation District encroachment permit would be necessary.
11/3/05	O	Commenter would like to know how property acquired by SCE for ROW will be appraised.
11/3/05	O	Commenter would like to know if the 1989 ROW grant prescribed limits to what can be done in the ROW or requirements regarding tower height, widths, etc.
11/3/05	O	Commenter explained that timing of tribal (Morongo Band of Mission Indians) decision regarding extension of SCE easements may take longer than the EIR/EIS process.
11/5/05	W	Commenter suggests that one existing ROW easement on his property be abandoned and relocated to a second existing ROW easement, and that the project also be located in the second ROW.