

# Public Scoping Report

## Southern California Edison's El Casco System Project

Application No. A.07-02-022

SCH No. 2007071076



CEQA Lead Agency:  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Contact: Juralynne Mosley  
Tel: (415) 703-2210

Prepared by:  
*Aspen Environmental Group*

September 2007

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	
1.1 Purpose of Scoping .....	1
1.2 Summary of El Casco System Project .....	2
1.3 Scoping Report Organization .....	2
<b>2. Project Scoping</b>	
2.1 Notice of Preparation .....	3
2.2 Outreach .....	5
<b>3. Scoping Comments</b> .....	6
3.1 Key Issues Raised during the Public Comment Period .....	7
3.2 Alternatives .....	10
3.3 Summary of all Public and Agency Comments .....	11
<b>4. Next Steps in EIR Process</b>	
4.1 EIR Events and Documents .....	12

## Tables

1. Repository Sites .....	4
2. Pre-Hearing Conference and Public Scoping Meetings .....	4
3. Newspaper Advertisements .....	5
4. EIR Events and Documents .....	12

## Appendices

<b>Appendix A Notice of Preparation</b>	
Notice of Preparation	
<b>Appendix B Scoping Meeting Materials</b>	
B-1: Newspaper Advertisements	
B-2: Pre-Hearing Conference and Scoping Meeting Presentations	
B-3: Scoping Meeting Handouts	
<b>Appendix C Summary of All Comments Received</b>	
C-1: Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies	
C-2: Summary of Written Comments Received from a Private Organization	
C-3: Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens	
C-4: Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings and on the Project Information Line	
C-5: Summary of Agency Consultations	
<b>Appendix D Comment Letters Received in Response to NOP</b>	
D-1: Comment Letters from Government Agencies	
D-2: Comment Letter from a Private Organization	
D-3: Comment Letters from Private Citizens	

# 1. Introduction

The environmental review of the El Casco System Project (Proposed Project) is being conducted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for the State of California and therefore is regulated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under California law. The intent of the public scoping process under CEQA is to initiate the public scoping for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), provide information about the Proposed Project, and solicit information that will be helpful in the environmental review process.

The Scoping Report for the Proposed Project documents the issues and concerns expressed by members of the public, government agencies, and organizations during the July/August 2007 EIR public scoping period. The release of the Notice of Preparation to prepare an EIR initiated the CPUC's 30-day public scoping period under CEQA. The comment period allowed the public and regulatory agencies an opportunity to comment on the scope and content of the environmental document, including the alternatives to be considered, and issues that should be addressed in the EIR.

Southern California Edison (SCE), the Project proponent or Applicant, has filed an application with the CPUC for a Permit to Construct the El Casco System Project. As part of the review process, the CPUC will prepare an EIR, which will evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the El Casco System Project and will identify mitigation measures to reduce these impacts, where possible.

## 1.1 Purpose of Scoping

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

Comments received during the scoping process are part of the public record as documented in this scoping report. The comments and questions received during the public scoping process have been reviewed and considered by the CPUC in determining the appropriate scope of issues to be addressed in the EIR.

The purpose of the scoping for the El Casco System Project was to:

- Inform the public and relevant public agencies about the Proposed Project, CEQA requirements, and the environmental impact analysis process;
- Identify potentially significant environmental impacts for consideration in the EIR;
- Identify possible mitigation measures for consideration in the EIR;
- Identify alternatives to the El Casco System Project for evaluation in the EIR; and

- Compile a mailing list of public agencies and individuals interested in future Project meetings and notices.

## 1.2 Summary of El Casco System Project

Northern Riverside County's electrical needs are currently served from SCE's main electrical grid via the existing 220/115 kilovolt (kV) Vista Substation and connecting transmission, subtransmission, and distribution facilities (referred to as the Vista System), and the 500/220/115 kV Devers Substation and connecting transmission, subtransmission, and distribution facilities (referred to as the Devers System).

Maraschino Substation, located within the eastern portion of the Vista System, and Banning Substation, located within the western portion of the Devers System have become heavily loaded due to the rapidly growing development in the northern Riverside County area. Projected peak demand in northern Riverside will exceed the operating limits of the 220/115 kV transformers that currently serve the Vista System by 2008 and the 115/12 kV transformers at the Maraschino Substation during late 2007.

Currently, SCE's existing subtransmission line right-of-way (ROW) is an active line serving as an overload emergency electrical source between the Devers and Vista 115 kV Systems in the event either system reaches capacity. When the Devers and Vista Systems are operating normally, no load travels through the existing 115 kV subtransmission line. Upgrading this line per the Proposed Project would ensure that safe and reliable electric service is available to meet customer electrical demand without overloading the existing electrical facilities that supply northern Riverside County by:

- Providing load relief to the Vista and Devers Systems through the transfer of the Banning, Maraschino, Mentone, Crafton Hills, and Zanja Substations to the newly created El Casco System; and
- Allowing load transfers between the Devers, Vista, and the new El Casco Systems under both normal and abnormal conditions.

The proposed El Casco System Project would include the following major components:

- Construct a new 220/115/12 kilovolt (kV) substation within the Norton Younglove Reserve in the County of Riverside (El Casco Substation), associated 220 kV and 115 kV interconnections, and new 12 kV line getaways.
- Replace approximately 13 miles of existing single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission lines with new, higher capacity double-circuit 115 kV subtransmission lines and replace support structures within existing SCE ROWs in the Cities of Banning and Beaumont, and unincorporated Riverside County.
- Replace approximately 1.9 miles of existing single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission lines with new, higher capacity single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission lines and replace support structures within existing SCE ROWs in the City of Beaumont and unincorporated Riverside County.
- Replace approximately 0.5 miles of existing single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission lines with new, higher capacity single-circuit 115 kV subtransmission lines on existing support structures within existing SCE ROWs in the City of Beaumont and unincorporated Riverside County.
- Rebuild 115 kV switchracks within Banning and Zanja Substations in the Cities of Banning and Yucaipa, respectively.
- Install telecommunications equipment at the proposed El Casco Substation and at SCE's existing Mill Creek Communications Site.

- Install fiber optic cables within public streets and on existing SCE structures between the Cities of Redlands and Banning.

## 1.3 Scoping Report Organization

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

- Section 1 provides an introduction to the report and describes the purpose of scoping and a brief overview of the El Casco project.
- Section 2 provides information on the scoping meeting and notification materials, including the Notice of Preparation.
- Section 3 summarizes the comments received and highlights the key issues raised during the scoping comment period.
- Section 4 describes the next steps in the EIR process.
- Appendices consist of all the supporting materials used during scoping. These appendices include copies of the Notice of Preparation and meeting materials provided at the public scoping meetings. They also include copies of the scoping comment letters received on the Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the proposed El Casco System Project.

# 2. Project Scoping

This section describes the methods used by the CPUC to notify the public and agencies about the scoping process conducted for the Proposed Project. It outlines how information was made available for public and agency review and identifies the different avenues that were and are available for providing comments on the project (i.e., meetings, fax, email, mail, and phone).

## 2.1 Notice of Preparation

As required by CEQA Guidelines §15082, the CPUC issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on July 16, 2007 that summarized the Proposed Project, stated its intention to prepare an EIR, and requested comments from interested parties (see Appendix A for full copy of the NOP). The NOP also included notice of the CPUC's Pre-Hearing Conference for the Proposed Project, and public scoping meetings that were held on August 1, 2007 in the cities of Banning and Beaumont, California. The NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse on July 16, 2007 (SCH# 2007071076), which initiated the 30-day public scoping period. The review period for the NOP ended on August 14, 2007.

Over 800 copies of the NOP were distributed to federal, State, regional, and local agencies; elected officials; and property owners within 300 feet of the Proposed Project alignment. Property owners were identified by SCE as part of their application to the CPUC and incorporated into the project mailing list. Citizens and community organizations who expressed interest in the Proposed Project prior to receipt of the NOP were also added to the mailing list. In addition, five copies of the NOP were delivered to local repository sites where documents and project information can be reviewed. The NOP and all future Proposed Project-related documents are available for review at the information repository sites listed in Table 1.

<b>Table 1. Repository Sites</b>			
<b>Repository Site</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>Hours of Operation</b>
Yucaipa Branch Library	12040 5th St. Yucaipa, CA 92399	(909) 790-3146	Sun Closed. Mon-Thurs 10 am - 8 pm Fri 10 am - 6 pm Sat 9 am- 5 pm
Banning Public Library	21 W. Nicolet St. Banning, CA 92220	(951) 849-3192	Sun Closed. Mon 9 am - 7 pm Tues 9 am - 6 pm Wed 9 am - 7 pm Thurs 9 am - 6 pm Fri 9 am - 5 pm Sat 9 am - 2 pm
Calimesa Library	974 Calimesa Blvd. Calimesa, CA 92320	(909) 795-9807	Sun, Mon Closed. Tues, Thurs, Fri 10 am - 6 pm Wed 12 pm - 8 pm Sat 9 am - 5 pm
Beaumont Library	125 E 8th Street Beaumont, CA 92223	(951) 845-1357	Sun Closed. Mon, Wed 10 am - 6 pm Tues, Thurs 10 am - 8 pm Fri-Sat 10 am- 6 pm
University of Redlands Armacost Library	1200 East Colton Avenue Redlands, CA 92373-0999	(909) 748-8081	Mon-Thurs 8 am - Midnight Fri 8 am - 9 pm Sat 10 am - 9 pm Sun 1 pm - Midnight

## **NOP Pre-Hearing Conference and Scoping Meetings**

The CPUC held one Pre-Hearing Conference (PHC) and two public scoping meetings in two locations in northern Riverside County on August 1, 2007. The PHC was held to identify issues related to the CPUC's General Proceeding and help determine the need to conduct hearings on the Proposed Project. The two public scoping meetings provided an opportunity for the public and government agencies to obtain more information on the proposed El Casco System Project, to learn more about the CEQA environmental review process, to ask questions regarding the Proposed Project, and to provide formal scoping comments.

### **Meeting Locations and Handouts**

The PHC and public scoping meetings were held at the locations and on the dates specified in Table 2.

<b>Table 2. Pre-Hearing Conference and Public Scoping Meetings</b>			
<b>Type</b>	<b>Pre-Hearing Conference</b>	<b>Public Scoping Meeting</b>	<b>Public Scoping Meeting</b>
<b>Date</b>	August 1, 2007	August 1, 2007	August 1, 2007
<b>Time</b>	1:00 to 2:30 pm	2:30 to 4:30 pm	6:30 to 8:30 pm
<b>Location</b>	Banning City Hall (Council Chambers) 99 E. Ramsey Street Banning, CA 92220	Banning City Hall (Council Chambers) 99 E. Ramsey Street Banning, CA 92220	Beaumont Civic Center (Council Chambers) 550 East Sixth Street Beaumont, CA 92223

Handouts and informational materials available at each meeting are listed below. Appendices A and B include copies of these materials.

- Notice of Preparation
- PowerPoint Presentation
- Project Fact Sheets
- Self-Addressed Speaker Comment Sheet
- Speaker Registration Card

Other information was also made available for public review, which included a copy of the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (PEA) and maps of the project alignment.

### Newspaper Advertisements

The date and location of the PHC and public scoping meetings were advertised in five local newspapers. The advertisements provided a brief synopsis of the project and encouraged attendance at the meetings to share comments on the Proposed Project. The meeting advertisements were placed in the newspapers presented in Table 3 (see Appendix B-1 for copies of the advertisements’ text).

<b>Table 3: Newspaper Advertisements</b>	
<b>Publication</b>	<b>Advertisement Date</b>
The San Bernardino Sun	Wednesday, July 25, 2007
The Press-Enterprise	Wednesday, July 25, 2007
Redlands Daily Facts	Wednesday, July 25, 2007
Calimesa News-Mirror	Thursday, July 26, 2007
Record-Gazette	Friday, July 27, 2007

### Agency Consultation

During the scoping process and prior to conducting the public scoping meetings, the CPUC contacted ten potentially affected local and regional agencies were contacted by phone to provide information on the project and to determine interest in face-to-face meetings to discuss the Proposed Project. These agencies were sent an information packet that included a project fact sheet and an 11 by 17 color map of the Proposed Project components and subtransmission line route (see Appendix B). The comments received during the telephone consultations are summarized in Appendix C. The majority of agencies opted not to meet face-to-face with the CPUC, and instead felt that a review of the information packet and NOP would provide them with sufficient information regarding the Proposed Project.

## 2.2 Outreach

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

### Project Information Hotline

In order to offer another opportunity to inquire about the scoping meetings or the Proposed Project, a telephone hotline [(877) 576-8342] was established to take oral comments and questions from those unable to attend the meetings. Telephone messages were retrieved daily and all calls were responded to within a 24-hour period. The hotline also served as a fax line to allow for comments to be submitted by fax instead of mail. Comments received through this hotline (voice or fax) have been considered and incorporated in this report.

## Email Address

An email address was established for the El Casco System Project (elcasco@aspeneg.com) to provide another means of submitting comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The email address was provided on meeting handouts and posted on the Project website. Comments received by email have been considered and incorporated in this report.

## Internet Website

Information about the El Casco System Project was made available through the Project website hosted by the CPUC. During the July/August 2007 scoping period, the website included electronic versions of the Project Application and PEA, NOP, and Project-related maps, and thus provided another public venue to obtain information on the Proposed Project. The website will remain a public information resource for the CPUC's environmental review of the Proposed Project, and will announce future public meetings and hearings. The website address is:

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

# 3. Scoping Comments

This section summarizes the comments raised by the public and agencies during the scoping process for the El Casco System Project EIR. This summary is based upon both written and oral comments that were received during the NOP 30-day public review period, from July 16, 2007 through August 14, 2007. All written and oral comments received during the public comment period for the NOP were reviewed for this report and for the EIR, including comments received during the public scoping meetings, during agency consultation, through the telephone hotline (voice/fax), and via email. Section 3.1 discusses the key issues that were raised during the scoping process. Section 3.2 extracts the suggested alternatives from the scoping comments. Section 3.3 references Appendix C, which summarizes all comments received during the scoping period, and Appendix D, which contains all of the scoping comment letters in their original format as submitted by commenters.

Fourteen comment letters were submitted during the scoping process, and six individuals presented oral comments during the scoping meetings. Appendix C summarizes all written and oral comments received. In addition to private individuals, six government agencies and one private organization submitted written and/or oral comments:

### Government Agencies

- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Banning City Attorney (Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP)
- Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Theresa Tung/Art Diaz)
- County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department
- Department of Toxic Substances Control

### Private Organization

- Henry Tappata – Chairman, Transportation Committee, Banning Chamber of Commerce



### Private Citizens

- Mr. Marvin Friedman (Banning)
- Mr. Osvaldo Henry Tappata (Banning)
- Mr. Virgil Barham (Yucaipa)
- Mr. Tim K. Beach (Banning)
- Mr. Ron Domme (Banning)
- Mr. Edward H. Leonhardt (Banning)
- Mr. & Mrs. James W. & Nancy R. Brown (Banning)

## 3.1 Key Issues Raised During the Public Comment Period

As discussed above, written and oral comments were provided by members of the public, organizations, and government agencies. The discussion below presents the key issues identified from the written and oral comments received on the Proposed Project during scoping. The specific issues raised during the public scoping process are summarized according to the following topics:

- Aesthetic Impacts
- Air Quality Impacts
- Cultural Resources Impacts
- Hazardous Materials/Contamination
- Land Use and Property Value Impacts
- Noise Impacts
- Water Resources/Hydrology Impacts
- Impacts from EMF
- Other Concerns

### Aesthetic Impacts

- Concern that the new subtransmission line will negatively impact scenic vistas, especially of nearby mountains (Beach, Brown, Leonhardt)
- Concern that the aesthetic impact of a new or upgraded subtransmission line will not be analyzed in sufficient detail (San Bernardino Land Use Services Dept.; Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP)

### Air Quality Impacts

- The *South Coast Air Quality Management District* had the following comments regarding the air quality analysis associated with the project:
  - Use the 1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook or the CARB approved URBEMIS 2007 Model when preparing air quality analysis

- Calculate both construction and operation air quality impacts, and include air quality impacts from indirect sources (sources that generate or attract vehicular trips) in the analysis
- Quantify and compare PM2.5 emissions to the recommended PM2.5 significance thresholds
- Calculate localized air quality impacts and compare the results to localized significance thresholds in addition to regional significance thresholds, or perform dispersion modeling as necessary
- Perform a mobile source health risk assessment
- Several comments were received on the need to address air quality emissions impacts from the Proposed Project on adjacent residences and businesses.

## Cultural Resources Impacts

- The *Native American Heritage Commission* had the following comments on the project:
  - Contact the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center for a record search
  - If an archaeological inventory survey is required, prepare a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey
  - Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for a Sacred Lands File Check and a list of appropriate Native American contacts for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in the mitigation measures
  - Include in the mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archaeological resources
  - In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities
  - Include in the mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans
  - Include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan

## Hazardous Materials/Contamination Impacts

- The *Department of Toxic Substances Control* had the following comments on the proposed project:
  - Identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the project site may have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances
  - Evaluate whether conditions at the site may pose a threat to human health or the environment
  - Identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight
  - Proper investigation, sampling and remedial actions overseen by the appropriate agency, if necessary, should be conducted at the site prior to the new development or any construction

- Appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is within a “Border Zone Property”
- Appropriate sampling is required prior to disposal of the excavated soil
- If the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, proper sampling should be conducted
- Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during the construction or demolition activities
- If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented

## Land Use and Property Value Impacts

- Concern, mainly among Sun Lakes residents, that the taller, newly energized subtransmission line would negatively impact property values (Beach, Brown, Domme, Hall, Leonhardt, Loconte)
- ***The City of Banning (Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP)*** requested consideration of impacts from the Proposed Project on City planning and private projects adjacent to the [Banning Municipal] airport area and from the Northerly Alternative on private projects adjacent to the potential location of the transmission lines

## Noise Impacts

- Concern that the new or upgraded subtransmission line and substations will produce unacceptable levels of noise pollution (Barham, Domme, Leonhardt)

## Water Resources/Hydrology Impacts

- The ***Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District*** had the following comments regarding water resources in the project area:
  - Any work that involves District right-of-way, easements or facilities will require an encroachment permit from the District
  - Coordinated with the District any construction of facilities within road right-of-way that may impact District storm drains
  - Demonstrate that all construction related activities within the District right-of-way or easement are consistent with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) by including a MSHCP consistency report with the EIR
  - Address potential impacts to proposed Banning and Beaumont Master Drainage Plan facilities within the project area
  - The Proposed Project may require coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity
  - If the proposed project will impact watercourses that may have floodplains associated with them, the DEIR should address potential direct and indirect floodplain impacts

## Impacts from EMF

- Concern that the proximity and voltage of the subtransmission lines will produce a level of EMF radiation that is hazardous to human health; comments were received on the need to consider EMF impacts on the health of the elderly population in the Sun Lakes Community and to businesses along the Proposed Project alignment (multiple commenters)
- Concern that existing CPUC regulations regarding EMF exposure from new transmission line projects are inadequate; comment received on the need to consider the National Institute of Environmental Health and Sciences recommendation and guidelines in the review of EMF (Tappata, Friedman)
- Concern that the EMF radiation will interfere with pacemakers (Domme and Leonhardt)
- Concern that the EMF radiation will interfere with electronic equipment such as radios, computers, telephones, cell phones, and equestrian treatment equipment (Domme, Hall, Leonhardt, and Tappata)

## Other Concerns

- Fear of possible *electrocution* due to proximity of subtransmission line to the ground (Leonhardt)
- Fear of possible *electrocution or crushing* due to subtransmission lines falling on homes or people (Beach, Enet, and Domme)
- Concern that the new, taller subtransmission lines could *interfere with the use of helicopters and airplanes to fight fires* (Domme and Enet)
- Concern that transmission lines and subtransmission lines are likely *terrorist targets* and that the impacts of an attack on the proposed subtransmission line should be considered (Burke, Williams & Sorensen, LLP)
- Mitigation methodology is inadequate to address health and safety of Sun Lake Residents. (Friedman)

## 3.2 Alternatives

Following are all written, oral, and agency consultation comments that suggested an alternative, along with a statement of each suggestion.

### Government Agency Suggestions

#### *County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department*

The proposed project should include evaluation of the alternative of undergrounding the facilities.

### Private Citizen Suggestions

***Mr. Marvin Friedman (Banning)***

New construction should be buried underground properly shielded to remove the EMF risk.

***Mr. Osvaldo Henry Tappata (Banning)***

Re-route the new lines away from the Sun Lakes residential area, or bury them underground within Sun Lakes.

***Mr. Tim K. Beach (Banning)***

Install new lines underground within Sun Lakes.

***Mr. Ron Domme (Banning)***

Require SCE to take an alternate route for their proposed power lines or put the power lines under ground for the 1.5 miles it will be going through the Sun Lakes Community.

***Mr. Edward H. Leonhardt (Banning)***

Redesign the proposed project to run the power transmission line underground where the public is impacted by overhead lines. I suggest that the northern route along the Devers-San Bernardino #2 ROW, which is greater than 350 feet wide, be re-reviewed as an alternative to the proposed project. I also suggest that a southern route along the Devers-Valley #1 ROW also be reviewed as an alternative to the proposed project.

***Mr. & Mrs. James W. & Nancy R. Brown (Banning)***

Strongly recommend that SCE be required to either bury or reroute the new 115-kV transmission lines passing through the Sun Lakes retirement community.

***Mr. Tim Smith (Banning)***

Prefers southern route because it impacts less people or undergrounding of transmission lines/towers.

***Mr. Milton Bracy (Banning)***

Recommends alternative route from Banning Substation to Valley Desert ROW to Highway 79 and down to Maraschino Substation. If this route is not feasible, then suggests undergrounding in the Sun Lakes Community.

### **3.3 Summary of All Public and Agency Comments**

Appendix C presents a comprehensive summary of all oral and written comments received from the general public, government agencies, and private organizations. Appendix C-1 to C-3 provides a summary of all written comments received. Appendix C-4 summarizes all of the oral comments received during the scoping process. Appendix C-5 presents a summary of the agency consultations conducted as part of the scoping process. Appendix D includes copies of written comments received on the El Casco System Project.

## 4. Next Steps in the EIR Process

### 4.1 EIR Events and Documents

While scoping is the initial step in the environmental review process, additional opportunities to comment on the Project EIR will be provided. The CPUC will provide for additional public input when the Draft EIR is released for public review, and during the public meetings for the Draft EIR. Table 4 on the following page presents the proposed timeline for the Proposed El Casco System Project environmental review process, and identifies where in the process the public and agencies can provide additional input in the environmental review process.

**Table 4. EIR Events and Documents**

Event/Document		Purpose	Approximate Date
<b>Completed Events/Documents</b>			
Notice of Preparation (NOP) for CEQA	Release of NOP <sup>1</sup>	Notified interested parties and agencies of the CPUC's intent to prepare an EIR.	July 16, 2007
	Public Review Period	Held 30-day public scoping period on the Project to provide for public comments on the scope of EIR.	July 16 to August 14, 2007
Pre-Hearing Conference (PHC)	One PHC was held	Identified issues related to the General Proceeding and helped determine the need to conduct hearings on the project.	August 1, 2007
Scoping Meetings – NOP	Two scoping meetings were held	Presented information on the Project and provided opportunity for public and agency comments in a public forum.	August 1, 2007
Scoping Report for CEQA NOP Process	Submittal of Scoping Report	Reported public and agency comments on the Proposed Project and environmental issues of concern to the public and agencies. This report includes comments made during the scoping process for the CEQA NOP.	September, 2007
<b>Upcoming Events/Documents</b>			
Draft EIR	Release of Draft EIR	Draft EIR Notice of Completion is file with SCH. EIR Presents analysis of impacts and proposes mitigation measures for the Proposed Project and alternatives brought forward for analysis. Includes other required analysis per CEQA.	Late October/Early November 2007
	Public Review Period	45-day minimum CEQA-required public review period.	November to December 2007
	Draft EIR Public Meetings	Allows for public comment on the Draft EIR	Early December 2007
Final EIR	Release of Final EIR	Final EIR issued by CPUC, including responses to public comments. Final EIR Notice of Determination is filed with SCH	March 2008
	Decision on the Project	CPUC certifies the Proposed Project EIR and issues a Proposed Decision	Mid-April 2008

<sup>1</sup>The NOP was mailed to interested parties, property owners within 300 feet of the Project route, federal, State, and local regulatory agencies, and elected officials.

Refer to the website for specific EIR document dates: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/asp/en/elcasco/elcasco.htm>