

CIRCLE CITY SUBSTATION AND MIRA LOMA- JEFFERSON 66 KV SUBTRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT

Scoping Report

SCH No. Number 2016021012

Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission

March 2016



CIRCLE CITY SUBSTATION AND MIRA LOMA- JEFFERSON 66 KV SUBTRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT

Scoping Report

SCH No. Number 2016021012

Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission

March 2016



550 Kearny Street
Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896.5900
www.esassoc.com

Irvine
Los Angeles
Oakland
Orlando
Palm Springs
Petaluma
Portland
Sacramento
San Diego
Seattle
Tampa
Woodland Hills

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson 66 kV Subtransmission Line Project Scoping Report

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	1
2. Description of the Project	2
2.1 Project Summary	2
2.2 Project Location	2
3. Scoping Process	2
3.1 Notification	2
3.2 Opportunities for Comment	3
3.2.1 Public Workshops and Scoping Meetings	3
3.2.2 Agency Consultation	3
4. Scoping Comments	4
4.1 Issues to be Considered under CEQA	10
4.2 Issues Not Analyzed under CEQA	27
5. Consideration of Issues Raised in Scoping Process	36
Appendices	
A. Notice of Preparation	A-1
B. Newspaper Notices	B-1
C. Scoping Meeting Attendance Sheets	C-1
D. Scoping Meeting Speaker Cards	D-1
E. Public Workshop and Scoping Meeting Presentations	E-1
F. Agency Consultation Meeting Notes	F-1
G. Scoping Meeting Transcripts	G-1
H. Written Scoping Comments	H-1
List of Tables	
1. Parties that Submitted Scoping Comments	4

This page intentionally left blank

SCOPING REPORT

Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson 66 kV Subtransmission Line Project

1. Introduction

In its California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) application (A.15-12-007), filed on December 4, 2015, Southern California Edison (SCE) sought a Permit to Construct (PTC) the Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson 66 kilovolt (kV) Subtransmission Line Project (Project).

Based on its review of the application and the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA), the CPUC decided to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the Project, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The CPUC formally began the process of determining the scope of issues and alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR (a process called "scoping") when it issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the Project on January 29, 2016.

The NOP initiated agency consultation about the scope and content of information to be analyzed in the EIR and invited early public input about potential environmental concerns (Pub. Res. Code § 21080.4(a); CEQA Guidelines §§ 15082(b), 15083). CEQA Guidelines Section 15083 provides that a "Lead Agency may...consult directly with any person...it believes will be concerned with the environmental effects of the project." Scoping is the process of early consultation with the affected agencies and public prior to completion of a Draft EIR. Section 15083(a) states that scoping can be "helpful to agencies in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in an EIR and in eliminating from detailed study issues found not to be important." Scoping is an effective way to bring together and consider the concerns of affected State, regional, and local agencies, the project proponent, and other interested persons (CEQA Guidelines § 15083(b)).

This Scoping Report provides an overview and a summary of the written and oral comments provided by agencies and individuals during the scoping period, a 30-day period which closed on February 29, 2016. The CPUC will use this Scoping Report as a tool to ensure the preparation of a comprehensive EIR tailored to agency and community concerns. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, all public comments will be considered in the EIR process.¹

¹ Comments not within the scope of CEQA will not be addressed through the CEQA process.

2. Description of the Project

2.1 Project Summary

The Project consists of: (1) construction of a new 66/12 kilovolt (kV) substation (Circle City Substation); (2) construction of four new 66 kV subtransmission source lines, which would be in two double-circuit configurations and combinations of overhead and underground construction; (3) construction of a new 10.9 mile 66 kV subtransmission line (Mira Loma-Jefferson Subtransmission Line); (4) upgrade of the existing Mira Loma Substation to accommodate the new Mira Loma-Jefferson Subtransmission Line; (5) construction of approximately six new underground 12 kV distribution getaways exiting the proposed Circle City Substation; (6) relocation of approximately 1.9 miles of an existing 33 kV distribution line to an underground position; and (7) installation of telecommunications facilities to connect the Project to SCE's existing telecommunications system.

2.2 Project Location

In its application, SCE has identified the purpose of this Project as follows: to ensure the availability of safe and reliable electrical service, and to provide additional capacity to serve long-term forecasted electrical demand requirements in the Electrical Needs Area (ENA), while also maintaining or improving system reliability and providing greater operational flexibility. The ENA includes the cities of Corona and Norco, and the surrounding area of unincorporated Riverside County.

The Project subtransmission and/or source lines would be located in portions of northwestern Riverside County, including the cities of Corona, Eastvale, and Norco; and in portions of San Bernardino County, including the cities of Chino and Ontario. The Circle City Substation would be located approximately 0.25 mile south of the corner of Magnolia Avenue and East 6th Street in Corona, and the existing Mira Loma Substation is located off Hamner Avenue near the corner of Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road in Ontario.

3. Scoping Process

3.1 Notification

On Friday, January 29, 2016, the CPUC published and distributed an NOP to solicit input from federal, State, and local agencies on the scope and content of information to be considered in the EIR for the Project. A copy of the NOP was sent to the State Clearinghouse of the Office of Planning and Research, which assigned State Clearinghouse Number 2016021012 as the Project's unique State identification number. The NOP was also sent directly to property owners within 300 feet of the Project routes and locations, as well as to responsible and trustee agencies, individuals that had previously shown interest in the Project, and parties of the Proceeding. The NOP described the Project, included a map showing the location of proposed components of the Project, identified potential areas of environmental impacts, and provided notice for a public participation workshop and Scoping Meeting that was held in Corona on February 17, 2016. It

should be noted that subsequent to the release of the NOP, another public participation workshop and Scoping Meeting date (February 16, 2016) was added (see Section 3.2.1, below). A copy of the NOP is provided in **Appendix A**.

The CPUC also posted newspaper legal advertisements announcing the release of the NOP and the date for the public participation workshop and Scoping Meeting. The announcements were also posted on the CPUC's website. The CPUC published legal advertisements in the San Bernardino Sun and the Press Enterprise on January 29, 2016, and February 13, 2016. Copies of the newspaper notices are provided in **Appendix B**. An electronic copy of the NOP was also posted on the CPUC's website established for the Project at:

www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/esa/Circle_City/index.html

3.2 Opportunities for Comment

3.2.1 Public Workshops and Scoping Meetings

The CPUC conducted two educational workshops and Scoping Meetings, one on February 16, 2016 at the Circle City Center located at 365 North Main Street, Corona, CA 92880, and one on February 17, 2016, at the Corona Public Library located at 650 South Main Street, Corona, CA 92882. On both dates the workshop was held from 6:00 to 6:30 p.m., and the Scoping Meeting was held from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. Sixteen members of the public attended on February 16th, and fourteen members attended on February 17th. Connie Chen of the CPUC, as well as Matt Fagundes, Claire Myers, and Michelle Irace of Environmental Science Associates (ESA), consultant to the CPUC, hosted the meeting. The sign-in sheets from the Scoping Meetings are provided in **Appendix C** and the speaker cards are provided in **Appendix D**.

Meeting attendees were provided materials including written comment forms and speaker cards. During the workshop ESA explained the role of participants and summarized the CPUC's decision and environmental review process and the opportunities for public participation within that process. During the Scoping Meetings, a description of the Project and alternatives identified by SCE in its PEA was presented and the range of environmental issue areas to be addressed in the EIR was identified. The meetings also included the solicitation of ideas about other possible Project alternatives, outlined next steps in the environmental review process and allowed for the acceptance of public comments. See **Appendix E** for a copy of the public workshop and Scoping Meeting presentation.

3.2.2 Agency Consultation

In January 2016, on behalf of the CPUC, ESA contacted local agencies and officials and resource agencies to offer information about the environmental review of the Project and solicit input on the scope of the EIR analysis. Agencies and officials contacted included the cities of Corona, Eastvale, Chino, Ontario, and Norco; the counties of Riverside and San Bernardino; and the

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. See **Appendix F** for the agency consultation meeting notes.

On behalf of the CPUC, ESA conducted agency meetings on February 3, 2016, with the City of Corona and the City of Chino, and with the City of Eastvale on February 17, 2016, to receive input on the scope of the EIR analysis.

4. Scoping Comments

Eight members of the public provided oral comments on the Project during the February 16, 2016 public Scoping Meeting and eight members of the public provided oral comments on the Project during the February 17, 2016 public Scoping Meeting (see **Appendix G**). The CPUC received additional comments in writing during the comment period. Copies of the written comments are provided in **Appendix H**. Commenting parties are listed in **Table 1** and summaries of the issues identified by the commenters are provided in Section 4.1, *Issues to be Considered under CEQA*, and Section 4.2, *Issues Not Analyzed under CEQA*. In some cases, the same letter was submitted by multiple individuals. These individuals are listed under Community Letter 1, Community Letter 2, or Community Letter 3. Several community letters were received that were signed with illegible signatures. Although these individuals' names are not identified below, their comments have been acknowledged and summarized under the appropriate community letter, and their letters are provided in **Appendix H**.

**TABLE 1
PARTIES THAT SUBMITTED SCOPING COMMENTS**

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Date/Received Date
Oral Comments		
Aoun, Michael	Resident	2/16/2016
Bennett, Kirk	City of Corona Planning and Housing Commission, Logos Architecture, Resident	2/16/2016
Haley, Dick	Resident	2/16/2016
Hove, Andrea	Realty One Group Inc., Resident	2/17/2016
Messner, Gary	Downs Energy	2/17/2016
Messner, Sherry	Downs Energy	2/17/2016
Morgan, Joe	Resident	2/16/2016
Richins, Tom (comments read by Bobby Spiegel)	FB / History of Corona	2/17/2016
Rigby, Todd	Resident	2/16/2016
Shamma, Tariq	TMS Consortium	2/17/2016
Simmons, Dickie	Resident	2/17/2016
Spiegel, Bobby	Corona Chamber of Commerce	2/16/2016 and 2/17/2016
Spiegel, Karen	Corona City Council	2/16/2016
Tejura, Krupali	Resident	2/16/2016

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Date/Received Date
Wilson, Kathleen	Resident	2/17/2016
Wilson, Tom	Resident	2/17/2016
Written Comments		
Alrayes, Nidham Aram	San Bernardino County Department of Public Works	2/29/2016
Barnett, Sylvia	Resident	2/19/2016
Bennett, Kirk	City of Corona Planning and Housing Commission, Logos Architecture, Resident	2/17/2016
Bhatt, Arti	Resident	2/29/2016
Brandt, Dennis J	Resident	2/18/2016
Brown, Brenna	Resident	2/17/2016
Brown, Robert	Resident	2/11/2016
Castro, Dee	DCS Publishing, Resident	2/17/2019
Cheryl DeGano	Jurupa Community Services District, Albert A Webb Associates	2/29/2016
Dayal, Rajesh	Resident	2/18/2016
Donaldson, Cathy	Resident	2/18/2016
Fidel, Jodee	Resident	2/23/2016
Flanigan, Kris	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	2/23/2016
Garvey, Susan	Resident	2/22/2016
Genis, Joanne	Resident	2/29/2016
Gonzalez, Jean	Resident	2/18/2016
Hernandez, Olga	Resident	2/19/2016
Husted, Dave	Resident	2/18/2016
Indrawan, Joe	City of Eastvale	2/29/2016
James, Charlene	Resident	2/29/2016
James, Darin	Resident	2/29/2016
Joanne Coletta	City of Corona	2/26/2016
Johnson, William	Resident	2/29/2016
King, Kathy	Resident	2/19/2016
Kray, Lydia	Realty One Group Inc., Resident	2/17/2016
Krenzin, Nicole	South Hills Norco Campus, Resident	2/18/2016
Kurdi, Ammar	Resident	2/29/2016
Lenhart, Ronald and Melissa	Residents	2/29/2016
Li, Victor J	Resident	2/29/2016
Lu, Penny	Resident	2/29/2016
Marchido, Tara	Resident	2/17/2016
Markus, Michael R	Orange County Water District	2/29/2016
Marshburn, Jeff	Resident	2/18/2016
Mendez, Lucy	Resident	2/19/2016
Moreno-Camacho, Maria	Resident	2/29/2016

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Date/Received Date
O'Donnell, Betty Jean	Keller Williams Realty, Resident	2/26/2016
Olsen, Matt	Resident	2/3/2016
Oyama, Erin K	Palmieri Tyler	2/29/2016
Peabody, Mark R	Peabody Engineering, Corona Chamber of Commerce, Resident	2/8/2016
Quach, Cindy	Resident	2/29/2016
Rambert, Susan	Resident	2/1/2016
Reinke, Kelly	Resident	2/19/2016
Rust, Julie	Resident	2/29/2016
Schafer, John	Richland Communities, Inc.	2/19/2016
Shah, Rushabh	Resident	2/29/2016
Shamma, Tariq	TMS Consortium	2/17/2016
Tejura, Krupali	Resident	2/17/2016
Voss, Tiffany	Resident	2/29/2016
Wentworth, Michele	Resident	2/16/2016
Wilson, Thomas E and Kathleen G	Residents	2/17/2016
Wong, Jillian	South Coast Air Quality Management District	2/11/2016
Community Letter 1		
Agredano, Adriana	Resident	2/29/2016
Alcazar, Teofila	Resident	2/29/2016
Biller, Bruce	Resident	2/29/2016
Burns, Mike and Sonja	Resident	2/29/2016
Chen, Yinfa	Resident	2/29/2016
Conklin, Cheryl	Resident	2/22/2016
Cui, Jade	Resident	2/29/2016
Da Costa, Christian	Resident	2/29/2016
De La Cova, Jamie G	Resident	2/15/2016
De La Cova, Jennifer	Resident	2/15/2016
Dierks, Michannan and Brian	Resident	2/15/2016
Elias, Janelle	Resident	2/15/2016
Ellis, Haiwan	Resident	2/29/2016
Ellis, Terry	Resident	2/29/2016
Fan, Tianjun	Resident	2/29/2016
Feng, Howard	Resident	2/25/2016
Fisher, Kelly	Resident	2/25/2016
Fotinos, John	Resident	2/29/2016
Fotinos, Shannon	Resident	2/29/2016
Garcia, Evelyn and Joe	Resident	2/29/2016
Garcia, Sarah	Resident	2/15/2016
Garvey, Susan	Resident	3/1/2016

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Date/Received Date
Hoang, Paul	Resident	2/29/2016
Hove, Andrea	Realty One Group Inc., Resident	2/17/2016
Jacques, James and Monica	Resident	3/1/2016
James, Darin and Charlene	Resident	2/15/2016
Jensen, Alicia	Resident	2/26/2016
Jiang, Susan	Resident	3/1/2016
Keo, Monirath	Resident	2/15/2016
Knight, Abby	Resident	2/29/2016
Knight, Matthew	Resident	2/29/2016
Lacambra, Wendy	Resident	2/29/2016
Lee, Easton	Resident	2/29/2016
Lee, Jeremy	Resident	2/29/2016
Lenhart, Ronald and Melissa	Resident	2/29/2016
Li, Jingxin and Yuan, Xiaojuan	Resident	2/29/2016
Li, Liang	Resident	2/29/2016
Li, Ni	Resident	2/29/2016
Li, Pamela	Resident	2/29/2016
Li, Zhaoyi	Resident	2/15/2016
Lin, Almon	Resident	2/29/2016
Liu, Kai	Resident	2/29/2016
Maine, Ryan and Lindsay	Resident	2/29/2016
McBurney, Chris	Carousel Graphics Inc., Resident	2/25/2016
Merilus, Catheline D	Resident	2/15/2016
Morones, Carlos	Resident	2/29/2016
Morones, Melissa E	Resident	2/15/2016
Navarro, Ericka	Resident	2/29/2016
Nguyen, Peter	Resident	2/29/2016
Patricia	Resident	2/15/2016
Paulsen, Gail	Resident	2/29/2016
Ponce, Bernard T	Resident	3/1/2016
Qian Li, Yangchun Shi	Resident	2/29/2016
Rebecca	Resident	2/29/2016
Reed, T	Resident	2/29/2016
Reese, Kelli	Resident	2/25/2016
Rodriguez, Armando and Sylvia	Resident	2/29/2016
Rose	Resident	2/29/2016
Shea, Amy	Resident	2/29/2016
Shea, Mark	Resident	2/29/2016
Smith, Aaron	Resident	2/19/2016
Song, Jessica	Resident	2/15/2016

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Date/Received Date
Sutherland, Kristen	Resident	2/29/2016
Toles, Terry	Resident	2/29/2016
Tran, Son	Resident	2/29/2016
Wang, Hao	Resident	3/1/2016
Wang, Siyang	Resident	2/24/2016
Wayne	Resident	2/29/2016
Wuence, Margo	Resident	2/29/2016
Xu, Ying	Resident	2/29/2016
Yunying Zheng, Ada	Resident	2/29/2016
Zepeda, Fidencio	Resident	2/29/2016
Zhao, Bingbing	Resident	2/24/2016
Zick, Diane	Resident	2/29/2016
Zick, Matthew	Resident	2/15/2016
Community Letter 2		
A, Arturo	Resident	2/29/2016
Agramonte, Al	Ergonomic Comfort Design Inc.	2/17/2016
Ahary, Jason	Resident	2/29/2016
Aldova, Felipe	Simply Fresh Markets	2/29/2016
Anzares, Ansel	Resident	2/29/2016
B, Eileen	Resident	2/29/2016
Baldwin, John W	Resident	2/29/2016
Barilone, Diane	Preferred Choice Printing	2/17/2016
Bates, Linda	Resident	2/29/2016
Carrillo, Alfred	Resident	2/26/2016
Carrillo, Juanita	Resident	2/26/2016
Coelho, Tom and Natalie	IHOP	2/17/2016
Cooley, Greg	Eibach Springs Inc.	2/17/2016
Corrao, Carolyn Anderson	Waste Management of the Inland Empire	2/17/2016
Cortez, George	Resident	2/26/2016
Dominguez, Victor	Resident	2/29/2016
Donner, Beverly	Resident	2/29/2016
Dumont, Lisa	Dumont Property Management	2/17/2016
F, Scott J	LPL Financial	2/29/2016
Galvan, Ernest	Resident	2/29/2016
Garcia, Esperanza	Resident	2/26/2016
Gois, Gayle	Resident	2/29/2016
Griffitts, Johnnie and Elly	Resident	2/17/2016
Gutierrez, Derek J	Authority Mortgage	2/17/2016
Holmes, Cindy	ConnectingU Marketing, Inc.	2/17/2016
Huffman, Mark	Creative Business Technologies	2/17/2016

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Date/Received Date
Juan, George	Resident	2/26/2016
Kelley, Sean R	Kelley Law	2/17/2016
Klein, Sandy	Resident	2/29/2016
L, Danielle	Resident	2/29/2016
Lewis, Elaine	Simply Elegant Gift Baskets	2/29/2016
Lolonado, Ricardo	Resident	2/29/2016
Lopez, Lila	Resident	2/26/2016
M, Maria	Resident	2/26/2016
Martinez, E	Resident	2/26/2016
Martinez, J	Resident	2/26/2016
McClain, William K	Resident	2/29/2016
McClure, Dana	Bernard Karcher Investments Inc.	2/17/2016
Medura, Tammy	Resident	2/26/2016
Merchant, Jami	Resident	2/29/2016
P, Linda A	Resident	2/29/2016
Power, Maxxine	PostalMaxx	2/17/2016
Putman, Karen M	Resident	2/29/2016
Ray, Kathleen	Ur Agendy Social Marketing	2/17/2016
Rentschler, Lionel E	Lionel E Rentschler DDS	2/17/2016
Reyes, Charlie	Resident	2/26/2016
Reyes, Ivan	Simply Fresh Markets	2/29/2016
Robbins, Ilene H	Camp Ilene	2/17/2016
Rodriguez, Paula	Resident	2/29/2016
Ruiz, Richard	Resident	2/29/2016
S, Jorge	Resident	2/26/2016
S, Robert	Resident	2/29/2016
Sanchez, Esther	Resident	2/29/2016
Sanchez, J	Resident	2/29/2016
Sanchez, William	Resident	2/29/2016
Seigler, Joel	Advance Real Estate Appraisal	2/29/2016
Shapiro, Solomon	Shapiro Enterprises	2/29/2016
Ulloa, Rosalio	ProAmerica Advisors, Inc.	2/17/2016
Velasquez, Susan	Innovative Property Solutions Team	2/17/2016
Weyhgandt, John	Resident	2/29/2016
Weyhgandt, Marlene	Western States Financial	2/17/2016
Won, Scott	Corona Chiropractic	2/17/2016
Community Letter 3		
Asmine, Bachir	Resident	2/29/2016
Beyler, Steven and Sharon	Resident	2/26/2016
Collins, Laura	Resident	2/29/2016

Name	Organization/Affiliation	Date/Received Date
Dennis	Resident	2/29/2016
Downs, Michael	Downs Energy	2/29/2016
Esperanza, Jose	Resident	2/29/2016
Garcia, Eliza	Resident	2/29/2016
Garcia, Elizabeth	Resident	2/29/2016
Garcia, Tomas	Resident	2/29/2016
Hansen, David	Resident	2/29/2016
Hansen, Susan	Resident	2/29/2016
James, John	Resident	2/29/2016
Jones, Harry	Resident	2/29/2016
Manns, Kim	Resident	2/28/2016
Messner, Sherry	M&D Development, LLC	2/29/2016
Rams, Elliot	Resident	2/29/2016
Rams, George	Resident	2/29/2016
Rams, Joyce	Resident	2/29/2016
Robbins, Carroll	Resident	2/29/2016
Robbins, Richard and Carroll	Farmers Insurance	2/29/2016
Smith, Joshua	Resident	2/29/2016
Smith, Juan	Resident	2/29/2016
Smith, Linda	Resident	2/29/2016
Smith, Michele	Resident	2/29/2016
Smith, Ruth	Resident	2/29/2016
Smith, Sue	Resident	2/29/2016
Smith, Tomas	Resident	2/29/2016
Vander, Diane	Resident	2/29/2016

4.1 Issues to be Considered under CEQA

The following discussions are summaries of the issues identified by the public that will be considered under CEQA in the EIR. The summaries are grouped by topic with oral comments listed first alphabetically by last name/organization, followed by written comments listed alphabetically by last name/organization.

Project Description

- How many lines are to be added to the existing system? (Oral – Bennett)
- Renderings SCE showed to counsel are out of date and show Corona from a different time period, pre-construction of new developments. The Project cannot be constructed as proposed given subsequent developments. (Oral – Morgan)

- Would it be better to install an underground system with spare conduit for future expandability? Commenter would like to see additional spare conduits run at the time of the new lines. (Written – Bennett)
- The City of Corona attached an email sent from resident Cynthia Vincent, who asks for details regarding the construction process, including: Who and how is it determined whether lines will be buried or stretched between poles? How many streets will be affected and for how long? What method/equipment will be used to trench or hoist lines, to dig holes? Where will the construction equipment be stored? How will the street conditions be impacted? What time of day/night will this take place? How will existing electrical service be impacted; for whom and for what length of time? Will emergency vehicles be able to access all construction areas/residences/businesses 24/7? What safety procedures will be implemented in and around construction sites? Who will pay for additional traffic control measures during rush hour? (Written – City of Corona)
- SCE has chosen this plan and route because it will cost much less than running lines underground. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)

Project Objectives

- It is agreed that the electrical system needs upgrading. (Oral – S. Messner)
- Regarding operating capacity and demand forecasts, the information provided in the PEA in the table and graphs is not easy to comprehend and in the City's opinion does not substantiate the claims by SCE or the need for the Project. The City would like to see this information explained more clearly and would like the EIR to clearly identify and examine the interrelationship between electrical capacity added by the Project and projected electrical demand. It will be important to examine whether, and if so by how much, added electrical capacity will exceed electrical demand so that the CPUC and the City can meaningfully consider and discuss alternatives that both mitigate the Project's environmental impacts and assure the area has sufficient electrical capacity. (Written – City of Corona)
- SCE is adding power lines in the City of Corona that may not be necessary in the foreseeable future. This concern is substantiated by a similar concern expressed by the CPUC's Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA). ORA also expressed concern as to whether the Project may impact or be redundant to another project that SCE is proposing in northwest Riverside County, referred to as the Riverside Project. (Written – City of Corona)
- The EIR should examine the interrelationship between the Project and the Riverside Project, and determine the degree to which the Project is redundant to or impacted by the Riverside Project. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona attached letters from several residents, stating that they acknowledge that the Project would upgrade the region's existing electrical infrastructure, improve overall electrical reliability in the area, and meet the community's increasing electricity needs. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Eastvale attached a letter from Mayor Ike Bootsma and several residents that acknowledges that the Project would upgrade the region's existing electrical infrastructure,

improve overall electrical reliability in the area, and meet the community's increasing electricity needs. (Written – City of Eastvale)

- The Project would upgrade the region's existing electrical infrastructure and improve overall electrical reliability in the Northwestern Riverside County region. Projects such as this address the increasing electricity needs of local communities and ensure that electricity is readily available and reliable in the future. (Written – Community Letter 1)
- The Project will upgrade the region's existing electrical infrastructure and improve overall electrical reliability in the Northwestern Riverside County region. Projects such as this address the increasing electricity needs of our community and ensure that electricity is readily available and reliable in the future. As a customer of SCE, we appreciate the efforts to improve the electrical reliability in this region. (Written – DCS Publishing)
- The need to improve existing electrical infrastructure and overall electrical reliability to the region. (Written – Genis)

Alternatives

- The route should follow Interstate 15. (Oral – Bennett)
- SCE should remove some of the overhead lines, for example on River Road, that run through Corona. (Oral – Bennett)
- The conduit should be installed in the ground with six fares, which would leave plenty of room for continued expansion without additionally opening up the street. (Oral – Bennett)
- Undergrounding the lines would reduce the chance of poles falling down during a seismic event. (Oral – Bennett)
- Power lines should be undergrounded due to the amount of people and children living nearby. (Oral – Hove)
- SCE materials show the Project going overhead, past Corona Pointe. They could put all the utilities below ground. All the new developments in town are below ground. (Oral – Morgan)
- If SCE is going to run the line thorough the middle of the city instead of going the direct route down the 15 freeway, it needs to be below ground. (Oral – Morgan)
- Undergrounding power lines do not eliminate problems entirely, but it does help to insulate a little bit better. (Oral – Rigby)
- SCE should spend the money to put the power lines underground. (Oral – Shamma)
- Alternatives such as going down the freeway or undergrounding the Project are the better option, even if it costs more money. (Oral – Simmons)
- Utility lines should be undergrounded. (Oral – Simmons)
- A letter from Mark Peabody was read, who supports upgrading electrical infrastructure but only if power lines are installed below ground for aesthetic reasons. (Oral – B. Spiegel)

- Commenter reads letter from Mark Peabody, who states that underground transmission lines are largely undetectable, just as reliable and help preserve environmental serenity and beauty. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- The Project should be all underground. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- SCE should go ahead and put together the infrastructure right now and build while the roadways are torn up, and put in the conduits. The conduits would stay empty, but SCE could go ahead and do that while the construction of the freeway is going on. This would have been the cost effective solution. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- If SCE has not started the Project and there is the option to bury it, then the power lines should be undergrounded. (Oral – Tejura)
- There is need for the lines, but to fulfill this need, the lines should be undergrounded instead of constructed the way it has been proposed. (Oral – T. Wilson)
- Please investigate placing the lines in rural and empty fields in Riverside County instead of going underground or overhead near homes and businesses. (Written – Barnett)
- The Project should be completely underground. (Written – Barnett)
- Why the circuitous route from the Mira Loma station to the New Corona Substation? Why not just follow Interstate-15? Having the new lines follow Interstate-15 is a more direct route and would not be as intrusive to the residential neighborhoods. A rerouting of the lines would go a long way in increasing the visual appeal of our community. (Written – Bennett)
- Why place the lines overhead? In other upscale neighborhoods, SCE places the new lines underground. Why not underground in the City of Corona? Overhead lines are cheaper to install but the existing overhead lines running along the north side of River Road are an eyesore. The overall appearance and unsightly location of the existing power lines and poles decreases property values and detracts from the overall appeal of the neighborhood. (Written – Bennett)
- The existing poles are cluttered with high voltage power lines. The proposed new 66 kV service will double this number. The new lines along with the existing lines should be relocated off the poles and placed underground. The new lines provide an excellent opportunity for the much needed power line and to address the existing deteriorating power poles as well. (Written – Bennett)
- All of the new power lines should be installed underground along with relocating all the above ground lines in the path of the new system to underground conduits at the same time as the installation of the new 66 kV lines. (Written – Bennett)
- The power lines should be undergrounded to give residents more space to walk in their neighborhoods and to keep residential areas looking appealing. (Written – Bhatt)
- Opposed to any alternative that is not undergrounded. (Written – Biller)
- Understanding the necessity for the lines and substation, the overhead lines will have a negative impact on the residents and businesses on the east side of the City of Corona. SCE should run the high voltage lines underground as has been done in other locales throughout Southern California. (Written – Brandt)

- Commenter does not support the installation of overhead subtransmission lines by SCE for the Circle City Project going through Eastvale and supports Mayor Ike Bootsma's request that all subtransmission lines be placed underground along Hellman Avenue, River Road, Baron Drive, and Archibald Avenue. (Written – B. Brown)
- The EIR should evaluate the undergrounding of power lines along the route in the area of Blaine Street. A new residential and commercial mixed use development is currently under construction on the property located on the north side of Blaine Street, west of Main Street. Although the poles are proposed to be located on the south side of Blaine Street, the width of this street is approximately 50 feet. Thus, the poles and overhead power lines would still be in close proximity to the new residential apartments, and will likely impair the apartments' aesthetic value and the quality of life for the residents (See Corona Protest at 8-9). (Written – City of Corona)
- Undergrounding should be examined. (Written – City of Corona)
- The EIR must evaluate an alternative to underground the proposed above ground lines. Because the lines are constructed after homes have been developed and occupied, and as the lines will degrade the neighborhood, affect view sheds, and disrupt the community, the underground option is the environmentally superior alternative. (Written – City of Eastvale)
- The City of Eastvale attached letters from Mayor Ike Bootsma and several residents that request that SCE underground the line along Hellman Avenue, River Road, Baron Drive, and Archibald Avenue rather than installing overhead lines, and supports undergrounding the full length of the Project's electrical infrastructure within the City of Eastvale's limits. (Written – City of Eastvale)
- Commenters support the undergrounding of the Project. (Written – Community Letter 1)
- For reasons of efficiency and overall aesthetics, it is requested that SCE underground the 66 kV subtransmission line along Hellman Avenue, River Road, Baron Drive, and Archibald Avenue rather than installing overhead line. The full length of the Project's electrical infrastructure within the City of Eastvale's limits should be put underground. (Written – Community Letter 1)
- Alternatives are inadequate and overly broad to make the preferred alternative the only choice. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- Alternative 3 (Battery alternative) is not viable technology and really isn't an alternative that should be been evaluated. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- Several alternative substation sites were dismissed for potential sensitive species that are neither listed as threatened nor endangered and are easily mitigated for or avoided. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- Substation and alignments were dismissed because jurisdictional areas that could easily avoided. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- Requests for an alternate route. (Written – Dayal)
- Support for undergrounding the power lines. (Written – Donaldson)
- Opposed to above-ground electrical poles on Hellman Avenue in Eastvale. They are an eyesore and unsafe. They need to be placed underground. (Written – Fidel)

- Opposed to above-ground electrical poles on Hellman Avenue, as they are unsightly and need to be placed underground. (Written – Garvey)
- SCE should underground the power lines through the City of Eastvale to preserve the aesthetics of the city. (Written – Genis)
- Support for placing power lines underground. (Written – Gonzalez)
- Opposed to the Project. Underground construction and coordination with other infrastructure projects in the city is what should be happening. (Written – Hernandez)
- The power lines should be undergrounded. (Written – C. James)
- Remove existing infrastructure or bury it at a safe distance. (Written – Johnson)
- If the Project is approved, let it be constructed underground. (Written – Kurdi)
- Supports underground power lines. (Written – Lu)
- Undergrounding is preferred due to high winds. (Written – Marchido)
- Supports undergrounding of subtransmission lines. (Written – Marchido)
- Work with the City of Corona to install the lines for the Project underground. (Written – Mendez)
- Requests that powerlines be placed underground. (Written – Moreno-Camacho)
- Since a part of the Project will be underground, all of the Project can be underground and not doing so is simply a cost-saving measure on SCE's part. The pre-existence of above-ground utilities along a portion of the proposed route is not a precedent to build larger and taller structures. Less above-ground utilities is requested. (Written – Olsen)
- Supports upgrading electrical infrastructure but only if power lines are installed below ground for aesthetic reasons. (Written – Peabody)
- Underground transmission lines are largely undetectable, just as reliable and help preserve environmental serenity and beauty. (Written – Peabody)
- Supports Mayor Ike Bootsma's request to have power lines installed underground for aesthetic purposes. (Written – Realty One Group Inc.)
- Above-ground poles are not what the City of Eastvale and its residents need. (Written – Rust)
- Against the Project and suggests the alternative route on Archibald Avenue. (Written – Shah)
- Power is lost every time it rains and that the power lines should be undergrounded to prevent this from happening. (Oral – Shamma)
- Commenter opposes putting the power lines through the City of Corona. Corona is already unfortunately known for horrible traffic, obnoxious electronic billboards, and a rundown downtown area. These power lines belong underground. Corona has the possibility to be a very desirable place to live, work and shop, but only if the people who make the decisions,

make the right ones. Do the right thing and place these lines underground where they belong. (Written – South Hills Norco Campus)

- Supports undergrounding all portions of the power lines. (Written – Tejura)
- Why does the subtransmission line route traverse so many cities instead of running adjacent to Interstate 15? (Written – Tejura)
- Opposes above-ground power lines on Hellman Avenue in Eastvale. (Written – Voss)
- Underground power lines would benefit the community by potentially reducing maintenance and operating costs, lowering story restoration costs, and lowering tree-trimming costs. (Written – Voss)
- Undergrounding the lines would improve reliability due to: increased reliability during severe weather (wind-related storm damage will be greatly reduced for an underground system, and areas not subject to flooding and storm surges experience minimal damage and interruption of electric service); less damage during severe weather; far fewer momentary interruptions; and improved utility relations regarding tree trimming. (Written – Voss)
- Undergrounding the lines would improve public safety because of fewer motor vehicle accidents, reduced live-wire contact injuries, and fewer fires. (Written – Voss)
- Undergrounding the lines would improve property values because improved aesthetics (from removal of unsightly poles and wires) and fewer structures impacting sidewalks. (Written – Voss)
- More alternatives should be evaluated because the current alternative routes are outdated. (Written – Wentworth)

Aesthetics

- Support for undergrounding the power lines. (Oral – Aoun)
- Concerned about the aesthetics of power lines. (Oral – Aoun)
- Why would the majority of the Project runs overhead instead of underground. Utilities were run underground to avoid the airport. Why not underground to correct the City's aesthetics problems? (Oral – Bennett)
- Commenter questions why SCE is not required to upgrade and is allowed to instead place overhead power lines throughout the City. (Oral – S. Messner)
- The need for the Project does not necessitate unsightliness and sight pollution. (Oral – S. Messner)
- We are trying to build a city we can be proud of. We do not need to turn it into some industrial waste land. (Oral – Morgan)
- Above ground poles are cheap and ugly. (Oral – Shamma)
- The Project if installed as currently designed would make an already blighted section of our city look even more third world, further degrading the aesthetics along River Road and the entire north end of my community. (Written – Bennett)

- Addressing electrical needs and ensuring that electricity is readily available can not come at the cost of visual blight. (Written – Biller)
- SCE proposes to replace existing wood power poles with Light Weight Steel (LWS) poles. The existing poles currently align River Road and are in an area that is mostly populated with residents. The EIR should evaluate the visual and aesthetic impact of changing out the wood poles with LWS poles. The City also requests that the EIR evaluate the placement of underground facilities in this section in order to mitigate environmental impacts. (Written – City of Corona)
- Route 4 has environmental impacts similar to Route 1, yet was not chosen by SCE, likely due to cost. Since Route 4 has almost 50 percent of the power lines being undergrounded, this alternative would be more favorable than Route 1 and would have less of a visual impact on the City's skyline. (Written – City of Corona)
- The EIR should include updated photo-simulations for the Circle City Substation's preferred route. The EIR should show photographs of the route area both as it exists today and as proposed with poles and overhead power lines. Because new construction is occurring on West Blaine Street, the City of Corona requests that the EIR photos show the scale and location of the poles and overhead power lines in relation to the development currently being constructed. Also, the visual appearance of Third Street and Grand Boulevard has recently changed due to the State Route 91 widening project. Therefore, visual simulations within this area should show these recent changes as well. (Written – City of Corona)
- The EIR should evaluate the noticeable visual change to the City of Corona's urban landscape and skyline in areas that will experience new poles and overhead power lines. The significance of this impact should not be limited on the basis of pole locations within areas that have sensitive receptors (such as residents), but should also be considered in non-residential areas. For example, East Sixth Street near Magnolia Avenue will experience a noticeable visual change due to the Project. But, according to SCE, the lack of sensitive receptors within the area "would not substantially alter the character of the urban landscape setting." The City disagrees with this conclusion. Regardless of sensitive receptors, the urban landscape will be substantially altered because poles do not currently exist within this segment of the City and this area recently experienced new industrial development and streetscape improvements. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City considers East Sixth Street a gateway into the City from the neighboring unincorporated county area. Therefore, the visual impact to the area should not be simply brushed off because the area consists of industrial and/or commercial enterprises. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Eastvale attached a letter from City Manager Michele Nissen, who expressed concerns regarding aesthetics, stating that views from properties along the proposed route must be considered in addition to the street-view indicated in the simulations provided. The towers and lines will obscure what is currently an unobstructed view of the surrounding mountains. This is a change to the existing condition and materially affects the adjacent homes. (Written – City of Eastvale)
- The City of Eastvale attached letters from Mayor Ike Bootsma and several residents that note that placing additional parallel lines along Hellman Avenue will create pole pollution,

and that overhead power lines are visually unsightly and will negatively impact the overall appearance of the city. (Written – City of Eastvale)

- There currently is an existing overhead 66 kV line along Hellman Avenue in the City of Chino. Placing an additional parallel line along Hellman Avenue will create pole pollution in the City of Eastvale. Overhead power lines are visually unsightly and will negatively impact the overall appearance of the city. (Written – Community Letter 1)
- The visual impacts are substantial to the community. In the PEA Executive Summary, the only impact noted was temporary impacts from construction. However:
 - New Lines along El Sobrante will create a visual impact to current unfettered views of South Corona and the Santa Ana Mountains from Interstate 15 southbound. Interstate 15 is a potential state scenic highway and these lines impact these views.
 - Overhead 66 kV lines located adjacent to new residential housing along Blaine.
 - The poles on 3rd Street are monsters and substantially change the viewshed and will impact the historic feel of East Grand, a Historic district.
 - VP15 the poles completely change the view shed and spoil view of the Santa Ana Mountains along 6th Street.
 - Completely disagree with 4.1.4 Impact Analysis which declares No Impact under section 4.1.4.1 and Less-Than-Significant impact under Section 4.1.4.2. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- Above ground power lines are an eyesore and commenter supports underground equipment whenever possible. (Written – Husted)
- Aesthetically, the Project will look horrible. (Written – C. James)
- Commenter opposes overhead powerlines on Hellman Avenue due to visual ugliness. (Written – D. James)
- Commenter expresses concerns regarding the Project's visual effects and the ability to affect property values. (Written – D. and C. James)
- Addressing electrical needs and ensuring that electricity is readily available cannot come at the cost of visual blight. (Written – Jensen)
- Aboveground wires are unsightly. (Written – Johnson)
- There are aesthetic concerns associated with above ground utilities. (Written – King)
- Objects to putting power lines above ground; they are unsightly. (Written – Marchido)
- Overhead lines are a huge eyesore. (Written – Mendez)
- American Heroes Park has large power lines; adding more is not a good idea. They are an eyesore to the community. (Written – Quach)
- Above-ground power lines are ugly. (Written – Reinke)

- Requests an exhibit showing the future pole locations down to the Eastvale boundary. (Written – Richland Communities Inc.)
- Opposes the proposed installation of high voltage wires because they are ugly. (Written – TMS Consortium)

Agricultural Resources

- Concern for how the Project may affect agriculture, health, and the environment. (Written – Dayal)

Air Quality

- SCAQMD staff provides recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the Project that should be included in the draft CEQA document. (Written – SCAQMD)
- SCAQMD requests a copy of the CEQA document upon its completion. In addition to the Draft EIR, include all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. These include original emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling files (not Adobe PDF files). Without all files and supporting air quality documentation, the SCAQMD will be unable to complete its review of the air quality analysis in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting air quality documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period. (Written – SCAQMD)
- SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use the CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993) as guidance when preparing the air quality analysis, and use CalEEMod land use emissions software. (Written – SCAQMD)
- The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the Project and all air pollutant sources related to the Project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from-grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis. (Written – SCAQMD)
- Requests that the lead agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the results to the recommended regional significance thresholds. In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts, the SCAQMD staff recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LSTs can be used in addition to the recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a CEQA document. Therefore, when preparing the air quality analysis for the Project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized analysis by either using the LSTs developed by the SCAQMD or performing dispersion modeling as necessary. (Written – SCAQMD)

- In the event that the Project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment. Guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment can be found in the document "Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk. From Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis." An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included. (Written – SCAQMD)
- Guidance on siting incompatible land uses (such as placing homes near freeways) can be found in the California Air Resources Board's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective. (Written – SCAQMD)
- Locations of SCAQMD rules and relevant air quality reports and data are provided. (Written – SCAQMD)

Biological Resources

- Risks for above ground lines include the following:
 - Risks to wildlife at the Prado Regional Park and surrounding Nature Preserve;
 - Disturbing indigenous wildlife;
 - The potential concerns with frac-outs which can release drilling fluids into the water body and sub-service environment;
 - Trimming certain oak trees during certain times of the year can cause the spread of Oak Wilt disease;
 - Concerns of wildlife reproducing near the strong electromagnetic fields (Written – Lenhart, Li; and
 - Invasive species become more invasive. (Written – Lenhart)
- Potential impacts to riparian habitat, the Least Bell's Vireo, and other biological resources in the Prado Basin can negatively impact Orange County Water District (OCWD)'s water conservation program. In addition, OCWD owns and operates a 465-acre treatment wetlands system in the Prado Basin. Approximately half of the Santa Ana River baseflow is diverted through these wetlands through a diversion channel that is located downstream of River Road. (Written – OCWD)
- This construction has potential to impact riparian habitat on land owned by OCWD and the diversion channel to the wetlands. Please include an evaluation of potential impacts to habitat for all work on or near the Santa Ana River. (Written – OCWD)
- Prior to any encroachment onto San Bernardino County Flood Control District (District) right-of-way, a permit shall be obtained from the District's Permits/Operations Support Division, Permit Section. Other on-site or off-site improvements may be required which cannot be determined at this time. (Written – San Bernardino County Department of Public Works)

Cultural Resources

- A text message was read from resident Tom Richins, which indicated that Grand Boulevard is on the National Historic Register List and the proper paperwork needs to be filled out that complies with national regulations due to the boulevard being on the National Registration if the utilities are going to be put on Grand Boulevard. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- Grand Boulevard is a registered historical landmark. (Written – Barnett)
- The Project looks like project dumping into a poor area where homes are already surrounded by California State Route 91 and the railroad easement. The lines go through the heart of the City's historic Grand Boulevard, and need to go underground. (Written – Wentworth)

Geology and Soils

- There is an earthquake fault that runs through the Project area. There is evidence of the fault at the Prado Dam. Requests information regarding the Project's vicinity to the earthquake fault. How close are the tall power poles going to be, especially on River Road, crossing over the river bottom? This could be problematic. During a seismic event the lines could come down. (Oral – Bennett)
- In looking at the height of the proposed poles, in light of the proximity to local earthquake faults, might the community be better served with underground distribution networks purely as a safety measure? (Written – Bennett)
- Commenter mentions earthquake dangers associated with above ground power lines. (Oral – Shamma)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Existing power lines run through parks off Helm, such as American Heroes Park. Park users can feel the electricity in the umbrellas and sun shades, and can see the sparks. (Oral – Rigby)
- High winds cause poles to fall over and burn houses and structures. (Oral – Shamma)
- High winds and power lines jeopardize residents. (Oral – Simmons)
- Has felt static electricity from existing power lines while sitting in an aluminum chair at American Heroes Park. (Oral – Simmons)
- A letter from Mark Peabody was read, indicating that overhead powerlines are unhealthy to live or work around. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- The proposed path is dangerously close to homes and there has been no guarantee from SCE that the wires will not impact people's health in a negative way. (Written – Barnett)
- Overhead power lines along River Road could interfere with the flight path of landing air craft. (Written – Bennett)
- It appears that the lines are shown to be undergrounded along Coda Street. Commenter suspects that this is to avoid conflict with landing air craft at the Corona Airport. Has due

consideration been made regarding the high power lines along River Road that will also be in the flight path of landing air craft? (Written – Bennett)

- It is unsafe to have power lines above ground. (Written – Bhatt)
- The City of Corona's attached letters included a comment that urges that the installation of any aboveground high voltage lines be subject to a rigorous environmental review, bearing in mind that such lines frequently lie under the suspicion of adversely affecting the health of those who live near them. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Eastvale attached a letter from City Manager Michele Nissen, who expressed concerns regarding safety impacts in tower fall zones, stating that lines fail, poles need to be replaced and maintenance of the facilities will all impact the use of adjacent properties. In addition, the potential exists for a catastrophic failure of one or more of the towers (as a result of a traffic collision, earthquake, inclement weather, etc.) that could cause tower(s) and lines to fall onto roadways on adjacent residential areas. The EIR must clearly indicate what additional restrictions may be required on adjacent development or use of property associated with the towering power lines. Safety of the lines, including the potential for failure and impacts in the areas in the fall zone must be included in the health risk assessment prepared for the Project. (Written – City of Eastvale)
- Published material has indicated the following health risks that link to living near power lines. How will these be addressed?
 - Brain cancer;
 - Childhood and adult leukemia;
 - Lou Gehrig's disease (ALS);
 - Alzheimer's disease;
 - Breast cancer in women and men;
 - Miscarriage, birth defects, and reproductive problems;
 - Decreased libido;
 - Fatigue;
 - Depression and suicide;
 - Blood diseases;
 - Hormonal imbalances;
 - Heart disease;
 - Neuro-degenerative diseases; and
 - Sleeping disorders. (Written – Feng)
- The Project would cause safety concerns for residents. For example, in 2014, SCE and the CPUC's Safety and Enforcement Division settled over an incident that left three members of a San Bernardino family dead and thousands of customers without power, due to a downed 12 kV power line that fell on the family's property. In this day and age and with all the modern technology available today, undergrounding power lines should be considered

the better option. Overhead power lines are dangerous, unsightly, and affect property values. (Written – Genis)

- There are hazards to the public associated with the construction of above ground power lines. (Written – Husted)
- Above-ground utilities are an outdated model and are dangerous given high winds in the Project area. (Written – King)
- Opposed to the Project because overhead power lines pose a safety risk that underground construction does not. (Written – Marshburn)
- Overhead powerlines are unhealthy to live or work around. (Written – Peabody)
- Large power lines are bad for those with pacemakers. You can feel electricity go through your body when you are close by. (Written – Quach)
- Commenter expresses concern for the safety and health of Corona residents and is concerned about the negative effects that overhead power lines may have on nearby homes or businesses. Short term health problems: Headaches, fatigue, anxiety, insomnia, pricking or burning skin, rashes, muscle pain. Long-term health problems: Risk of damaging DNA, risk of cancer, risk of leukemia, neurodegenerative disease, immune disorders, miscarriage. It also affects behavior, growth, reproduction, and melatonin production. (Written – Rambert)
- Opposed to the proposed installation of high voltage wires because they may be structurally unsafe to resist in high wind gale forces or earthquakes, and thus constitute a continuous living public safety structural risk to the citizens, young and old, walking by or playing in the open space nearby. They also constitute an extreme fire hazard to residences of the neighborhoods if they start to fall due to wind/earthquake forces. (Written – TMS Consortium)
- Studies set a recommended safe distance from high voltage lines to be more than 200 meters (656 feet). The Commenter's home is approximately 60.96 meters (200 feet) from the line. Many, many homes in both Corona and Norco are much closer to the proposed high voltage lines and are probably being affected already by their close proximity to the existing lines. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)

Hydrology and Water Quality

- What method will be used to cross the Santa Ana River? Will it be over the bridge? In the past, the bridge over the river at that location has been washed out, a new bridge has been constructed; commenter would like to see the results of the 100 year flood projections for that bridge and any possible crossing point for the proposed power lines. (Written – Bennett)
- The Orange County Water District (OCWD, the District) is a special district formed in 1933 by an act of the California Legislature. The District manages the groundwater basin that underlies north and central Orange County. Water produced from the basin is the primary water supply for approximately 2.4 million residents living within the District's boundaries. Flow from the Santa Ana River is the primary supply of water used to recharge the Orange County Groundwater Basin. (Written – OCWD)

- It appears that both alternatives may affect Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) rights of way. Any work that involves RCFCWCD rights of way, easement, or facilities will require an encroachment permit from the RCFCWCD. Therefore, the RCFCWCD will likely be a CEQA responsible agency and should be named as such in the EIR to facilitate the encroachment permit process. (Written – RCFCWCD)

Land Use and Planning

- In the past 10 years or so, the staff at the City of Corona has shown a considerable ability to make consistently good decisions regarding planning and zoning changes. With a little help from the CPUC, the progress can not only continue, but it can be improved. (Written – Bennett)
- The City of Eastvale attached a letter from City Manager Michele Nissen, who expressed concerns regarding General Plan consistency, stating that the City of Eastvale General Plan Policy C-29: States that the City will "locate new and relocated utilities underground when possible" and that "all remaining utilities shall be located or screened in a manner that minimizes their visibility by the public." As shown, the proposed lines are not consistent with the City's General Plan. The EIR must evaluate the conflict between the City's General Plan and the Project. The conflict has the potential to reduce property values, result in lower homeownership, and create a transition from stable home owner neighborhoods to a more transient population. (Written – City of Eastvale)

Noise

- Opposed to overhead powerlines on Hellman Avenue due to buzzing wires (Written – James D)

Public Services

- The City of Corona's attached letters included a comment that expresses concern that possible further disruption of traffic patterns could impede on the timely operation of police, fire, and other emergency vehicles. (Written – City of Corona)
- Existing overhead power lines on River Road run through property housing the Corona/Norco YMCA, which operates a preschool and afterschool childcare, Auburndale Intermediate School, River Run Senior Apartments, and numerous other apartments and housing developments as far as Main Street. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)

Recreation

- The Project will entail construction of electrical facilities across approximately 0.4 miles of the southern perimeter of American Heroes Park in an area with existing SCE right-of-way. Include in the Draft EIR a discussion of impacts to any recreational programs and how SCE or its contractor will coordinate this work with the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD)'s Parks and Recreation Department to minimize impacts to park users and programs. (Written – JCSD)

- The Project will entail construction within the northeastern portion of James C. Huber Park. Although SCE right-of-way abuts this park to the north, prior to any construction or disturbance within Huber Park, SCE is required to obtain the approval of JCSD. Include in the Draft EIR a discussion of impacts to any recreational programs at Huber Park and how SCE or its contractor will coordinate this work with the JCSD's Parks and Recreation Department to minimize impacts to park users and programs. (Written – JCSD)

Transportation

- Coordination with the construction on the California State Route 91 would have been helpful for Project and more cost effective. From Main Street to Grand Boulevard, in the exact area where they are going to do this new wiring, the freeway will go from initially six to eight lanes up to 22 lanes, 11 lanes in each direction. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- A letter was read from Mark Peabody that stated technology exists to construct the Project with the goal of causing the least amount of interruption during construction, and preservation of pending and newly-constructed roads associated with the 91 freeway project. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- Archibald and River Road are used as one of the main thoroughfares and (non-freeway) detours to and from the Ontario Airport and the cities to the north. Traffic from the 60 and 10 freeways often spills over when there is an accident and causes even more congestion. (Written – Barnett)
- Concerned about the possible further disruption of traffic patterns within the City of Corona in addition to the construction work on California State Route 91. (Written – Bennett)
- Given that traffic flow in the City of Corona is completely disrupted by the 91 freeway expansion, how can you justify the further disruption of the few roadways that are open that cross California State Route 91? (Written – Bennett)
- The City of Corona's attached letters included a comment that expresses concern about the possible further disruption of traffic patterns within the city in addition to the construction work on California State Route 91 that has closed several freeway entrance and exit ramps and diverted drivers onto surface streets. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona's attached letters included a comment that supports the Project, but suggests that operations be postponed until the construction work on California State Route 91 reaches a point where traffic patterns return to normal. (Written – City of Corona)
- SCE should actively work with all regional stakeholders currently doing major public works projects in the community, including more than \$1 billion of major freeway and other roadway improvements, so that the closure and cutting of certain new and recently reopened streets can be minimized. (Written – Community Letter 2)
- With new residential and commercial developments along Hellman Avenue, the risk of traffic collision to power line structures is significant. If structural integrity is compromised by any factors (air, auto, environmental), adjacent residents and businesses are at risk of injury and/or death. (Written – Feng)

- Technology exists to construct the Project with the goal of causing the least amount of interruption during construction, and preservation of pending and newly-constructed roads associated with the 91 freeway project. (Written – Peabody)
- The City of Corona attached a Protest of the City of Corona that states that unique measures should be considered to avoid post-freeway shock. (Written – City of Corona)

Utilities and Service Systems

- The Draft EIR should include identification of any JCSD owned potable water, non-potable water, and sewer facilities within the construction footprint of the Project and a discussion of potential impacts to these facilities. Include in this discussion how SCE or its contractor will coordinate this work with JCSD so there are no disruptions to service. (Written – JCSD)

Cumulative

- Commenter attended SCE's infrastructure meeting in September of 2015. SCE brought old maps that showed no consideration for the new freeway. SCE's design disregards people's yards, and disregards the possibility of moving the lines next to the freeway. SCE didn't contact RTVT. They did not look at the plans for the freeway as it is going to be. They had no current materials. (Oral – Morgan)
- The City of Corona is being torn up. If you drive through the city, there is a lot of construction, both on the freeway and on the streets, some of which are the same streets that would be affected by the Project, inconveniencing the same people. (Oral – K. Spiegel)
- The Project will overlap or closely follow the current project on California State Route 91, which has negatively impacted residents, ultimately relocating families, primarily Hispanic. (Written – Barnett)
- Small business in the Project area cannot withstand another big project where customers cannot get to their locations and owners are discouraged with all the construction. One more project of that magnitude would completely devastate some businesses. In fact, these business owners have been in regular attendance to the Corona City Council meetings to voice their strong concern about the negative impact of traffic from the 91 freeway construction on their business. (Written – Barnett)
- The PEA does not appear to meaningfully address cumulative impacts associated with construction of the Project during and immediately following periods of time when the City of Corona's residents and businesses have experienced material impacts associated with improvements to State Route 91 and Interstate 15 (Freeway Projects). SCE plans to install its facilities under, on and over many of the same roadways that have been and will be most impacted by the Freeway Projects. The City requests that the EIR include an analysis of these impacts. As described in the City's protest, our community is experiencing significant freeway construction activity being undertaken by the Riverside County Transportation Commission. (See Corona Protest at 7-8). The City's residents and businesses have already been impacted by the Freeway Projects, and it is reasonable and necessary to avoid or reduce further impacts. (Written – City of Corona)

4.2 Issues Not Analyzed under CEQA

The EIR will be used to guide decision-making by the CPUC by providing an assessment of the potential environmental impacts that would result from the Project. The weighing of Project benefits (environmental, economic, or otherwise) against adverse environmental effects is outside the scope of the EIR. When the CPUC considers whether to approve SCE's application for the Project, it may consider economic and other considerations along with the EIR.

The EIR will not consider direct health effects associated with electric and magnetic fields (EMF) in the context of the CEQA analysis of potential environmental impacts because [1] there is no agreement among scientists that EMF creates a potential health risk, and [2] there are no defined or adopted CEQA standards for defining health risk from EMF. Presently, there are no applicable federal, State, or local regulations related to EMF levels from power lines or related facilities, such as substations. However, CPUC policies and procedures (as reflected in decision D.06-01-042) require utilities to incorporate "low-cost" or "no-cost" measures for managing EMF from power lines up to approximately four percent of the total Project cost.

The EIR will not consider comments related to whether or not SCE has the proper easements or ROWs for construction, operation, or maintenance of the Project. Negotiations of ROWs or easements occur between SCE and affected property owner(s) and generally do not require discretionary approval from a State or local agency. Consequently, such agreements would be outside the scope of CEQA. Any physical impacts that would occur within newly-acquired ROW as part of the Project would be assessed in the EIR.

The EIR will evaluate a Permit to Construct (PTC) application (i.e., not a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity application). Therefore, consistent with CPUC General Order 131-D, which does not require an affirmative showing of need for projects under 200 kV, the EIR also will not consider comments that directly pertain to SCE's determination of Project need. This issue is not generally litigated in PTC proceedings. However, the EIR will study a "No Project Alternative" which will examine the environmental impacts of not building the Project. Thus, the analysis of the No Project Alternative will consider what would happen from an electrical standpoint if the Project objectives are not met.

Summaries of the scoping comments received on issues that will not be analyzed under the CEQA review for the Project are presented below.

Economics-Related Comments Received

- Concerned about how overhead power lines affect property values. Research has shown that houses in the area with overhead power lines are taking four times longer to sell, at a lower price. This also impacts city and county revenues. (Oral – Aoun)
- Above ground power lines negatively affect property values, as well as time on the market for a home to sell. (Oral – Rigby)
- A letter from Mark Peabody was read, that stated overhead powerlines limit development of prime real estate and drive down the values of adjacent land. (Oral – B. Spiegel)

- The Project would lower property values. (Written – Bennett)
- Addressing electrical needs and ensuring that electricity is readily available cannot come at the cost of decreased property value. (Written – Biller)
- The City of Eastvale attached a letter from City Manager Michele Nissen, who expressed concerns regarding cumulative impacts associated with lowered property values, stating that Hearings held on similar power lines in Chino Hills in 2012 showed a reduction in property values of up to 17 percent. The reduction in property value associated with the Project will result in lower appraised values well beyond the homes adjacent to the power lines as comparable sales records (comps) used to justify bank loans seldom list the reason for the reduction in value. This will result in homes through this region of the City having difficulty refinancing or qualifying for loans, which lowers the property value. Dropping property values are associated with increases in crime, homes becoming rental properties creating a tear in the fabric of the neighborhood. The EIR must evaluate the impact to the adjacent properties associated with conversion to rental or group homes, and an increase in law and code enforcement calls to the neighborhood. (Written – City of Eastvale)
- The Project may result in decreased property values. FHA loans may not be approved due to close proximity to power lines. (Written – Feng)
- The Project would affect property values. (Written – Genis)
- The resale value homes will greatly decline because of added proposed power poles. (Written – C. James)
- Home resale values will decline. (Written – Jensen)
- Overhead powerlines limit development of prime real estate and will drive down the values of adjacent land. (Written – Peabody)
- Above-ground power lines will decrease property values. (Written – Reinke)
- The Project would create a severe drop in real estate prices. (Written – Shah)
- The Project would have a negative socioeconomic impact in an already economically challenged area. Socio-environmental injustice would occur if the Project routes are aboveground around Grand, 3rd, and Main. (Written – Wentworth)
- Commenter is concerned about decreased property values and having difficulty selling properties in the future. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)

EMF-Related Comments Received

- Concern related to dangers associated with EMF exposure, magnetic fields, and high voltage lines. It is a risk management nightmare; why take the risk associated with exposing a populated area to high voltage lines? (Oral – Aoun)
- Concerned about the link between living near power lines and cancer. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) is part of the World Health Organization, and its major goal is to identify causes of cancer. The IARC considers the evidence for ELF magnetic and electric fields and found limited evidence in humans for carcinogenicity of extremely low frequency magnetic fields in relation to childhood leukemia. (Oral – Tejura)

- The EIR should adequately addresses all potential impacts associated with long-term exposure to EMF, particularly in those areas that have sensitive receptors. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona attached an email sent from resident Cynthia Vincent, which included research regarding medical risks of exposure to EMF, and objects to the Project continuing without further public meetings. (Written – City of Corona)
- The transmission line presently behind the commenter's home results in static noise and sparks. The commenter is concerned how a second transmission line running parallel would affect the situation. (Written – Dayal)
- There have been links between magnetic field exposure (considered carcinogenic) and various health issues with the strongest evidence towards childhood leukemia. Will this be part of the scope of study on environmental impact? (Written – Feng)
- Concerned about health risks associated with being close to EMF that comes off the power poles, such as leukemia, other forms of cancer, auto immune disorders, etc. (Written – James C)
- Opposed to overhead powerlines on Hellman Avenue due to health risks. (Written – James D)
- Homeowners are being exposed enough to electromagnetic rays. (Written – Johnson)
- Electromagnetic fields are harmful to adults and children. (Written – Shah)
- The Project should be denied as submitted or to be altered to require SCE to underground power lines to shield citizens from EMF fields. The existing overhead power lines running between Corydon Street and Main Street should be removed and put underground (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)
- There will be a negative impact of increased EMF field radiation on health, animals, plants, and electronic device interference. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)

Project Need-Related Comments Received

- The need for the Project is acknowledged. (Written – Bhatt)
- The scale of the Project is a concern and whether the Project is necessary based on the projected demand for electricity in the area. (Written – City of Corona)
- Substantive information should be provided in the EIR in order to document the need for the Circle City substation and related power lines. This information should include, but not be limited to, an analysis of population growth trends, as well as an evaluation of approved projects and vacant parcels zoned for future development that are located within the ENA. Such information is critical in order to determine how the need for the Project is derived. (Written – City of Corona)

General Comments

- SCE is not cooperating with the City, and needs to partner with the City. Even though they are a monopoly, they cannot come in to an area and stamp over everybody, the public officials and the residents and the clients. Ratepayers are paying their salary. Ratepayers

are the client. Edison keeps increasing their rates. The cost does not matter. If the cost is more, charge ratepayers more. SCE has to work with the City and with City officials. As an agency, CPUC has the power over them. CPUC needs to exercise that power and force them to work with the City that they are impacting. (Oral – Aoun)

- A lack of information was provided to residents and a meeting in Eastvale should have taken place. (Oral – Hove)
- Going to make sure everyone hears about the Project; will spread the word on Facebook, will work with Eastvale City Manager, etc. (Oral – Hove)
- The scoping meeting was located too far from Eastvale residents. (Oral – Hove)
- Commenter requests that SCE submit plans, pictures, illustrations, and other information that would help educate residents on the details of the Project. (Oral – Messner G)
- Why wasn't the public notified by SCE about this meeting? The only way the commenter found out about the meeting was because it was on the City website. There were no mailers. Part of the Project goes above ground on the sidewalk in front of people's houses. These individuals should have been notified. The Project would also go overhead near unoccupied apartment buildings. Who will notify those people? (Oral – Morgan)
- SCE did not accept the City of Corona's offers to work together to minimize the impact on the City. Edison was completely oppositional. (Oral – Morgan)
- The Project affects Eastvale residents and a meeting should be held in Eastvale. (Oral – Rigby)
- Collecting signatures should be done in order to protect the city from the project and that other actions can be taken to be more active in the Project. (Oral – Shamma)
- Opposed to the Project. (Oral – Simmons)
- Turnout at the scoping meeting is a disappointment and outreach was inadequate. The outreach did not reach local residents. (Oral – Simmons)
- The Project area on Hellman Avenue is all new residents who are unaware of the project. (Oral – Simmons)
- SCE's outreach was insufficient. It did not go door to door, or put fliers out. There should have been a public meeting in Eastvale. (Oral – Simmons)
- Should have received more notice on the meeting. The Chamber of Commerce sent letters on December 31st regarding the Project. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- For future meetings the CPUC can notify the Chamber of Commerce in order to help get the word out. This will help increase exposure. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- SCE brought outdated materials to the infrastructure committee meeting at the City of Corona in September 2015. Projects that were built 4 and 5 years ago were not on the map. The City of Corona strongly recommended that SCE hold off so that they could work together, and have community input. SCE was insistent that they move forward immediately. (Oral – B. Spiegel)

- Supports the system, but only if it is installed the proper way, with community input. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- Yet to find one business that supports this plan. Most are very upset over it. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- Will try to get more comment letters from businesses and residents. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- SCE should have encouraged people to attend the meetings. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- Nobody from the City Councils for Eastvale, Norco, or Corona would be in favor of the Project the way it is proposed. (Oral – B. Spiegel)
- SCE has not partnered with the community and has made no efforts to reach out above and beyond the meetings. This is very frustrating for the community. Commenter is on the City Council and has tried to reach out to work with SCE, to be a partner in the Project. Partnering with the City would have resulted in a Project that is cheaper, with less inconvenience to local residents and businesses. It is not ok that Edison refuses to partner with the City. (Oral – K. Spiegel)
- The 300-foot notification requirement is not enough; the Project affects everybody. (Oral – K. Spiegel)
- SCE is not concerned about aesthetics; they are concerned about the bottom dollar. They have shareholders that they have to be accountable to. The City of Corona has always gotten the back seat. (Oral – K. Spiegel)
- Questions the Project objectives to "ensure safe and reliable electrical service" because overhead power lines are affected by strong winds and are therefore not always reliable. When they are close to residential areas, they may cause health issues, and are therefore not always safe either. (Oral – K. Spiegel)
- The City of Corona is not the only city that is concerned. The City of Norco is also holding a town meeting, as is the City of Eastvale. (Oral – K. Spiegel)
- Few people at the scoping meeting are representing a city or area of almost 300,000 people because SCE has not made an effort to notify people of the Project beyond the basic information provided. (Oral – T. Wilson)
- More information is desired about the Project regarding the existing lines, the voltage increase, etc. and states that this necessary information is not provided by SCE. (Oral – T. Wilson)
- The Project has a negative impact on residents but there is an opportunity to turn it into something that could work. (Oral – T. Wilson)
- It is unclear how a project with such far reaching scope and complexity could have escaped his attention until such a late date. Can some additional review be allowed because of the time of the failure of the notification process? As a planning commissioner, he was caught totally off guard by the proposed new lines. (Written – Bennett)
- The current economic conditions provide an unprecedented opportunity to improve our community. However, with this opportunity comes danger. That danger is that we move too fast and look to the most expedient solutions to problems. The infrastructure improvements

proposed are sorely needed and will be welcome if they can be accomplished with both safety and good design with an eye toward expandability. (Written – Bennett)

- Approval of the application for the Project should be delayed until SCE gives residents, businesses, and stakeholders the opportunity to discuss Project details, including but not limited to commenting on where SCE proposes to construct its high voltage lines, where lines would be above-ground and underground, how to work with all regional stakeholders currently doing major public works projects in the community to minimize the closure of certain new and recently reopened streets, and how SCE can engage in a communication program that aims to inform the community in order to receive meaningful feedback. (Written – Bennett)
- The City of Corona has a significant interest in the Project and welcomes the opportunity to provide input to and work collaboratively with the CPUC on the environmental review of the Project. (Written – City of Corona)
- On February 3, 2016, staff from the City of Corona met with CPUC staff for an agency coordination meeting on the Project. The City requests that its protest and discussions occurring in the agency coordination meeting also be considered in determining the scope of the EIR. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona attached a Protest of the City of Corona that protests SCE's application for a Permit to Construct the Project and notes that SCE denied the City's requests to meet with SCE to receive further information on the Project and provide feedback, and one or more public participation hearings should be held in Corona. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona attached a letter from Darrell Talbert, City Manager to SCE, expressing disappointment at SCE's recent decision to forego meaningful public input opportunities and decline an invitation to attend a City Council session to educate the council and public on the Project. More involvement from SCE is requested and SCE should reconsider requests to suspend its plans until further public outreach in Corona is conducted. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona attached letters from several residents, stating that they support delaying approval of the application for the Project until SCE gives residents, businesses, and stakeholders the opportunity to discuss Project details, including but not limited to commenting on where SCE proposes to construct its high voltage lines, where lines would be above-ground and underground, how to work with all regional stakeholders currently doing major public works projects in the community to minimize the closure of certain new and recently reopened streets, and how SCE can engage in a communication program that aims to inform the community in order to receive meaningful feedback. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona attached letters included a comment that acknowledges SCE's responsibility to inform residents and allow comments regarding their plans and intentions prior to, during, and with any proposed changes to the Project. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Corona attached letters included comments that opposed construction of above-ground utility lines. (Written – City of Corona)
- The City of Eastvale attached several documents for consideration and inclusion, including: City Council Special Meeting Agenda, City Council Special Meeting Staff Report and

subsequent attachments, and City Council Special Meeting Minutes. (Written – City of Eastvale)

- Commenters are opposed to the Project for the following reasons:
 - The scoping, including routes, location and visual, physical and other environmental impacts;
 - SCE's initial efforts in getting meaningful feedback from an informed community have lacked tremendously;
 - There seems to be empathy and mitigation support for the impacts of high kV infrastructure weaving throughout the community. (Written – Community Letter 2)
- SCE should engage with regional stakeholders to assure that SCE's proposed facilities are coordinated with public works projects. Neither the City or the Chamber have seen evidence of such coordination and the presentation materials they have seen appear to be several years old, are very challenging to understand, and would appear to conflict with some of the noted freeway improvements. (Written – Community Letter 2)
- The PEA is outdated. Though the document is dated December 2015, the data are obviously outdated.
 - Page 2-13 refers to the State Route 91 Project as a proposed project. It has been under construction for 18 months.
 - 2012 appears to be last public outreach (one meeting in north Corona).
 - References show 2012 dates for research.
 - Overheads on 6th Street do not take into account new freeway transition heights.
 - Alternatives were limited and did not take into account newly created opportunities that were created by the State Route 91 project alignments and new residents along Blaine. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- Public outreach is outdated.
 - Outreach was done in 2009 when there wasn't a defined project and again in 2012 and did not take into account changes in condition. SCE has refused to meet with City of Corona to discuss alternatives that could meet objectives with minimal disruption and visual impacts.
 - Residents along 3rd Street and Quarry Streets are predominantly Spanish speakers and elderly with limited access to transportation. Outreach was not in Spanish and was not central to their location. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- Environmental Justice section was inadequate.
 - The above ground running of lines in lower income residence along 3rd and Quarry. Are other area undergrounded?
 - 4 and 12 kV lines will be replaced with 66 kV lines in low income residential neighborhoods. Setbacks do not seem to conform to SCE policies.

- Predominantly Spanish speaking residences are traditionally not reached by mailings. Outreach has been inadequate and is dated. (Written – Community Letter 3)
- SCE should delay construction of the Project until more adequate feedback from community members is received and more information is delivered to the community. Commenter understands the need for the upgraded transmission lines, but states that more community outreach was involved with local freeway construction than with the outreach done for the Project, and that being overloaded with upgrades has become an inconvenience. (Written – ConnectingU Marketing, Inc.)
- Approval of the application for the Project should be delayed until SCE commits to giving businesses, residents, and other stakeholders the opportunity to comment on where SCE proposes to construct its high voltage lines and where SCE proposes to place them above ground and underground. (Written – DCS Publishing)
- Approval of the Project application should be delayed until SCE works with regional stakeholders currently doing major public works projects in the community to minimize the closure of certain new and recently reopened streets. (Written – DCS Publishing)
- Approval of the Project application should be delayed until SCE engages in a communication program that aims to inform the community in order to receive meaningful feedback. (Written – DCS Publishing)
- Many of the Eastvale residents were not able to attend the recent CPUC Project Environmental Scoping meetings due to the location and lack of proper notification of the meetings. One of the two Scoping meetings should have been held in the City of Eastvale, but instead both meetings were held in the City of Corona. It should be mandatory that scoping meetings be held in each city that would be impacted by a Project. The City of Eastvale requested SCE to hold a meeting in their city, but SCE denied their request. (Written – Genis)
- It is stated in the CPUC General Order (GO) 131-D that property owners within 300 feet of a utility right-of-way are to be mailed a notification when a Permit to Construct has been filed for a project. It is also noted in this GO that a notification of the projects are to be advertised in a local newspaper. The Project affects many beyond that 300 foot notification limit and not everyone subscribes to newspaper publications. The last update on this GO was in 1995, 21 years ago. We are now in the 21st century and it is time to update this GO, along with the approval process used for these types of projects. (Written – Genis)
- The City of Corona and SCE should put their negative past behind them and start working together collectively and in the best interest of the citizens and community, who are SCE customers. (Written – Husted)
- SCE should attend a Town Hall Meeting where they can hear residents' concerns. (Written – James C)
- Approval of the application for the Project should be delayed until SCE gives residents, businesses, and stakeholders the opportunity to discuss Project details, including but not limited to commenting on where SCE proposes to construct its high voltage lines, where lines would be above-ground and underground, how to work with all regional stakeholders currently doing major public works projects in the community to minimize the closure of certain new and recently reopened streets, and how SCE can engage in a communication

program that aims to inform the community in order to receive meaningful feedback.
(Written – Keller Williams Realty)

- The Project would upgrade the region's existing electrical infrastructure, improve overall electrical reliability in the area, and meet the community's increasing electricity needs.
(Written – Keller Williams Realty)
- Opposed to the Project due to lack of community involvement in the Project on SCE's part.
(Written – Marshburn)
- Opposed to the Project because several enormous infrastructure projects are currently underway or about to begin. To not integrate the Project with those is a needless interruption of life in Corona and failure to coordinate resources to the benefit of the stakeholders and customers. (Written – Marshburn)
- Commenter attended the Scoping meeting and read the Notice of Preparation, but expectations fell short as the commenter did not gain useful insight as to how the Project will proceed or how it would impact their property. Commenter wishes that further efforts be taken to educate and inform the public about the Project. (Written – Palmieri Tyler)
- Based on the following, CPUC is either not prepared to disseminate important facts about the Project, or is intentionally withholding such facts from the public:
 - There were no available written materials at the Meeting other than the Notice of Preparation that had already been distributed.
 - There were no representatives from SCE at the Meeting to provide details about the power transmission lines that it will be installing.
 - The presentation was very short and extremely broad in scope, with a majority of the meeting consisting of public comment rather than presentation of actual facts by the CPUC.
 - Project impacts were not set forth with any particularity such that property owners can adequately assess potential issues relating to their properties.
 - The Project description contained within the presentation was vague.
- The Scoping Meeting was merely a cursory effort, and consequently, was not effective in educating and informing the public about the Project. (Written – Palmieri Tyler)
- Why will SCE not respond to requests for meetings with Corona City Council and members of the city? (Written – Tejura)
- Opposed to the proposed installation of high voltage wires because they are cheap. Money should not be the only consideration for this above ground high voltage design installation. Environmentally correct and public safety should be the prime design and construction considerations. (Written – TMS Consortium)
- SCE should work with the local stakeholder businesses and residents hand in hand to give us a structurally safe and environmentally acceptable underground new electrical installation system. (Written – TMS Consortium)
- This is a major Project through the heart of the City of Corona and no notice has gone out to the residents of the City from SCE. (Written – Wentworth)

- SCE has shown bad faith and intent to deceive by pushing through the Project that they know would be harmful to the community, favoring their bottom line over the health and wellbeing of their customers. This has been demonstrated by their repeated refusal to meet with elected city officials, to answer their questions and concerns, and listen to their input prior to filing the Project with the CPUC. They have also shown bad faith to citizens by delaying their own stated timeline for conducting public outreach activities between 2009 and 2015. Only one letter/notice was received on November 27, 2015, which contained an overview of the Project, timeline, and notice of their intent to file with the CPUC in less than a month. No notice was received from SCE regarding the public input meetings set for February 16 and 17. Neighbors know nothing about what has been going on and do not realize the impact the Project could have on their lives and property. (Written – Wilson T and K, Oral – Wilson K)
- Existing overhead power lines on River Road run through the backyards of homes. Commenter attached photos. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)
- Driving north on River Road, over the Santa Ana River onto Archibald, are thousands of new homes. The area north had been dairy and farm land for over 100 years. Edison has crisscrossed that area with huge metal towers as well as overhead power lines. Driving further north to just south of California State Route 60, all lines disappear underground as they run deeper into the city of Ontario. SCE has gotten away with running these lines overhead prior to development of that area, and wishes to continue them now deep into the city of Corona. Corona has largely required utilities to be run underground for the last 30 years or so. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)
- The CPUC is urged to deny approval of SCE's Circle City Project as submitted, to require all lines running adjacent to neighborhood homes to be buried and shielded, and require SCE to make all plans subject to the approval of the elected leaders of the City of Corona. (Written – T. and K. Wilson, Oral – K. Wilson)

5. Consideration of Issues Raised in Scoping Process

A primary purpose of this Scoping Report is to document the process of soliciting and identifying comments from agencies and the public. The scoping process provides the means to determine those issues that interested participants consider to be the principal areas for study and analysis. Every issue that has been raised during scoping that falls within the scope of CEQA will be addressed and/or be considered in the EIR