
CHAPTER 7: PUBLIC AND AGENCY COORDINATION

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines encourage early public and agency participation in the development of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). At the start of the environmental review process, a public participation program was developed for the proposed Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP) to identify outreach methods and a public notification process that would be utilized throughout the Proposed Project, including identifying interested stakeholders, types of informational materials that would be disseminated, and opportunities to solicit and consider public comment. The intention of the public involvement process is to (1) inform the public about the Proposed Project; (2) help identify issues or concerns related to the Proposed Project that should be considered during the evaluation and determination of Proposed Project alternatives; and (3) allow for the integration of public information and input throughout the planning process. This chapter describes the program as well as the results of this outreach effort.

7.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAM

The public participation program incorporated various outreach methods including newsletters, media announcements, open houses, agency contacts, and agency and elected official briefings. The public involvement approach for the proposed RTRP has been flexible, and evolved with the Proposed Project based on level of public interest, types of public comments, issues identified, and stage of the planning process. In some instances, additional newsletters were published, public meetings were held, or agency presentations were conducted beyond originally identified efforts.

7.2.1 PUBLIC INFORMATION

Newsletter and Proposed Project Mailing List

During the course of the Proposed Project, a series of newsletters was published to inform the interested parties about the environmental process, the project status, and opportunities to participate. Publications were sent out to individuals, organizations, and agencies on the project mailing list. These entities were identified based on those jurisdictions or agencies potentially affected by or with permitting authority related to the Proposed Project, and individuals who attended public meetings or provided comments on the Proposed Project. Additionally, county assessor data was obtained and property owners within one mile of either side of the 230 kV alternatives and 0.25 mile of either side of the 69 kV alternatives were included in the project mailing list for each newsletter. As alternatives were eliminated or refined, the assessor data was updated to ensure potentially affected property owners received newsletters and meeting announcements. In addition, although the Eastern route and Bain Street route had been eliminated from further consideration, assessor data for property owners along these routes was included in the mailing list for Newsletters #6 (January 2009) and #7 (September 2009) to notify adjacent residents of the current status of those routes. A summary of newsletter distribution throughout the Proposed Project is included in Table 7.2-1 below.

TABLE 7.2-1. PROJECT NEWSLETTERS

Newsletter	Date	Mailing List Size	General Topic
1	March 2006	32,400	Announced Proposed Project, upcoming public meetings, initial study area.
2	January 2007	26,021	Announced upcoming public meetings and extension of study area to the south to include 69 kV routes.
3	April 2007	31,052	Announced upcoming public meetings and showed 230 kV and 69 kV alternatives.
4	June 2007	31,130	Announced upcoming public meetings and environmentally superior routes for 230 kV and 69 kV transmission lines.
5	December 2008	21,151	Provided project update and re-evaluation of previously selected routes.
6	January 2009	29,304	Announced upcoming public meetings and showed revised 230 kV routes under consideration; summarized why some routes no longer being considered.
7	September 2009	30,227	Announced upcoming public meetings and showed current 230 kV routes under consideration.
Scoping Announcement	November 2009	634	Postcard sent to interested parties only (assessor data not included). Announced public scoping meetings.

Media Contacts

Paid display advertisements in English and Spanish were published in local area newspapers to announce all public open houses. Based on suggestions received by the public, advertisements were later placed in an additional newspaper (the Riverside County Record) to reach the public in the Jurupa area. Press releases announcing the public meetings also were distributed to local newspapers. Newspapers and advertisement print dates are listed in Table 7.2-2.

TABLE 7.2-2. DISPLAY ADVERTISEMENTS AND PRINT DATES

Newspaper	Communities/Areas Covered	Circulation	Print Dates
The Press-Enterprise	Corona, Norco, Hemet, San Jacinto, Lake Elsinore, Wildomar, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Menifee, Perris, Riverside, San Bernardino County, Temecula	120,000	Wednesday, March 29, 2006 Wednesday, January 17, 2007 Wednesday, April 18, 2007 Wednesday, June 20, 2007 Wednesday, February 4, 2009 Wednesday, October 7, 2009 Saturday, November 21, 2009
La Prensa	Riverside, Corona, Moreno Valley, Perris, Lake Elsinore, Temecula, Ontario, Pomona, Chino, Rancho Cucamonga, Montclair, San Bernardino, Colton, Apple Valley, Hesperia, Victorville, Barstow	67,500	Friday, March 31, 2006 Friday, January 19, 2007 Friday, April 20, 2007 Friday, June 22, 2007 Friday, February 6, 2009 Friday, October 9, 2009
Hispanic News (Hispanos Unidos)	San Diego and Riverside Counties	26,000	Wednesday, March 22, 2006 Wednesday, January 24, 2007 Wednesday, April 18, 2007 Wednesday, June 27, 2007 Wednesday, February 4, 2009

Newspaper	Communities/Areas Covered	Circulation	Print Dates
Black Voice News	Riverside and San Bernardino Counties	10,000	Thursday, March 30, 2006 Thursday, January 18, 2007 Thursday, April 19, 2007 Thursday, June 21, 2007 Thursday, February 5, 2009 Thursday, October 8, 2009
The Riverside County Record	Glen Avon, Pedley, Mira Loma, Rubidoux, Sunnyslope, Jurupa Hills, Indian Hills, Eastvale, Riverside	5,000	Thursday, April 19, 2007 Thursday, June 21, 2007 Thursday, June 28, 2007 Thursday, February 5, 2009 Thursday, October 8, 2009 Thursday, November 26, 2009

Press Release Distribution List

Press releases for the Proposed Project were directed to the following publications:

- Press Enterprise
- The San Bernardino Sun
- Inland Empire Community Newspapers
- Black Voice News
- Los Angeles Times
- Riverside County Record
- Inland Valley Bulletin

Website

CEQA requires the lead agency to include provisions in their CEQA procedures for wide public involvement on both a formal and informal basis in order to receive and evaluate the public's reaction to the Proposed Project. The procedures, whenever possible, should provide environmental information on a publicly maintained web site. Public notices should also be posted on the public web site.

Project information was placed on the Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) website at www.riversidepublicutilities.com. The website was provided in all open house announcements, including the newsletters, display advertisements, and press releases. The website contains general project information, as well as a copy of the planning process flow chart, a summary of communication outreach efforts, newsletters, and a study area map. In April 2007, a comment form was added to the website to provide additional opportunities for the public to provide comments to RPU prior to selection of the environmentally superior routes. Team contact information also was provided. The website can be viewed in either English or Spanish.

Telephone Information Line

In January 2007, prior to distribution of the second project newsletter, a telephone information line (951-710-5013) was established. The purpose of the information line was to provide access to meeting dates and allow callers to leave comments, request to be added to the mailing list, or

ask a project team member to contact them. RPU has been maintaining an extensive contact log of all calls and comments received through the information line and via email.

7.2.2 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Public open houses were held throughout the environmental review process to provide updates on project studies and current routes being evaluated, and to allow the public to speak directly with project team members, ask questions, and provide comments on the Proposed Project. The meetings were held in an informal, open house format, allowing the public to attend at their convenience. Meetings were held in the evening to allow the public to attend after work hours. The meetings were held at community facilities centrally located within the study area. In some instances, when public interest was high and to provide sufficient comment opportunity, two meetings were held at different locations in the study area to allow residents the opportunity to plan for their attendance at a convenient location. At each meeting, attendees were asked to sign in for inclusion on the mailing list, provided with a comment form in either English or Spanish, and directed around the room to review Proposed Project displays. The displays were organized in stations according to topic, which included Proposed Project purpose and need, Proposed Project description, planning process and schedule, and Proposed Project maps. Project team members were available at each display station to review the information and answer any questions.

In addition to the informal open house meetings, a formal scoping meeting was held on December 3, 2009 at the City of Riverside Planning Commission. At this meeting, attendees made formal verbal comments. Public meetings are listed below in Table 7.2-3.

TABLE 7.2-3. PUBLIC MEETINGS

Date	Location	City	Attendance	Comment Forms Received at Meeting
April 5, 2006	Riverside Municipal Airport 6951 Flight Road	Riverside	6	0
April 6, 2006	Riverside Municipal Airport 6951 Flight Road	Riverside	8	3
January 25, 2007	Riverside Municipal Airport 6951 Flight Road	Riverside	29	2
April 25, 2007	Indian Hills Golf Club 5700 Club House Drive	Riverside	90	34
April 26, 2007	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District 1995 Market Street	Riverside	26	10
June 28, 2007	Riverside Municipal Airport 6951 Flight Road	Riverside	53	13
February 12, 2009	Jurupa Community Services District 11201 Harrel Street	Mira Loma	88	25
October 14, 2009	Patriot High School 4355 Camino Real	Riverside	47	2
October 15, 2009	Bryant Park Community Center 7950 Philbin Avenue	Riverside	25	1
December 3, 2009*	City Council Chambers, City Hall 3900 Main Street	Riverside	22	21

* Formal scoping meeting; comments received were verbal comments transcribed by court reporter

7.2.3 AGENCY COORDINATION

Agencies and organizations having jurisdiction and/or specific project interest were contacted by project resource specialists and RPU and SCE environmental staff to inform them of the RTRP, to verify the status and availability of existing environmental data, and to solicit their input on specific aspects of the study process. Concerns and recommendations for the Proposed Project were discussed and documented in the project database and records system. They were used to inform the route identification and refinement process. These agency coordination meetings are documented in Table 7.2-4.

In addition, management-level contacts were made with agencies, as requested, following the distribution of project information. Additionally, those agencies that were considered to potentially have a significant role either in permitting or project approvals were asked to participate in a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Other management level meetings and TAC meetings are described within this section.

Agency Letters

In addition to correspondence distributed to request or verify resource data collected in the study area, RPU distributed letters to various agencies throughout the Proposed Project area to provide information on the Proposed Project background, purpose and need, and Proposed Project description, as well as to identify any concerns the agencies might have. The letters also noted that the Proposed Project would be subject to CEQA compliance and that the City of Riverside would serve as the lead agency during environmental document preparation. These update letters were sent in April 2006, December 2006, and April 2007. Agency letters also were mailed on November 18, 2009 with a copy of the Notice of Preparation, notifying agencies that the DEIR was being prepared and requesting formal scoping comments. At that time, a Notice of Completion and Environmental Document Transmittal was filed with the State Clearinghouse.

Technical Advisory Committee

A TAC was formed to establish a group representing a range of opinions in a forum small enough to allow for thorough education of the participants, detailed discussion of issues, and informal dialogue. Representation included county and municipal agencies that have administrative jurisdiction in the Proposed Project area. The purpose of the TAC was to allow members to share their knowledge of the Proposed Project area and of potential issues during environmental studies and evaluation of alternative routes. TAC members were encouraged to share their thoughts on project studies throughout the planning process. New members were subsequently added to the TAC based on an identified need for representation or as recommended by existing members. For example, in 2008, as Proposed Project alternatives were refined, elected officials also were invited to participate in the TAC.

The first TAC meeting was held on December 19, 2006. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the Proposed Project, summarize the study process, and receive feedback on any issues in the study area and the public involvement approach. The second TAC meeting was held on March 28, 2007. At this meeting, team members summarized project status and public involvement activities to date, sought input on the impact assessment and mitigation planning process, and summarized the next steps, including route selection. The third TAC meeting was held on June 6, 2007, and presented the environmentally superior routes to the group. The fourth

and final TAC meeting was held on December 17, 2008 to notify participants that routes were being refined and studied, and that additional public outreach would occur to update the public and obtain comments on refined alternatives. The TAC meetings, including a list of representation, are summarized below in Table 7.2-4.

Agency and Elected Official Briefings

Early in the project planning process (2006), briefing packets containing a letter summarizing the Proposed Project, route maps, newsletter, open house presentation DVD, and process flow chart were distributed to various elected officials and staff members throughout the study area. The purpose of the briefing packets, similar to the public open houses, was to inform potentially interested or affected jurisdictions of the Proposed Project and allow them to make comments or suggestions about issues that may need to be reviewed during environmental studies and identification of route alternatives. Packets were distributed to the Cities of Rialto, Riverside, Grand Terrace, Norco, and Colton; and to the Riverside, Alvord, Colton, and Jurupa Unified School Districts.

Additionally, throughout the development of the Proposed Project, RPU provided in-person briefings or project presentations as needed to further discuss project issues with interested jurisdictions, elected officials, or stakeholder groups. For example, County Supervisor John Tavaglione's office requested additional project information on several occasions and provided important input on project development. Project representatives also provided project updates to the Riverside City Council at regularly scheduled council meetings. These briefings are summarized in Table 7.2-4.

TABLE 7.2-4. AGENCY AND ELECTED OFFICIAL BRIEFINGS

Date	Jurisdiction or Agency	Items Discussed during Meeting / Agency Actions or Comments Received
January 20, 2006	RPU Board	Project presentation.
February 17, 2006	RPU Board	Project presentation.
March 14, 2006	Riverside City Council	Project presentation.
May 23, 2006	Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce – ED Committee	Project presentation.
May 23, 2006	Riverside Downtown Partnership	Project presentation.
June 14, 2006	CAISO Board of Governors and Operations Committee	Project presentation / Project approved; board recommends SCE complete project as soon as possible.
June 23, 2006	City of Rialto Henry Garcia, City Administrator	Briefing Packet; no comments received.
June 23, 2006	Riverside Unified School District Superintendent Susan J. Rainey	Briefing Packet; no comments received.
June 23, 2006	Alvord Unified School District Superintendent Paul Jessup	Briefing Packet; no comments received.
June 23, 2006	Colton Joint Unified School District Superintendent Dennis Byas	Briefing Packet; no comments received.
June 23, 2006	Jurupa Unified School District Superintendent Elliott Duchon	Briefing Packet; no comments received.
June 26, 2006	RPU Board	Project presentation.
October 20, 2006	RPU Board	Project presentation.
November 7, 2006	Riverside City Council	Project presentation.

Date	Jurisdiction or Agency	Items Discussed during Meeting / Agency Actions or Comments Received
December 19, 2006	TAC Meeting #1 – SCE, RPU, Riverside County Flood Control, Riverside County Parks, Riverside City Planning Dept.	Discussed Proposed Project, schedule, preliminary routes, and public involvement process.
February 26, 2007	Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD)	Project presentation; JCSD Board voted in favor of a resolution to oppose 230 kV transmission alignments through the District.
March 13, 2007	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission	Project summary presentation; staff recommended filing an application with the preferred 69 kV route and noted the conflict with the current zoning (Zone A) for the Riverside Municipal Airport.
March 19, 2007	Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD) Board	Project summary presentation; JUSD Board voted 5-0 in opposition to the proposed SCE 230 kV transmission lines.
March 28, 2007	TAC Meeting #2 - SCE, RPU, Riverside County Flood Control, Riverside County Parks, Riverside City Planning Dept., Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, City of Colton Planning Division, Supervisor John Tavaglione's office	Discussed project status, agency and public comments, impact assessment process.
April 4, 2007	RPU Board and Council Members, County of Riverside, County of San Bernardino, City of Colton, City of Grand Terrace	Briefing Packet mailed, no comments received.
May 15, 2007	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Project briefing, description and discussion of CPUC involvement. CPUC will provide comments on the DEIR during public review.
May 16, 2007	Supervisor John Tavaglione	Project briefing.
June 6, 2007	TAC Meeting #3 - Riverside City Planning Dept., Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, City of Colton Planning Division, Riverside City Planning Dept., Supervisor Tavaglione's office, Supervisor Buster's Office, Senator Dutton's office, Assemblyman Jeffries' office	Discussed route selection and alternative route ranking process.
June 15, 2007	RPU Board	Project presentation.
December 17, 2008	TAC Meeting #4 - SCE, RPU, City of Colton Electric Department, CPUC, City of Colton Planning Division, Riverside City Planning Dept., Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, Riverside County Parks, Riverside County Planning Div., Supervisor Tavaglione's office, Supervisor Caliva's office, Assemblyman Nestande's office, Assemblyman Jeffries' office	Discussed current routes under consideration, why some routes were altered or eliminated, next steps in public outreach.
November 11, 2009	Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce Good Morning Riverside	Project briefing.
December 3, 2009	Riverside Planning Commission	Project presentation / scoping meeting.
December 9, 2009	Riverside Downtown Partnership Board Meeting	Project briefing.

American Indian Tribes

To coordinate input from Native American interests, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted regarding Native American groups that might have historic

ties to and interest in the Proposed Project area. NAHC provided a list of American Indian Tribes that should be contacted for the Proposed Project. These tribes were included as part of the Proposed Project's mailing list and received agency letters as well as copies of formal notifications, such as the Notice of Preparation. Several tribes responded to the City and requested further coordination and meetings. With the assistance of the University of Arizona's Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology (BARA), in April and May 2007 meetings and site visits were held with three of the groups identified by the NAHC: the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Pechanga Band of Mission Indians, and Morongo Band of Mission Indians (see Appendix G of this DEIR). The goal of the meetings and site visits was to identify portions of the Proposed Project area that are of special importance to Native American groups. During site visits, Native American representatives emphasized that their observations about cultural sensitivity of particular locations were preliminary. The findings from the tribal coordination were included in the environmental planning process, and taken into consideration during the selection of the environmentally superior transmission line routes. Input from the Gabrieliño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians and the Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians has not been obtained, despite requests.

In December 2010, a certified letter was sent to the Soboba, Pechanga, Morongo, Ramona, and Gabrieliño/Tongva regarding recent updates to the Proposed Project and alternatives. As of February 2011, only the Soboba Tribe has responded to this letter.

7.3 PUBLIC SCOPING

CEQA guidelines encourage early project consultation with interested agencies, organizations, or members of the public either before or during preparation of a DEIR. In addition to the informal public outreach process described above, a formal scoping process was conducted for the RTRP, allowing agency and public comments, issues, and concerns regarding the Proposed Project to be identified prior to distribution of the DEIR. Public outreach and meetings associated with the formal public scoping process are described below.

7.3.1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) to prepare a DEIR was distributed for the Proposed Project on January 23, 2007. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15082, the NOP summarized the Proposed Project, stated RPU's intention to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and requested comments from interested parties. The NOP also announced a public scoping meeting to be held for the Proposed Project and was mailed with an attached copy of the Initial Study (IS).

On November 18, 2009, a revised NOP with the new route and Proposed Project description and announcing preparation of the DEIR was distributed to interested agencies. The NOP summarized the history of the project studies, requested comments regarding issues or information that should be considered in the EIR, and provided the date and location of the public scoping meeting that would be held on December 3, 2009. The NOP requested that comments be provided within the 30-day scoping period, which was initiated with distribution of the NOP. The scoping meeting was announced in a legal advertisement published in the Press Enterprise on November 21, 2009, through a mailed announcement distributed to approximately 634 interested agencies and individuals on the project mailing list, and through distribution of the NOP.

7.3.2 SCOPING MEETING

A public scoping meeting was held during the regularly scheduled Riverside City Planning Commission Meeting on December 3, 2009. During this meeting, 21 verbal comments were made by members of the public. Issues and concerns identified during scoping are summarized in Section 7.4 below.

7.4 SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Comments were received throughout the project planning process, primarily following distribution of public newsletters and open house meetings. Comments were considered throughout the planning process as they were received. Comments have been received through the project telephone information line, email address, open house comment forms, and mailed letters. In addition, verbal comments made informally during open houses were noted by project team members and discussed internally following each public meeting. The contact information to provide comments on the Proposed Project was provided in the newsletters, display advertisements, and press releases.

The nature of public comments evolved throughout the development of the Proposed Project as routes were identified or eliminated. Initial comments were received after the first newsletter, which showed only a study area but no preliminary routes. These comments included general questions on how the Proposed Project would affect their property, or if the Proposed Project would result in such impacts as degradation of views or increased traffic.

In January 2007, the project newsletter included preliminary transmission alternatives; these alternatives also were included in the April 2007 newsletter. At this point, comments became more focused, expressing concern over specific routes and impacts to communities and residences. In particular, comments increased during April 2007 as residents in the Jurupa area became more aware of the Proposed Project and expressed opposition to routes along Bain Street and Van Buren Boulevard, and preference for what became known as the “eastern” routes through the City of Riverside. Comments also requested consideration of a route further to the west, along I-15, which was not included in the preliminary alternatives at the time.

Newsletters in late 2008 and 2009 provided revised maps, showing routes along Bain, Van Buren, and I-15 (January 2009); the route along Bain Street was later dropped (September 2009). Most of the comments received during this time again emphasized opposition to the Bain and Van Buren routes, and included requests that the eastern route be reconsidered. Developers along I-15 also submitted comments expressing concern with or opposition to the I-15 route due to potential impacts to existing and proposed commercial developments.

During the December 3, 2009 Scoping Meeting, many of these same concerns were reiterated along with some additional specific comments. The most common comment dealt with health concerns associated with the proposed 230 kV line and its proximity to schools and parks on both the proposed route and alternative route. Other common concerns expressed included visual impacts near existing and proposed residential areas, uneven burden imposed on residents of the County, and effects on property values. Additional concerns included wind loading, helicopter conflicts, and animal migration corridors. Meeting participants suggested project modifications

or new alternatives such as undergrounding the entire transmission line or portions, proposing an eastern route, tying into an existing SCE 115 kV line to the east, minimizing the amount of the transmission line in the County, and including the County more directly in the decision-making process.

As the project team reviewed and considered public comments, the comments were generally categorized and summarized by resource. In general, land use, visual, and electric and magnetic field (EMF) concerns were most frequently mentioned throughout the project planning process. Some concerns also noted potential effects to specific areas or resources. For example, commenters may have noted the presence of a specific recreation area, use (such as equestrian or biking), or wildlife species that could be affected by an alternative route. The following is a summary of public comments received, organized topically. It should be noted that in some instances, comments or impacts summarized in this section may have been resolved by the elimination or refinement of route alternatives.

7.4.1 LAND USE

Land use concerns included conflicts with adjacent or other uses, including residential areas, existing or future school sites, or flight paths. The majority of these comments specified concern over the proximity of the proposed routes to existing homes and residential areas. During the scoping process, many comments focused on impacts to the Jurupa area, where residents were opposed to routes specifically along Bain Street or Van Buren Boulevard. Comments regarding flight paths for the Riverside Airport and low-flying helicopters that train and practice in the Santa Ana River floodplain were received during the planning process, and also mentioned during the public scoping meeting. During the scoping process, impacts to commercial land uses along the I-15 route also were noted. In addition to comments regarding conflicts with specific adjacent land uses (i.e., residential areas), comments throughout the planning process noted that it would be unfair to place the new transmission line in areas already burdened by a high proportion of utility or industrial infrastructure, such as along the Van Buren route.

7.4.2 PROPERTY VALUES

Concern about the impact of the Proposed Project to property values was prevalent in comments expressed throughout the planning process, including during the scoping process. Most of these comments focused on residences adjacent to the alternative routes; however, some comments also noted the potential for impact to the property values of commercial developments, primarily near the I-15 route.

7.4.3 RECREATION

Comments regarding potential impacts on recreation were primarily received earlier in the planning process, when several preliminary alternatives were being evaluated. Comments regarding recreation decreased as alternatives were narrowed to the Van Buren, Bain, and I-15 routes, and comments became more focused on impacts to residences rather than open space or recreation. Comments were received regarding recreational uses in the river bottom and along the “Mountains to the Sea” bike path. Potential impacts to the horse trail along the Santa Ana River and the Mount Rubidoux recreation areas were also mentioned. Residents in the Jurupa area expressed concern that the presence of structures would impact current equestrian uses.

7.4.4 NOISE AND ELECTRIC AND MAGNETIC FIELDS

The majority of comments regarding EMF were received at the April 2007 open houses and following Newsletter #3, and again in the verbal comments made during the scoping meeting. Residents expressed concern regarding potential effects of EMF levels near residential areas, schools, and recreation areas (particularly equestrian trails), with a particular focus on potential health effects to children and animals. Comments were also received about potential noise from the power lines, or interference with television and radio reception.

7.4.5 VISUAL IMPACTS

Comments regarding visual impacts were prevalent throughout the planning process, and noted frequently during the scoping period. These comments noted concern for impacts to views from homes and recreation areas. Areas of concern included the Jurupa Hills area, Mount Rubidoux recreation area, homes along the river bluff, and the city bike path. Some comments regarding visual impacts also questioned if the transmission and subtransmission lines could be placed underground. Other comments regarding visual impacts noted an associated potential impact to property values.

7.4.6 PROJECT NEED AND ALTERNATIVES

Numerous comments regarding Proposed Project need were received primarily after the distribution of Newsletter #3 and at the April 2007 public open houses, from residents in the northwestern portion of the study area. Comments stated that the Proposed Project would not serve the unincorporated County area, but rather only the City of Riverside. Residents along the central routes felt that the line should be routed through the City instead (eastern routes). These comments were again stated in early 2009 and during the scoping meeting, as residents of unincorporated areas (primarily Jurupa) requested that the eastern routes be reconsidered.

Comments received from residents in other portions of the study area expressed preference for the central route, particularly along Van Buren Boulevard, as this route would avoid impacts to biological areas, require fewer new access roads, impact the least amount of homes, and provide a short distance to a new interconnection.

Some comments regarding routes to the east, when they were still under consideration, stated preference for locating the 230 kV transmission line near the Santa Ana River, either on the west side near the industrial development to avoid residences, or on the east side of the river to continue protection afforded by the dike.

7.4.7 MAJOR TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS

In addition to resource concerns noted above, some residents stated opposition to routes along Van Buren Boulevard, Bellegrave Avenue, and Bain Street due to the effect of multiple projects in the same transportation corridor that impact the Jurupa Valley communities. These concerns include existing vehicular and train traffic; construction; the expressed need for widening Van Buren Boulevard; previous expansion of other roadways resulting in loss of vegetation, noise, and construction impacts; recent residential development; and existing electrical structures.

Similar concerns were expressed for the 69 kV transmission line alternatives near the University of California at Riverside, where there are plans for work on a Sycamore Canyon service road that would divert traffic into neighborhood areas.

7.4.8 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Throughout the planning process, comments were received on the public involvement process itself, including notification and opportunities to comment. Several comments requested that additional public meetings be held throughout the Proposed Project area. In response, RPU and SCE scheduled two open houses in April 2007 at different locations in the study area to provide additional comment opportunities prior to route selection. Other comments stated that RPU and SCE should use better notification methods. RPU and SCE therefore decided to expand media notification (display advertising and press releases) to include *The Riverside County Record*, with circulation primarily to residents north of the Santa Ana River (Riverside County portion of the study area), to increase public awareness of the Proposed Project and upcoming public meetings. Comments regarding the public notification process also were received during the scoping meetings, during which many residents noted that they or their neighbors had not received mailers regarding the Proposed Project or were unaware of the routes proposed near their homes. Other comments received during scoping indicated that the time of public meetings made it difficult for people who worked to attend meetings, particularly the scoping meeting, which was held in the morning in the City of Riverside, rather than in the evening near their community as the public meetings had been scheduled.

7.5 PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT EIR

7.5.1 NOTICE OF COMPLETION

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15085, the Notice of Completion (NOC) was filed with the California State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, as soon as the DEIR was completed. The City of Riverside also provided public notice of availability of the DEIR at the same time it sent the NOC to the State Clearinghouse (CEQA Guidelines Section 15087). In addition to the information disclosed in the NOC, the notice of availability also included a list of significant environmental effects and whether the Project site is listed under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code (hazardous waste facilities). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15105, the public review period for a Draft EIR shall be no less than 30 days nor should it be longer than 60 days except under unusual circumstances. In the case of the RTRP DEIR, the comment period was originally scheduled for 30 days but was extended by an additional 60 days at the request of the City of Jurupa Valley. Details of the extension are contained in Section 7.5.6, Comment Period Extension.

7.5.2 DRAFT EIR NOTIFICATION

A Project notification was mailed July 29, 2011 to approximately 16,000 residents, businesses, and interested parties. The list was developed using GIS and existing lists used for previous Project mailings. It included agencies, elected officials, Native American Tribes, property owners, and interested individuals and organizations. GIS was used to identify property owners within two miles of the 230 kV transmission line (a one-mile buffer on either side) and within 0.5 mile of the 69 kV subtransmission lines (0.25-mile buffer on either side.) The Project mailing included the NOC and a Project map. The Project website was also updated to include the NOC

and the DEIR. Newspaper ads in the Press Enterprise and Riverside County Record were placed to announce the availability of the DEIR.

TABLE 7.5-3. DISPLAY ADVERTISEMENTS AND PRINT DATES FOR THE DEIR

<u>Newspaper</u>	<u>Communities/Areas Covered</u>	<u>Circulation</u>	<u>Print Dates</u>
<u>The Press-Enterprise</u>	<u>Corona, Norco, Hemet, San Jacinto, Lake Elsinore, Wildomar, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Menifee, Perris, Riverside, San Bernardino County, Temecula</u>	<u>120,000</u>	<u>July 30, 2011</u>
<u>The Riverside County Record</u>	<u>Glen Avon, Pedley, Mira Loma, Rubidoux, Sunnyslope, Jurupa Hills, Indian Hills, Eastvale, Riverside</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>August 2, 2011</u>

7.5.3 DOCUMENT REPOSITORY SITES

CEQA Section 15087(c)(5) and Section 15087(g) require lead agencies to make project documents available to the public for review. CEQA documents prepared as part of the RTRP, including the DEIR and appendices, were made available at the public repository sites listed in Table 7.5-4. The repository sites were announced in the DEIR mailing and in the display advertisements.

TABLE 7.5-4. REPOSITORY SITES

<u>Location</u>	<u>Address</u>
<u>Riverside City Hall, Planning Division</u>	<u>3900 Main Street 3rd Floor, Riverside</u>
<u>La Sierra Branch Public Library</u>	<u>4600 La Sierra Avenue, Riverside</u>
<u>Rubidoux Library</u>	<u>5840 Mission Blvd., Riverside</u>
<u>Glen Avon Library</u>	<u>9244 Galena, Riverside</u>

7.5.4 DRAFT EIR DISTRIBUTION LIST

The distribution list for copies of the DEIR is found in Attachment G of the FEIR in Volume I.

7.5.5 PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

In accordance with CEQA requirements, the DEIR was circulated for public and agency review and comment for 60 days from August 1, 2011 to September 30, 2011, but the comment period was extended to November 30, 2011 at the request of the City of Jurupa Valley. Comments were accepted via email at rtrp@riversideca.gov and by mail at Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP), City of Riverside, Public Utilities Department, 3901 Orange Street, Riverside, CA 92522. A phone number for the Project Manager, George Hanson, was also provided: (951)-710-5013.

7.5.6 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD EXTENSION

The original comment period for the RTRP DEIR was scheduled for August 1, 2011 to September 30, 2011, but was extended by 60 days at the request of the City of Jurupa Valley. The public was notified of the extension of the comment period through an additional Project mailing on September 20, 2011. A postcard announcing the extension was mailed to the same list created for the DEIR NOC and Project map mailing. The list was updated to include requests

received from the public to be added to the mailing list as a result of the announcement of the availability of the DEIR. Display ads were also placed in the following newspapers.

7.5.7 PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT EIR

The formal public review period for the RTRP Draft EIR (including the 60-day extension) ended on November 30, 2011. Opportunities were provided via mail, Project email, and by phone to submit comments during the review period. Comments were received from agencies, Tribes, organizations, and individuals via all the comment modes provided. During the public review period, the City received 115 comment letters from agencies, organizations, and individuals. The City received 29 comments after the close of the official comment period and chose to continue accepting and responding to these additional comments until final review and preparation of the FEIR. At the City of Riverside Planning Commission meeting on April 5, 2012, organizations, members of the public, and Planning Commissioners submitted oral comments on the DEIR. The comments submitted at the Planning Commission meeting duplicated written comments received on the DEIR. Any oral comments raised at the Planning Commission meeting have been adequately responded to in the responses in Chapter 2 of the FEIR in Volume I. The Planning Commission meeting minutes have been included in the project record. Table 7.5-7 summarizes the sources and modes of comments received.

TABLE 7.5-7. SOURCES, MODES AND TOTALS OF DEIR COMMENTS

<u>Comment Source</u>	<u>Submission Mode</u>	<u>Submission Count</u>	<u>Submission Total</u>
<u>Agencies, Tribes, and Organizations</u>			<u>21</u>
	<u>Letter</u>	<u>18</u>	
	<u>Project Email</u>	<u>3</u>	
<u>Individuals</u>			<u>94</u>
	<u>Letter</u>	<u>31</u>	
	<u>Project Email</u>	<u>57</u>	
	<u>Phone Call</u>	<u>6</u>	
<u>Combined Total</u>			<u>115</u>

7.5.8 COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM AGENCIES, TRIBES, AND ORGANIZATIONS

A total of 21 comments were received from agencies, Tribes, and organizations on the DEIR. Five of the comments were received after the close of the formal review period:

- Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians on January 30, 2012
- Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians on February 29, 2012
- Corona-Norco Unified School District on March 21, 2012
- City of Jurupa Valley on March 29, 2012
- City of Jurupa Valley on April 5, 2012

See Table 7.5-8 for a complete list of agencies that submitted comments on the DEIR. Copies of each substantive comment and the response from the lead agency are provided in Chapter 2 of the FEIR in Volume I.

TABLE 7.5-8. COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM AGENCIES, TRIBES, AND ORGANIZATIONS

<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Submission Mode</u>
<u>Native American Heritage Commission</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Jurupa Community Services District</u>	<u>3 Letters</u>
<u>California Department of Transportation – District 8</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>City of Jurupa Valley</u>	<u>5 Letters</u>
<u>Airport Land Use Commission</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>City of Norco</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>South Coast Air Quality Management District</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>California Department of Transportation – Division of Aeronautics</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>California Public Utilities Commission</u>	<u>2 Letters 1 email</u>
<u>Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians</u>	<u>2 Letters</u>
<u>Corona-Norco Unified School District</u>	<u>Letter</u>

7.5.9 COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDIVIDUALS

A total of 94 comments were received from individuals on the DEIR. See Table 7.5-9 for a complete list of individuals who submitted comments. Eighty-eight of these were in written form (either letter or e-mail). A copy of each substantive comment and the response from the lead agency is provided in Chapter 2, Comments Received and Responses to Comments, in Volume I of the FEIR.

TABLE 7.5-9. COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDIVIDUALS

<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Submission Mode</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Submission Mode</u>
<u>Bernal, N.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Powers, C.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Nolkamper, M.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Clark, H.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Zonker, J.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Anderson, S.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Hernandez, A.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Porter, D.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Britain, T. & L.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Reynolds, B.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Powers/Smith</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>English, P.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Swan, L.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Dewhurst, J.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Gooding, L.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Fonseca, A.</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Hansen, E.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Ehrlich, S.</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Clark, H.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Broome, A. & A.</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Robinson, K.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Rah, S.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Reynolds, B.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Stevens, G. & A.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Hodous, G.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Thomas, L.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Meyerett, K.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Porter, E.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>McDowell, S.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Fox/Kirkman</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Clark, H.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Schafer, B.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Carrington, M.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Hancock, B.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Glick, H. & D.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Ramirez, J.</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Posey, J & S.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Kasen, A.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Peterson, M.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>O'Connor, S.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Iyler, B.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Hawkins, E.</u>	<u>Email, Letter</u>
<u>Rodriguez, M.J. & R.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Friess, K.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Salazar, I.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Van Train III, W.</u>	<u>2 Emails</u>
<u>Saathoff, D.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Hess, J.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Saathoff, J.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Anderson, B.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Saathoff, S.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Hoggard, K. & C.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Casas, E.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Kimm/Kimm Hammons</u>	<u>Letter</u>

<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Submission Mode</u>	<u>Commenter</u>	<u>Submission Mode</u>
<u>Allen, P.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Leja, D.</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Lipp, E. & S.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Chaklashiya, K.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Carrington, C.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Shaffer, A.</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>Carrington, R.</u>	<u>2 Letters</u>	<u>Bondar, R.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Carrington, H.</u>	<u>Letter, Email</u>	<u>Glick, H.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Carrington, C.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Posey, S.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Carrington, M.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Brookens, L.</u>	<u>Letter</u>
<u>Carrington, D.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Burdett, J.</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>Carrington, D.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Wallner, B. & D.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Pallas, B.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Carrington, D.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Crump-Knighton, T.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Wright, K.D.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Hepker, G.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Ford, R.</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>Smith, J.</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Schroeder, D.</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>Torchia, D. & D.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Gano, B.</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>Nizato, R. & E.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Roth, B.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Albegolfin</u>	<u>2 Emails</u>	<u>Zwinger, H.</u>	<u>Phone</u>
<u>Hughes, C.</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Gano, B. & M.</u>	<u>Email</u>
<u>Lovett, L.</u>	<u>Letter</u>		

7.5.10 PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC MEETING

A public meeting was held before the City Planning Commission of the City of Riverside in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 3900 Main Street, Riverside, California on Thursday, April 5, 2012. A notice, including a Project map, was mailed to approximately 16,000 agencies, elected officials, Native American Tribes, property owners, and interested individuals and organizations. The mailing list used for notification purposes for the DEIR and the extended comment period was also used for this mailing. It was updated to include names of people who submitted comments on the DEIR or requested to be added to the Project mailing list. Newspaper ads in the Press Enterprise and Riverside County Record were placed to announce the Planning Commission Public Meeting. The publication dates are listed below.

TABLE 7.5-10. DISPLAY ADVERTISEMENTS AND PRINT DATES FOR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

<u>Newspaper</u>	<u>Communities/Areas Covered</u>	<u>Circulation</u>	<u>Print Dates</u>
<u>The Press-Enterprise</u>	<u>Corona, Norco, Hemet, San Jacinto, Lake Elsinore, Wildomar, Moreno Valley, Murrieta, Menifee, Perris, Riverside, San Bernardino County, Temecula</u>	<u>120,000</u>	<u>March 25, 2012</u>
<u>The Riverside County Record</u>	<u>Glen Avon, Pedley, Mira Loma, Rubidoux, Sunnyslope, Jurupa Hills, Indian Hills, Eastvale, Riverside</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>March 22, 2012</u>