



Scoping Report

Environmental Impact Report
San Diego Gas & Electric
Permit to Construct the Sycamore-Peñasquitos
230-Kilovolt Transmission Line Project

September 2014

PANORAMA
ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Scoping Report

Environmental Impact Report San Diego Gas & Electric Permit to Construct the Sycamore-Peñasquitos 230-Kilovolt Transmission Line Project

Lead Agency:

California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102
Contact: Billie Blanchard
(415) 703-2068

Prepared by:

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.1	Project Background	1-1
1.2	Purpose of Scoping	1-3
1.3	Scoping Report Organization	1-3
2	Project Scoping	2-1
2.1	Overview	2-1
2.2	Notice of Preparation.....	2-1
2.3	Public Scoping Meetings	2-2
2.4	Newspaper Advertisements and posted fliers.....	2-2
2.5	Agency and Tribal Government Consultation.....	2-4
2.6	Outreach	2-5
3	Scoping Comments	3-1
3.1	Scoping Period Commenters	3-1
3.2	Commenters Outside of Scoping Period.....	3-4
3.3	Key Issues Raised during Public Comment Period.....	3-6
4	Summary of Future Steps in the CEQA Process.....	4-1

SCOPING REPORT
Table of Contents

List of Tables

Table 2.2-1: Summary of CEQA NOP Requirements and CPUC Noticing 2-1
Table 2.3-1: Public Scoping Meetings 2-2
Table 2.4-1: Newspaper Advertisements 2-2
Table 2.4-2: Posted Flier Locations 2-3
Table 2.5-1: Tribes Invited to Participate in Scoping 2-4
Table 3.1-1: Agency and Organization Scoping Period Commenters 3-2
Table 3.1-2: Individual Scoping Period Commenters 3-3
Table 3.2-1: Commenters Who Provided Comments Outside of the Scoping Period 3-5
Table 3.2-2: Individuals Who Signed Petitions 3-6
Table 4-1: Future Steps in the CEQA Process 4-1

Appendices

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation
- Appendix B: Scoping Meeting Materials
- Appendix C: Scoping Meeting Transcripts
- Appendix D: Newspaper Advertisements and Fliers
- Appendix E: Comments Received Before the Scoping Period
- Appendix F: Comments Received During the Scoping Period
- Appendix G: Comments Received After the Scoping Period

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Project Overview

The proposed Sycamore-Peñasquitos 230 Kilovolt Transmission Line project (Proposed Project) includes construction and operation of a new 230-kV transmission line between the existing Sycamore Canyon and Peñasquitos Substations. The Proposed Project would be located within the Cities of San Diego and Poway in existing San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) right-of-way (ROW) or franchise. A portion of the Proposed Project would be located on the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar east of Interstate 15 (I-15). The Sycamore-Peñasquitos corridor traverses residential, open space, military (MCAS Miramar), vacant land, urban, commercial/shopping, industrial/energy facility, park, transportation, and light industrial/business park uses.

The SDG&E Proposed Project includes four transmission line segments and minor modifications to four existing substations:

- **Segment A: Sycamore Canyon Substation to Carmel Valley Road.** SDG&E would construct an approximately 8.31-mile long 230-kV transmission line on 36 new double-circuit 230-kV and two 138-kV tubular steel poles (120-foot and 75-foot average height, respectively) from the Sycamore Canyon Substation to Carmel Valley Road. Two existing transmission lines (TL 13820 and TL 13825, which both terminate at Chicarita Substation) would be relocated to the new tubular steel poles, and approximately 42 wood H-frame structures, two tubular steel poles, one double-circuit cable pole, and two single-circuit wood mono poles associated with the two existing transmission lines would be removed. A portion of TL 13820 would be undergrounded as it enters the Sycamore Canyon Substation. Existing transmission line TL 23041 would be relocated to two new 230-kV structures within and immediately adjacent to the Sycamore Canyon Substation to make room for the new 230-kV connection at the substation.
- **Segment B: Underground Carmel Valley Road.** SDG&E would construct an approximately 2.84-mile long 230-kV underground transmission line in Carmel Valley Road. Two cable pole structures (160-foot average height) for underground/overhead transmission conversion would be placed at the ends of the undergrounded segment. One double-circuit steel lattice tower would be removed at the western reach of the segment. Also, one 138-kV single circuit wood H-frame structure would be removed.

SCOPING REPORT
Introduction

- **Segment C: Carmel Valley Road to Peñasquitos Junction.** SDG&E would install approximately 2.19 miles of 230-kV conductor on existing steel lattice structures and one new tubular steel pole between Carmel Valley Road and Peñasquitos Junction. One steel lattice tower would be removed at the Peñasquitos Junction. Two existing transmission lines (TL 23001 and TL 23004) would be reconducted and bundled on the existing structures and re-designated as TL 23004. Existing shield wire on top of existing 230-kV steel lattice towers would be replaced with new optical ground wire.
- **Segment D: Peñasquitos Junction to Peñasquitos Substation.** SDG&E would install approximately 3.34 miles of 230-kV conductor on existing double-circuit lattice towers and a tubular steel pole between the Peñasquitos Junction and the Peñasquitos Substation. SDG&E would also consolidate two existing 69-kV power lines (TL 675 and TL 6906) onto 17 new 69-kV tubular steel poles (95-foot average height) that would replace 16 existing 69 kV wood H-frame structures and five wood monopoles. Two tubular steel poles would replace two existing wood cable poles outside the Peñasquitos Substation. Existing shield wire on top of existing 230-kV steel lattice towers would be replaced with new optical ground wire.
- **Sycamore Canyon Substation.** SDG&E would modify Sycamore Canyon Substation to facilitate the new 230-kV transmission line connection. Modifications would include transferring five existing transmission lines from existing bay positions to new bay positions, and adding a new circuit breaker.
- **Peñasquitos Substation.** SDG&E would modify Peñasquitos Substation to facilitate the new 230-kV transmission line connection. Modifications would include adding two circuit breakers and four disconnects.
- **San Luis Rey and Mission Substations.** Minor alterations may be made to these substations, including adjusting relays and upgrading protection on remaining lines.
- **Temporary Staging Yards.** The Proposed Project would utilize temporary construction staging yards for vehicles equipment refueling, pole assemblage, open storage of material and equipment, construction trailers, portable restrooms, parking, lighting, possibly generator use for temporary power in construction trailers, and incidental landing areas for helicopters. SDG&E is currently refining final staging yard locations and needs.
- **Access Roads.** Construction would primarily take place within the existing SDG&E ROW easements and access roads and public roadways. Most work areas would be accessible by vehicle on unpaved SDG&E-maintained access roads or by overland travel. Access roads would be used for vehicle parking and turn-around, and specific construction site staging.

SCOPING REPORT
Introduction

1.1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Review

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is the lead agency for review of the Proposed Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because it has the principal responsibility for approving the Proposed Project (i.e., it must decide whether to approve or deny a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity [CPCN]).

1.2 PURPOSE OF SCOPING

This scoping report describes the CPUC's CEQA scoping process and contains the comments received on the Proposed Project during the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) scoping period. The CPUC will use scoping comments to:

- Define the issues and alternatives for the Proposed Project for evaluation in the EIR
- Focus the environmental analysis
- Identify potential environmental impacts for consideration in the EIR
- Identify potential mitigation measures for consideration in the EIR

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

1.3 SCOPING REPORT ORGANIZATION

The scoping report is organized into the following sections:

- **Section 1, Introduction:** provides an overview of the scoping report
- **Section 2, Project Scoping:** describes the CEQA EIR scoping process
- **Section 3, Scoping Comments:** lists commenters who provided comments during the EIR scoping period and summarizes key issues raised during the scoping period
- **Section 4, Summary of Future Steps in the Planning Process:** briefly describes the future steps in the planning process

The scoping report appendices contain materials and documents used and received during the EIR scoping period. The following appendices are included:

- **Appendix A, Notice of Preparation:** Copy of the Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- **Appendix B, Scoping Meeting Materials:** Written comment form, speaker request form, scoping meeting sign-in sheets, and scoping meeting presentation
- **Appendix C, Scoping Meeting Transcripts:** Transcripts of scoping meetings, including verbal scoping comments
- **Appendix D, Newspaper Advertisements and Fliers:** Newspaper advertisements for the NOP and posted fliers
- **Appendix E, Comments Received Before the Scoping Period:** Comment letters received before the start of the scoping period

SCOPING REPORT
Introduction

- **Appendix F, Comments Received During the Scoping Period:** Comment letters received during the scoping period
- **Appendix G, Comments Received After the Scoping Period:** Comment letters received after the close of the scoping period (prior to the publishing of this scoping report)

2 PROJECT SCOPING

2.1 OVERVIEW

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

2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The CPUC determined that the appropriate environmental document to prepare for the Proposed Project would be an EIR. The CPUC issued an NOP on August 11, 2014, to inform the public and agencies of its intention to prepare an EIR (see Appendix A). The NOP also solicited comments on the scope of the EIR during a 30-day scoping period, which began on August 18, 2014, and ended on September 16, 2014. Table 2.2-1 contains CEQA NOP requirements and describes how the CPUC distributed the NOP.

Table 2.2-1: Summary of CEQA NOP Requirements and CPUC Noticing

CEQA Requirement	CPUC Noticing
To each responsible ¹ and trustee agency ² advising them of its intention to prepare an EIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15082).	✓
Consultation with persons and organizations prior to completing the Draft EIR is optional under CEQA. When such scoping occurs, it should be a part of agency consultation under Section 15082 to the extent that combining agency consultation and public scoping is feasible (CEQA Guidelines § 15083).	✓ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provided newspaper notice (UT San Diego, Central Edition; UT San Diego, North County Edition; and San Diego Business Journal) and posted fliers. 2. Posted NOP and scoping meeting times and locations to CPUC project website. 3. Distributed direct mailing well beyond requirements of CEQA. The NOP was mailed to all properties within 1,000 feet of the Proposed Project alignment and to parties who had requested notification or submitted their addresses. 4. Met with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) staff on August 26, 2014. 5. Conducted outreach to tribal governments.
Notes:	
¹ Any public agency, other than the lead agency, that has discretionary approval power over a project (CEQA Guidelines § 15381).	
² State agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of California (CEQA Guidelines § 15386).	

2.3 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

The CPUC held three public scoping meetings on August 25, 2014, and August 26, 2014, at the DoubleTree Golf Resort in San Diego, California. The dates and locations of the scoping meetings are summarized in Table 2.3-1. The CPUC described the Proposed Project and potential alternatives and impacts that would be addressed in the EIR. The CPUC also accepted verbal and written comments at the scoping meetings. Appendix B contains materials from the scoping meetings. The transcripts from the scoping meetings are provided in Appendix C.

Date and Time	Meeting Location	Sign-Ins	Oral Comments	Written Comments
August 25, 2014 6:30 PM	DoubleTree Golf Resort 14455 Peñasquitos Drive San Diego, CA 92129	32	6	3
August 26, 2014 2:00 PM	DoubleTree Golf Resort 14455 Peñasquitos Drive San Diego, CA 92129	14	0	0
August 26, 2014 6:30 PM	DoubleTree Golf Resort 14455 Peñasquitos Drive San Diego, CA 92129	12	2	2

2.4 NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS AND POSTED FLIERS

2.4.1 Newspaper Advertisements

The dates and locations of the public scoping meetings were advertised in three local newspapers. The advertisements provided a brief summary of the Proposed Project and encouraged attendance at the public meetings to share comments on the Proposed Project. The advertisements were placed in the newspapers presented in Table 2.4-1. The advertisements are provided in Appendix D.

Publication	Advertisement Date
UT San Diego, Central Edition	August 18, 2014 August 23, 2014
UT San Diego, North County Edition	August 18, 2014 August 23, 2014
San Diego Business Journal	August 18, 2014 August 25, 2014 ¹
<p>Note:</p> <p>¹ A corrected advertisement was published in the San Diego Business Journal on August 25, 2014, at no charge due to a publishing error in the August 18, 2014, advertisement.</p>	

SCOPING REPORT
Project Scoping

2.4.2 Posted Fliers

Fliers were posted in locations close to the Proposed Project and conceptual alternative alignments. The fliers provided an additional means of advertising the public meetings. Information posted on fliers included a brief summary of the Proposed Project and encouraged attendance at the public meetings. All fliers were posted on August 18, 2014. The fliers were placed in the locations presented in Table 2.4-2. The flier is provided in Appendix D.

Table 2.4-2: Posted Flier Locations	
Location	Location
Torrey Hills Park Intersection of Calle Mejillones and Calle Mar de Mariposa San Diego, CA 92130	Sabre Springs Park Intersection of Sabre Springs Parkway and Evening Creek Drive South San Diego, CA 92128
Ocean Air Recreation Center 4770 Fairport Way San Diego, CA 92130	Aldercrest Point 11722 Aldercrest Point San Diego, CA 92131
Sage Canyon Park 5252 Harvest Run Drive San Diego, CA 92130	Torrey Highlands Dog Park 4792 Torrey Circle San Diego, CA 92130
Canyonside Recreation Facility 12350 Black Mountain Road San Diego, CA 92129	Torrey Corner Shopping Center 1130 East Ocean Air Drive, #110 San Diego, CA 92130
Spring Canyon Park 10907 Scripps Poway Parkway San Diego, CA 92131	Intersection of Manorgate Drive and Laurelcrest Drive San Diego, CA 92130
Scripps Ranch Community Services 11885 Cypress Canyon Road San Diego, CA 92131	Briarlake Woods Drive Briarlake Woods San Diego, CA 92130
Views West Park 12958 La Tortola San Diego, CA 92129	Peñasquitos Creek Park 7930 Park Village Drive San Diego, CA 92129
Hilltop Community Park 9711 Oviedo Way San Diego, CA 92129	Santa Fe Canyon Place 6941 Santa Fe Canyon Place San Diego, CA 92129
Black Mountain Ranch Park 12115 Black Canyon Mountain Road San Diego, CA 92129	Evergreen Nursery 13650 Carmel Valley Road San Diego, CA 92130
Torrey Del Mar Park Intersection of Torrey Del Mar Lane and Kerry Lane San Diego, CA 92130	Harvest View Way 10401 – 10433 Harvest View Way San Diego, CA 92128
Nationallink, Inc. 10641 Scripps Summit Court San Diego, CA 92131	Scripps Ranch Recreation Center 11454 Blue Cypress Drive San Diego, CA 92131
Plaza Rancho Peñasquitos 9845 – 9975 Carmel Mountain Road San Diego, CA 92129	Rasmussen Way 14134 Rasmussen Way San Diego, CA 92128

SCOPING REPORT
Project Scoping

Table 2.4-2 (Continued): Posted Flier Locations

Location	Location
Freeport Court Intersection of Freeport Road and Freeport Court San Diego, CA 92129	Poway Branch, San Diego County Library 13137 Poway Road Poway, CA 92064
Quinton Road 13701 – 13755 Quinton Road San Diego, CA 92129	Rancho Peñasquitos Branch Library 13330 Salmon River Road San Diego, CA 92129
Sundevil Way Intersection of Sundevil Way and Bassmore Drive San Diego, CA 92129	Carmel Mountain Ranch Branch Library 12095 World Trade Drive San Diego, CA 92128
Vons 4267 Carmel Mountain Road San Diego, CA 92130	

2.5 AGENCY AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION

The CPUC Project Manager and Panorama Environmental, Inc., met with USFWS, CDFW, and City of San Diego MSCP staff on August 26, 2014, to discuss the biological resources that exist in and around the Proposed Project alignment.

DUKE Cultural Resources Management, Inc., contacted 20 tribes in mid-August 2014 to invite them to participate in the scoping process. Tribes were contacted first by mail, then by email, and finally by a follow-up email. Table 2.5-1 lists the tribes that were contacted during the scoping period.

Table 2.5-1: Tribes Invited to Participate in Scoping

Tribe	Tribe
Campo Band of Mission Indians	Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Ewiiapaayp Tribe	Pala Band of Mission Indians
Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Protection Council	Pauma Valley Band of Luiseno Indians
Jamul Indian Village	Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee	Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee	San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy	Soboba Band of Mission Indians
LaPosta Band of Mission Indians	Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Lipay Nation of Santa Isabel	Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Manzanita Band of Mission Indians	

2.6 OUTREACH

2.6.1 Email Address

The CPUC established an email address for the Proposed Project (sycamorepenasquitos@panoramaenv.com) to provide an alternate means of submitting comments on the scope of the EIR. The email address was provided on meeting handouts and posted on the CPUC website (see Section 2.6.2). The CPUC considered all comments received by email and incorporated them into this report.

2.6.2 Internet Website

The CPUC publicized information about the Proposed Project through a project website. The website serves as an additional public venue to learn about the Proposed Project. During the scoping period, the website included electronic versions of the project application, NOP, location and times of scoping meetings, and project-related maps. The website will remain a public resource for the Proposed Project and will announce any future public meetings and/or hearings. The website address is:

http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/panoramaenv/Sycamore_Penasquitos/index.html

3 SCOPING COMMENTS

This section summarizes the comments raised by the public and agencies during the scoping process for the EIR. All written and oral comments received during the public comment period, during the public scoping meetings, and through email were reviewed for this report and for consideration in preparation of the EIR. Comments received prior to the start of the scoping period (August 11, 2014) were also considered for this report and for the EIR. Comments continued to be received after the close of the scoping period (September 16, 2014). Some of these comments were received and documented in this scoping report. All comments will be considered by the CPUC during the development of the Draft EIR, whether or not they were submitted in time to be included in this scoping report. Section 3.3 summarizes the comments in relation to human environment issues and concerns, physical environment issues and concerns, and alternatives. All written comments received before the opening of scoping, during the scoping period, and after the close of scoping are provided in Appendices E, F, and G, respectively. Oral comments are recorded in the scoping meeting transcripts, provided in Appendix C.

3.1 SCOPING PERIOD COMMENTERS

Table 3.1-1 summarizes the federal agencies, state agencies, local agencies, and organizations that provided comments during the scoping period. Table 3.1-2 summarizes the individuals who provided comments during the scoping period. Multiple dates indicate that multiple comments were received from the commenter, including when the same date is entered multiple times.

SCOPING REPORT
Scoping Comments

Table 3.1-1: Agency and Organization Scoping Period Commenters	
Commenter	Date Received
State Agencies	
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	9/12/2014
California Native American Heritage Commission	8/14/2014
Local Agencies	
City of Poway	9/11/2014
City of San Diego	9/16/2014
Tribal Governments	
Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians	8/20/2014
Private Organizations and Companies	
Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee	8/25/2014 9/11/2014
Poway Unified School District	8/25/2014 9/8/2014
San Diego Gas & Electric	9/16/2014
San Diego Land Lawyers, on behalf of Kilroy Realty	9/16/2014
Torrey Santa Fe Homeowners Association	9/5/2014

SCOPING REPORT
Scoping Comments

Table 3.1-2: Individual Scoping Period Commenters			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Xiliang Bao	9/5/2014	Raymond Liu ¹	9/15/2014
Mark Baysinger	9/15/2014	Christina Mannion	9/14/2014
Commenter ³	9/15/2014	B. Marathe	9/5/2014
Josephine Bravo	9/15/2014	Irina Masarsky ¹	9/15/2014
Pablo Bravo	9/15/2014	Michael Masarsky ¹	9/15/2014
Christian Buckley	9/9/2014	Tom Mayo	9/7/2014
Xia Cao ¹	9/15/2014	DeForest McDuff ¹	9/15/2014
Chong Chen	8/28/2014	Susan McDuff ¹	9/15/2014
Laura Copic	8/25/2014 9/15/2014	Beth McNeill	8/24/2014
Caroline Davis ¹	9/15/2014	Vinod Menon	8/25/2014
Chris Davis ¹	9/15/2014	Omez Mesina	9/5/2014
Neeraj Deshmukh	9/15/2014	Commenter ³	9/15/2014
De Diep ¹	9/14/2014 9/15/2014	Stephen Nussbaum	8/25/2014
Julie Diep ¹	9/15/2014	Sunju Park ¹	9/15/2014 9/15/2014
Deborah Ditter	9/3/2014	Ajit Prasad	9/16/2014
Young Rang Do ¹	9/15/2014	Jennifer Purczynski	9/11/2014
Michael Doering	8/26/2014 8/26/2014	Ansha Purwar	9/13/2014
Aimee Farr	9/16/2014	Tariq Rana	9/15/2014
Scott Farr	9/15/2014	Anne Richter	8/25/2014 8/25/2014
Leonard Foster	9/5/2014	Alexandria Risso ¹	9/15/2014
Judy Gaukel	9/4/2014	Murray Risso ¹	9/15/2014
Yurong Guo ¹	9/15/2014	Chris Rosin	9/13/2014
Fred Hammond	9/16/2014	Marc Rubenzik	9/13/2014
Carolyn Hawley	9/16/2014	Tammy Rubenzik	9/13/2014
Richard Hofstetter	9/5/2014	Saritha Sakamuri ¹	9/15/2014
Patrick Hosein	9/3/2014	Sukumar Sakamuri ¹	9/15/2014
Ming Hu	8/26/2014	Sharon Schwad ¹	9/15/2014

SCOPING REPORT
Scoping Comments

Table 3.1-2: Individual Scoping Period Commenters

Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Daniel Jackson	8/26/2014 8/26/2014	Derek Schwartz	9/16/2014
Barry Jantz	8/13/2014	Lori Scott	8/12/2014
Danielle Kerper ¹	9/15/2014	Lianhe Shao ¹	9/16/2014
Menke Kevin ¹	9/15/2014	Jason Stewart	9/16/2014
Daehyon Kim ¹	9/15/2014 9/15/2014	Han Suh ¹	9/15/2014
Jieun Kim ¹	9/15/2014	Denise Teuber	9/5/2014
Nam Kim ¹	9/15/2014	Unknown Female ²	8/26/2014
Peter Kounelis	9/5/2014	Kodi V. ¹	9/15/2014
Grazyna Krajewska	8/26/2014 8/26/2014 9/15/2014	Siva V. ¹	9/15/2014
Barb Krass	8/26/2014	Jeff VanderWal	9/15/2014
Poonam Krishnam	9/15/2014	Dongmei Wei	9/5/2014
Levi Kuknariev ¹	9/15/2014	Sumarlin William ¹	9/15/2014
Yuan Kang Lee	8/26/2014	Qun Wu	9/15/2014
Wuxiang Liao ¹	9/15/2014	Andrew Zack	9/1/2014
Jay Libman	9/15/2014	Yiru Zhou	9/16/2014
Vicki Libman	9/15/2014	Ayesha Zierhut ¹	9/15/2014 9/15/2014
Katherine Liu ¹	9/15/2014	Matt Zierhut ¹	8/27/2014 9/15/2014

Notes:

- ¹ Lianhe Shao submitted a comment on behalf of the Carriage Run Community. Commenter was included as a resident of the Carriage Run Community.
- ² Commenter spoke at scoping meeting and did not identify herself by name.
- ³ Commenter requested to remain anonymous in the scoping report.

3.2 COMMENTERS OUTSIDE OF SCOPING PERIOD

3.2.1 Commenters

A summary of the agencies, organizations, and individuals who provided comments outside of the scoping period is presented in Table 3.2-1. Multiple dates indicate that multiple comments were received from the commenter.

SCOPING REPORT
Scoping Comments

Table 3.2-1: Commenters Who Provided Comments Outside of the Scoping Period			
Commenter	Date Received	Commenter	Date Received
Local Agencies		Minh Le	9/17/2014
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce	8/5/2014	Randy Lenac	8/8/2014
Private Organizations and Companies		Brian Miller	7/30/2014
Alter	9/18/2014	Chris Miller	9/18/2014
Individuals		Leslie Miller	9/18/2014
Theresa Andrews	8/8/2014	Commenter ¹	5/21/2014 9/18/2014
Commenter ¹	4/28/2014 5/5/2014 9/18/2014	Stephen Nussbaum	5/4/2014
Dwight Baker	5/6/2014	Tamara Pan	9/17/2014
Niel Berkley	9/17/2014	Patty Pardo	5/6/2014
Commenter ¹	9/18/2014	Vandana Prasad	9/17/2014
Josephine Bravo, as leader of petition	5/30/2014	Danielle Schaffer	9/17/2014
Pablo Bravo, as leader of petition	5/30/2014	Greg Scott	9/17/2014
Christian Buckley	5/1/2014	Dianne Sievenpiper	9/17/2014
Brit Coupens	7/25/2014	Harold Todus	8/8/2014
Gaurav Goel	9/17/2014	Monique Tu	9/17/2014
Fred Hammond	5/11/2014	Jen VanderVeer	7/4/2014
Kani Han	9/17/2014	Rich Volker	7/21/2014
Jennifer Hou	9/23/2014	Wei Wang	9/17/2014
Gregg Imamoto	9/17/2014	Huirong Xie	9/17/2014
Grazyna Krajewska	8/7/2014		
Note: ¹ Commenter requested to remain anonymous in the scoping report.			

3.2.2 Petitions

Two petitions were created by members of the public in response to the Proposed Project and submitted before the start of the scoping period. Table 3.2-2 summarizes the individuals who signed the petitions.

SCOPING REPORT
Scoping Comments

Table 3.2-2: Individuals Who Signed Petitions

Individual	Individual	Individual	Individual
Petition Led by Commenter¹			
A. S. Abulencia	Mike Gore	Compton Martins	Mike Stringer
Robert Arend	Sandra Gore	Rita Maumausolo	Tim Swann
Commenter ¹	Roger Gornichoc	Sivakumar Mungosan	Ron Tindell
John Barion	Dustin Hunter	Hung Nguyen	Carl Umland
Paltraud Barton	Jimmi Huynh	Stephen Nussbaum	Patricia Vlasin
Waultraud Barton	Judith Hwang	Laura Pomeroy	Leslie Wagner
Wyloma Bradshaw	Jeffrey Lee	Uma B. Rao	Ronald Walker
Steve Bunk	Shirley Lyon	Michael Riches	Ronald Wallace
Shamby Dahlke	Heldy Magalloma	Jason Stampfl	Chien Chung Yang
Monique Evans	Mario Mejia	Karen Stringer	
Petition Led by Josephine Bravo and Pablo Bravo			
Neil Berkley	Gaurav Goel	Poonam Krishnam	Robert Schaffer
Andy Bermudec	Steve Hansen	Minh Le	Greg Scott
Josephine Bravo	Carolyn Hawley	Xilun LeBlanc	Dianne Sevenpiper
Pablo Bravo	Wenqi Hu	Hongwen Lu	Matthew Waizmann
Daisy Brum	Barbara Imamoto	Kim McNamara	Wei Wang
Gabrielle Doss	Valerie Kaenel	Ajit Prasad	
Leah Feco	Manisha Kanodia	David S.	
Note:			
¹ Commenter requested to remain anonymous in the scoping report.			

3.3 KEY ISSUES RAISED DURING PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

3.3.1 Human Environment Issues and Concerns

Some commenters expressed concerns regarding the potential effects of the Proposed Project on the human environment, which included conflicts with existing land uses, impacts to property values, safety and fire risks, health and safety impacts of increased emissions from electric and magnetic fields (EMFs), impacts to views, and noise.

Conflicts with Existing Land Uses

The largest concern regarding existing land uses was the proposed use of two staging yards for the Proposed Project. The concerns centered on the Carmel Valley Road Staging Yard and the Torrey Santa Fe Staging Yard. Poway Unified School District (Poway Unified) strongly opposed use of the Carmel Valley Road Staging Yard because it would be located on Poway Unified property on a site that is currently scheduled for construction of a new school facility. Poway Unified stated that the property was selected without request for permission and requested the removal of the Carmel Valley Road Staging Yard from consideration as a potential staging yard. San Diego Land Lawyers, on behalf of Kilroy Realty, similarly expressed their opposition to the use of the Torrey Santa Fe Staging Yard and stated that no one communicated with Kilroy Realty regarding its use. Kilroy Realty requested to remove the Torrey Santa Fe Staging Yard from the list of potential staging yards.

A number of residents expressed concern with the placement of towers and transmission and power lines near their homes. The Carmel Valley and Rancho Peñasquitos communities, near parts of Segments A and D, believed they were particularly burdened by the addition of towers and lines and requested undergrounding portions of the alignment closest to homes as an alternative.

The Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve was another area of concern. Friends of the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve, as well as members of the public, articulated their apprehension about the potential impact of the Proposed Project on wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve. Many of these individuals were also concerned about the potential impact of the Proposed Project to recreational uses in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve, particularly regarding potential trail closures during project construction.

Impacts to Property Values

Property owners were concerned with the potential of the Proposed Project to negatively affect the value of their property. They asserted that their property value would decrease as a result of the Proposed Project, primarily due to towers and lines degrading the views from their homes and increases in EMF.

Safety and Fire Risks

Residents from the Torrey Santa Fe community adjacent to the proposed Torrey Santa Fe Staging Yard expressed their concerns for safety and access to the community. Torrey Santa Fe Road is the only access route into and out of the community, and residents felt that increased traffic congestion due to worker access to the staging yard would impede egress from the area, particularly in the case of a wildfire. Residents requested to either move the staging yard to a different location or for an emergency access route to be built for their use. They similarly expressed concerns for access into and out of the Del Mar Mesa Preserve.

Other residents expressed concern about the risk of wildfires and implementation of fire management. Some residents felt that towers placed in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve would increase the risk of fire in the area, especially given current drought conditions. Poway

SCOPING REPORT
Scoping Comments

Unified, as well as some members of the public, also expressed concern for the safety of students from wildfire. Some members of the public requested that the EIR include appropriate measures to address the risk of wildfire.

Along with fire risk, Poway Unified and residents expressed concern for safety of students from other hazards, such as accidental injury as a result of access to staging yards and general hazards associated with project construction. Sunset Hills Elementary School, Black Mountain Middle School, Mt. Carmel High School, and Sage Canyon Elementary School were specifically mentioned as schools whose students may be impacted. Some residents requested that the EIR address all potential safety impacts to students, parents, and educational programs and facilities. Poway Unified highlighted that there are regulations that mandate how close a school may be to transmission lines.

Health and Safety Impacts of EMF

A major concern was the potential health and safety issues resulting from increased EMF. Concerns dominantly came from neighborhoods where towers and lines would be placed in close proximity to existing towers and lines and possibly closer to homes than existing towers and lines.

Residents wanted to know how much EMF would increase with the Proposed Project and requested a comparison of existing EMF from the existing transmission line and projected EMF with addition of the proposed transmission line. They were concerned with significant health risks associated with prolonged exposure to increased EMF. In particular, many commenters were concerned for the health and safety of children and raised the issue that there may be a potential link between prolonged exposure to high EMF and childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Some residents inquired into possible mitigation that would increase shielding or insulation that would reduce EMF. Other residents wanted to know if undergrounding the Proposed Project would reduce EMF.

Impacts to Views

Another chief concern was the potential of the Proposed Project to alter views. Residents felt that additional towers, poles, and lines would impede the views from homes, schools, roadways, trails, and parks. Many expressed concern with the proximity of the Proposed Project to their homes, stating that visual impacts would increase the closer the towers and lines were placed to their property. Some residents were concerned with the views of staging yards and wished not to be burdened with the sight of heavy construction equipment and temporary sanitary facilities.

Residents felt the views assessed in SDG&E's Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) did not accurately reflect the views that would be seen from homes. A number of residents were concerned that the visual simulations presented in the PEA did not show the cumulative visual impact from the existing and proposed towers and lines.

Noise

Residents expressed concern for noise during construction and operation of the Proposed Project. They inquired as to how much corona noise would increase from ambient noise levels with the addition of the Proposed Project and requested an evaluation of the combined corona noise level from the existing and proposed transmission lines. MSCP staff requested that the Proposed Project avoid construction noise during sensitive species breeding seasons within the City of San Diego's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and, if this was not possible, stated that mitigation would be required.

3.3.2 Physical Environment Issues and Concerns

Some public comments focused on the potential impacts the Proposed Project may have on the physical environment, particularly on biological resources.

Biological Resources

CDFW and MSCP staff requested that protocol-level surveys for sensitive species be completed prior to release of the Draft EIR to ensure that biological resource issues are effectively addressed and mitigated in the draft document. Both agencies expressed concern with avoiding development or conversion of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values and requested that special attention be given to the potential presence of vernal pools within or in close proximity to impact areas.

MSCP staff also asked that the Draft EIR address any potential impacts to wildlife corridors within the MHPA. Members of the public were similarly concerned that construction would cause displacement of animals in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve. Residents requested a thorough evaluation of biological resources to effectively mitigate potential impacts to biological resources.

3.3.3 Alternatives

Many commenters expressed concern with the proposed route of the Proposed Project. The majority of comments focused on undergrounding the Proposed Project and/or relocating towers and lines.

Undergrounding

Residents have asked why undergrounding the Proposed Project is not possible. They felt that undergrounding would resolve their concerns with visual impacts, noise impacts, and EMF, and that undergrounding would not be cost-prohibitive.

Residents suggested multiple alternatives to the Proposed Project, and many stated their preferred alternative would be to underground the entire alignment. They requested either to underground the entire Proposed Project or small portions of the Proposed Project that are closest to homes. Members of the Carmel Valley and Rancho Peñasquitos communities were particularly interested in undergrounding where the Proposed Project would be located near homes.

SCOPING REPORT
Scoping Comments

Relocating Towers, Poles, and Transmission and Power Lines

If undergrounding was not possible, many residents requested that towers, poles, transmission lines, and power lines be relocated as far away from homes and existing towers as possible. Residents in the Carmel Valley area were specifically interested in moving towers and lines along Segment D approximately 200 feet farther away from homes but still within the existing right-of-way. Other residents suggested moving towers and lines to other canyons to avoid homes. Some residents felt that relocating the Proposed Project farther from homes would help mitigate possible increases in EMF and negative impacts on property values.

4 SUMMARY OF FUTURE STEPS IN THE CEQA PROCESS

Scoping is the first step of the EIR process. There are many steps remaining before completion of the CEQA process for the Proposed Project. This section describes the steps of the CEQA process that will occur following the conclusion of the EIR scoping period. Table 4-1 shows the completed and next steps in the CEQA process for the Proposed Project.

Table 4-1: Future Steps in the CEQA Process		
Item	Description	Approximate Date
Completed Events/Documents		
NOP	Notice to informed agencies and the public of the CPUC's intent to prepare an EIR for the Proposed Project	August 11, 2014
NOP Public Review Period	Opportunity for the agencies and public to submit comments to the CPUC on the scope of the EIR	August 18, 2014, to September 16, 2014
Scoping Meetings	Meeting to provide agencies and the public information about the Proposed Project and to hear and accept comments on the scope of the EIR	August 25, 2014, and August 26, 2014
Scoping Report	Report that describes the scoping process, including public comment opportunities, as well as who commented and the substance of comments received during scoping	September 2014
Upcoming Events/Documents		
Draft EIR	Document that describes the Proposed Project, alternatives, impacts and mitigation, project need, and other CEQA topics	Spring 2015
Draft EIR Public Review Period	Opportunity for the agencies and public to submit comments to the CPUC on the content of the Draft EIR	45 days, beginning day of Draft EIR release
Draft EIR Public Meeting	Meeting to provide agencies and the public information about the content of the Draft EIR and to hear and accept comments on the content of the Draft EIR	During the Draft EIR public review period
Final EIR	Document that describes the Proposed Project, alternatives, impacts and mitigation, project need, and other CEQA topics, as well as addresses comments on the Draft EIR	Summer 2015
Certification of Final EIR and Project Decision	The CPUC will certify the EIR as being prepared pursuant to CEQA and will issue a Notice of Decision (NOD), triggering a 30-day appeal period	After Final EIR

SCOPING REPORT
Summary of Future Steps in the CEQA Process

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