

APPENDIX D

Summary of All Comments Received

- D-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts
- D-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies
- D-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Groups and Nonprofits
- D-4. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens
- D-5. Summary of Oral Comments
 - D-5a. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings
 - D-5b. Summary of Oral Comments Received on the Project Hotline
- D-6. Summary of Agency Consultations
- D-7. Summary of Tribal Government Consultations
- D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

APPENDIX D-1

Summary of Written Comments Received from
Government Agencies and Special Districts

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

| Date | From | Comments |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Federal Agencies | | |
| January 9, 2006 | U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Ivan Sosa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests information regarding cultural resources survey in YPG area, impacts to YPG natural and cultural resources and mitigation, and would like to know who the EIR/EIS team contacted at YPG to discuss the crossing of YPG. |
| January 24, 2006 | U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground Ivan Sosa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested the inclusion of raptor-safe specifications during construction of the DPV2 project to reduce the hazard of bird injury or death while perching on the transmission lines or towers. |
| State Agencies | | |
| January 6, 2006 | Arizona State Land Department James E. Gross, Project Leader II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Palo Verde Subalternate Route. • Harquahala West Subalternate Route would create visual impacts. • Processing of right of way applications through the Department's land holdings would require 18-24 months from the date of filing the initial application. |
| January 17, 2006 | Arizona Game and Fish Department William C. Knowles, Habitat Specialist | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States that special status species (details in attachment) have been documented to occur in the vicinity of the DPV2 project. Additional information can be found on the Department's website. • Prefers DPV2 project alternative in which DPV2 would be constructed adjacent to the existing DPV1. Supports construction of new transmission lines within existing utility corridors with existing lines because it minimizes impacts to wildlife. • Subalternate Route 2 traverses important wildlife habitat in Plomosa and Dome Rock Mountains, and would have significant adverse impacts to bighorn sheep and other wildlife species. • Subalternate Routes 3 and 4 may have significant adverse impacts to wildlife depending on project details. <p>Attachment: Special status species information from the Department's Heritage Data Management System.</p> |
| January 19, 2006 | California Department of Transportation, District 11 Mario H. Orso, Chief Development Branch Review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any work within Caltrans Right of Way (ROW) would require an encroachment permit. • Improvement plans for construction within State ROW would require various specific items that are listed. • Permit applications for portions of DPV2 project within State ROW must be stated in metric and English units. • Developer for work or improvements in State ROW must quantify environmental impacts (project level analysis) and complete appropriate mitigation measures. Developer must also procure necessary permits and approvals. |
| January 19, 2006 | Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Gerry Ramirez | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the time frame for beginning work in Arizona (AZ)? • How many times would DPV2 cross I-10 and US 95? Specify locations. • ADOT would require encroachment permits when DPV2 crosses I-10 and US 95. |

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

| Date | From | Comments |
|------------------|--|--|
| January 31, 2006 | California Department of Fish and Game Scott Dawson | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States applicant will consult the Natural Diversity Data Base (NDBB), the draft Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRMSHCP). • The project traverses portions of the Reche Canyon/Badlands planning area of the WRMSHCP. Species for units 2 and 3 are listed in the letter. • The project traverses the proposed Coachella Valley MSHCP. Some of the species addressed by the plan are identified in the letter. • The EIR/EIS should discuss project in relation to these HCPs and impacts should be categorized as permanent, temporary, or maintenance/management. • Distinguish mitigation between those required as part of the previous transmission line project and new impacts. • Requests updated biological studies should be conducted prior to any environmental or discretionary approvals. • Focused biological report should include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A complete assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to project area 2. Thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts 3. Range of alternatives should be analyzed 4. If applicable, a California Endangered Species Incidental Take Permit must be obtained 5. Department opposes the elimination of watercourses and/or their channelization or conversion to subsurface drains |

Regional Agencies

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| January 6, 2006 | South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Steve Smith, PhD, Program Supervisor – CEQA Section | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests copy of Draft EIR, including all air quality-related appendices and technical documents. • Recommends use of SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook or CARB-approved URBEMIS 2002 Model as guidance for air quality analysis. • Recommends identification of any potential adverse air quality impacts and air pollutant sources from all phases of the DPV2 project. • Recommends that a localized significance analysis and mobile source health risk assessment be performed. • SCAQMD has various resources that provide guidance on feasible mitigation measures as required by CEQA. |
|-----------------|---|---|

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

| Date | From | Comments |
|------------------------|--|--|
| County Agencies | | |
| January 3, 2006 | Imperial County, Planning & Development Services Jurg Heuberger, Planning & Development Services Department Director | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received Notice of Public Scoping Meetings/NOP on 11/29/05; however NOP states that all comments are due by 11/28/05. • Concerned that County and Palo Verde area residents did not receive proper notification of the DPV2 project (especially Subalternate Route 3 that traverses Palo Verde area) or the scoping meetings, and were unable to provide comments or attend the November 2005 scoping meetings. • Requests that affected jurisdictions and residents be provided proper notification and adequate time to identify potential impacts and mitigation measures, and respond to potential impacts. • Requests that Palo Verde Improvement Association be included as a repository site. • NOP Attachment 1 does not provide any reference to County plans or impacts to local agencies/residents. • Requests information regarding who was contacted at Palo Verde Irrigation District and Palo Verde County Water District for potential impacts or if the County was contacted when route was selected. • County must be able to review its plans and amend the affected Palo Verde portions prior to DPV2 project approval. Any General Plan amendment would require public meetings in the Palo Verde area to collect public input. • Selection of Subalternate Route 3 as preferred alternative would require a change to the Palo Verde Community Area Plan. <p>Attachment: Palo Verde Community Area Plan.</p> |
| January 18, 2006 | Maricopa County* Don Stapley, Chairman, Board of Supervisors Mary Rose Wilcox, Supervisor, District 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognizes the need for new transmission lines given California (CA) and AZ growth. • Understands that there are two potential transmission line corridors being considered in western Maricopa County. One is the preferred route that parallels the existing DPV1 north of I-10, and the second is an alternative that proceeds west from the Harquahala Generating Station south of I-10. The latter alternative would require a new corridor through Harquahala Valley. • Object to the establishment of a new transmission line (or corridor?) that would have a negative effect on the Harquahala community, including the farmland, and its future growth. • Request that the preferred route be approved, which would help mitigate impacts to the Harquahala Valley by placing DPV2 in an existing corridor. <p><small>*Submitted by Peter Martori (Martori Farms) on behalf of Maricopa County at January 18, 2006 scoping meeting that was conducted at the Harquahala Irrigation District in Tonopah, Arizona from 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm.</small></p> |
| City Agencies | | |
| January 6, 2006 | City of Calimesa Gabriel Elliott, Planning Manager | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about potential impacts to the planned future development within the City. • EIR should include detailed project description, related graphics of proposed facilities, and line of sight exhibits in addition to the impact discussion. Also describe and illustrate access roads and maintenance buildings. • Requests copy of Draft EIR. |

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

| Date | From | Comments |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| January 20, 2006 | City of Scottsdale, Water Resources Department David M. Mansfield, General Manager | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments limited to Arizona portion of DPV2 project, particularly in the vicinity of the Harquahala Irrigation District (HVID), that includes the Proposed Project and the Harquahala Subalternate Route. • The City owns agricultural land within HVID that in the future will have its water transported to the CAP canal through a new pipeline. • The City has identified the pipeline corridor, which south of I-10 runs north/south along Harquahala Valley Road from I-10 to 9 miles south of the interstate, and north of I-10 runs west-northwest along Salome Road for 8 miles, ending at the CAP canal. • Appears that the Harquahala Subalternate Route would cross City pipeline corridor at Harquahala Valley Road (south of the I-10), however it is unclear whether the Proposed Project would cross the pipeline corridor along Salome Road (north of I-10). • States that the final route must not impact the City's ability to utilize the identified pipeline corridor, and it must not have a negative impact on continued agricultural uses on or water deliveries to City land, and existing and future property values. |
| Special Districts | | |
| January 20, 2006 | Harquahala Valley Irrigation District William D. Baker (from Ellis & Baker Attorneys at Law) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HVID owns irrigation distribution system constructed from reinforced concrete. Harquahala West Alternative route could adversely interact with the reinforcing steel in HVID's irrigation structures through electromagnetic forces. • State that Harquahala West Alternative is not financially viable because increased land acquisition costs would negate any savings from shorter distance and fewer towers. • Supports placement of DPV2 in DPV1 corridor. <p>Attachment: 11/28/05 e-mail comment submitted during NOP scoping period.</p> |
| Tribal Governments | | |
| December 22, 2005 | Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Tribal Planning & Development Thomas Davis, Chief Planning Officer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPV2 project crosses exterior boundaries of the Reservation • Tribe has ordinance regulating development of public utility projects within the Reservation. Ordinance would require SCE to secure approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) prior to project construction. CUP requires written explanation of direct benefits gained by the Tribe and members through allowing DPV2 project to cross the Reservation. • Requests mitigation measure be added to DPV2 project requiring approval of Tribal CUP prior to project construction. |
| January 5, 2006 | White Mountain Apache Tribe, Historic Preservation Office Mark T. Altaha, Historic Preservation Officer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed DPV2 project information, and there is no need to send additional information. • No threat to Tribe's cultural properties or religious places. • DPV2 project can proceed with "No historic properties effected." • Any inadvertent discovery of sites/items with Apache cultural affiliation would require stoppage of DPV2 project construction and notification of proper authorities. |
| January 18, 2006 | Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe Greg Glassco | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AZ portion of DPV2 project would traverse the aboriginal homeland of the Tribe. • Requests that archaeological surveys of the alternatives be performed and the Tribe be given the opportunity to identify traditional cultural properties. • Concerned with transmitting clean power out of AZ to CA. • Concerned about impacts to cultural resources, wildlife, irrigated farmland, tribal land, Kofa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), BLM lands, recreational resources, and aesthetics. • Concerned about impacts to bighorn sheep as they are culturally significant to the Tribe. |

APPENDIX D-2

Summary of Written Comments Received
from Private Organizations and Companies

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

| Date | From | Comments |
|------------------|--|--|
| January 10, 2006 | The Tahiti Group Jack Vander Woude, Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• References a newspaper article regarding a proposed substation in Calimesa.• Owner of land traversed by existing transmission lines that is adjacent to proposed Calimesa substation.• Concerned about location of proposed Calimesa substation. |

APPENDIX D-3

Summary of Written Comments Received
from Groups and Nonprofits

Appendix D-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Groups and Nonprofits

| Date | From | Comments |
|------------------|--|--|
| January 17, 2006 | Maricopa Audubon Society Robert A. Witzman, MD, Conservation Chair | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the DPV2 project, especially through Kofa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), because it would create significant negative environmental impacts including habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that California (CA) does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of Arizona (AZ) will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |
| January 20, 2006 | Sierra Club - Grand Canyon Chapter Sandy Bahr, Conservation Outreach Director | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members enjoy and protect lands along DPV2 route. • Questions the need and purpose of the DPV2 project. Objectives of the DPV2 project can be better achieved through conservation, efficiency and use of renewables. Requests that these items be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPV2 has been in planning stages for 15 years and CA has been able to exist without the transmission line. The energy crisis of 2000-2001 was due to manipulation of the energy market, and not the lack of transmission. • The Phoenix metro area is rapidly growing, and therefore all power produced in the area will most likely stay in the area, and not be exported to CA. • There are alternatives to DPV2, such as energy efficiency and conservation programs, and investment in environmentally-friendly/sustainable/renewable energy sources, which have not been considered. Energy efficiency and clean renewable energy technologies are cheaper and better solutions than investing in more fossil fuel plants and long transmission lines. References solar and wind energy data. • Disagrees with the exclusionary clause in the Desert Wilderness Act that allowed DPV2. States that this clause is incompatible with wilderness and the refuge. In addition, DPV2 project is incompatible with the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System. This should be evaluated in the EIR/EIS and/or other NEPA documents. • DPV2 project would cause habitat fragmentation, reduce the quantity/quality of habitats, harm desert tortoise and bighorn sheep habitat, and obstruct views in Kofa NWR. • Four hundred acres of land in Kofa NWR would be affected through the use of the right of way (ROW) and construction of the Project, including 85 tower sites. Major impacts would include reduction of protective habitat, establishment of invasive species, and increase of illegal off road vehicle use. Mitigation of negative impacts to plant resources was not successful during DPV1 construction. • The proposed project and alternatives are not environmentally friendly because they would have impacts to visual and biological resources, and would go through populated areas. |

Appendix D-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Groups and Nonprofits

| Date | From | Comments |
|------------------|---|---|
| January 21, 2006 | Arizona Wilderness Coalition Jason Williams, Regional Director | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposed to projects that impact the natural desert landscape.• DPV1 has already impacted natural and recreational resources in Arizona, and DPV2 would only increase the existing impacts.• Support an alternative in which new transmission lines would not need to be constructed.• Request that the EIR/EIS addresses the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DPV2 project would create social, environmental, and economic impacts such as social inequity of creating power and impacts to visual resources, air quality, and habitats in AZ, while CA gets benefits of power; potential need for and impacts of AZ building more power plants because it sold all power to CA; and the environmental and social justice issues of CA being able to more easily create power and impacts in AZ rather than addressing its power needs within its own boundaries.• SCE's Implementation of conservation measures and use of renewable energy to account for CA energy needs.• Impacts to BLM areas being considered for wilderness (Ranegras Plain region east of the Kofa NWR).• Ensuring that construction stays within designated ROW and no impacts occur within existing wilderness due to trespass.• Methods that DPV2 project would protect natural resources in Kofa NWR.• Questions the following about the DPV2 project:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can existing towers be upgraded to hold additional transmission lines?• Can the corridor be made smaller to limit impact on the landscape?• The construction of new roads would have significant impact on wildlife and natural hydrologic cycles. How would SCE mitigate these impacts?• New roads would also spread noxious weeds such as Saharan mustard. SCE should propose and explicitly outline a mitigation plan to manage the spread of noxious weeds that includes annual monitoring and eradication.• How would temporary roads be restored and how much money would be allocated to these activities?• What assistance would SCE provide to BLM, USFWS, and AZ Game and Fish to maintain existing wildlife population levels, and how would this be monitored?• Mitigation measures proposed to limit impacts to birds perching on the power lines and towers.• Mitigation of existing and probable impacts from DPV1 and DPV2, respectively, on wildlife migration through SCE providing assistance to BLM in acquiring and enhancing other wildlife corridors, such as private lands south of Saddle Mountain.• Harquahala West alternative seems to be the most logical; why is this not the proposed project?• Suggests alternative of placing DPV2 in the I-10 corridor as there are existing impacts to wildlife movement. |

APPENDIX D-4

Summary of Written Comments Received
from Private Citizens

Appendix D-4. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens

| Date | From | Comments |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--|
| December 27, 2005 | George & Frances Alderson | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DPV2 project appears to traverse California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) lands, therefore the EIR/EIS should address the CDCA via narrative and maps. |
| January 9, 2006 | Krishan Knoles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOP fails to consider the direct impacts of increased dependence on nuclear power, and therefore increased nuclear waste. • States that it is environmentally irresponsible to construct infrastructure that relies on hazardous power generation. • Supports the New Generation option in which “cleaner” power sources, such as solar and wind, are used. |
| January 16, 2006 | Michael R. Colbert | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). |
| January 16, 2006 | Don Steuter | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, and questions the need for it to traverse Kofa NWR. • Recommends the greater use of renewable energy sources and energy conservation programs. |
| January 17, 2006 | Mark Hayduke Grenard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to DPV2 traversing Kofa NWR. • Impacts to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep, and disruption of views. • Questions need for DPV2 project. |
| January 17, 2006 | Mike Mullarkey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that California (CA) does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of Arizona (AZ) will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |
| January 17, 2006 | Tim Lengerich | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa NWR. |
| January 17, 2006 | Audrey Clark | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |
| January 17, 2006 | Cal Lash | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts. |
| January 17, 2006 | Frank Mackowski | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa NWR, because it will harm the Kofa NWR and wildlife, and it is unnecessary. |
| January 17, 2006 | Lance Moody | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |

Devers–Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line Project
ADDENDUM TO THE SCOPING REPORT

| | | |
|------------------|-------------------|--|
| January 17, 2006 | John P. Donovan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because it would cause habitat fragmentation in Kofa NWR and create negative visual impacts. • DPV2 project is unnecessary. |
| January 17, 2006 | Alan Cowan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa NWR. • Negative impacts would include destruction of views. • Suggests routing the DPV2 project through the military lands in the area rather than through the Kofa NWR. |
| January 18, 2006 | William Wesselink | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that California does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |
| January 18, 2006 | Linda S. Miller | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |
| January 18, 2006 | David Barnes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. • Supports keeping Kofa NWR wild and natural. |
| January 18, 2006 | David Dubé | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa NWR. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Questions if non-development alternatives such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project have been considered. • Supports efforts to protect wetlands and riparian areas. |
| January 18, 2006 | Alan Timmerman | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |

Devers–Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line Project
ADDENDUM TO THE SCOPING REPORT

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|
| January 18, 2006 | Tammy Snook | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa NWR. • Impacts from the DPV2 project would include harming plant and animal life in the NWR, destruction of landscape views, and construction of associated roads would encourage ATV use and further harm biological, geological, and cultural resources of the area. • DPV2 project is unnecessary; California can use solar power instead. |
| January 18, 2006 | Matthew Martin | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes new transmission lines, especially along Courthouse Road. • Opposes sending power to CA. CA should use solar and wind energy to generate their own power. • AZ gives energy to CA, while CA gives human waste to AZ. |
| January 18, 2006 | Jim Vaaler | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CA must generate power in CA via wind and solar sources, or through implementation of conservation measures. • Opposes additional transmission lines in AZ. • All DPV2 alternatives would adversely impact bighorn sheep and desert tortoise and their habitats. • Viewsheds from wilderness areas would be adversely impacted by new transmission line corridor, such as DPV2. |
| January 18, 2006 | Susan E. Haas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes Harquahala Valley West Alternative because it would negatively affect property values and destroy views. • Prefers the North route. |
| January 19, 2006 | John Alcock | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa NWR. • Impacts to the NWR would include destruction of visual resources, introduction of non-native plant species, illegal off-road vehicle use, habitat fragmentation, and harm to bighorn sheep. • Excess power generated at PVNGS will most likely go to Phoenix. |
| January 19, 2006 | Paul Bjornstad | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project, especially the portion through Kofa NWR. • Construction of access roads would open the area to off-road vehicle use. • NWRs supposed to protect lands from development. • Recommends energy conservation, use of renewable energy, and low-impact development. |
| January 20, 2006 | Lori Adkison | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |
| January 20, 2006 | Jean Myers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep. • Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future. • Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |

Devers–Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line Project
ADDENDUM TO THE SCOPING REPORT

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| January 20, 2006 | Patricia Kenyon | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposes DPV2 project because of significant negative environmental impacts that it would cause and it is not the best method to meet California's energy demand.• There is a clause in the Desert Wilderness Act that excluded a right-of-way for the second transmission line (DPV2) to cross the Kofa Wilderness, yet this is the primary route proposed for DPV2.• DPV2 project would cause habitat fragmentation, introduction of invasive species, illegal off-road vehicle use, and harm to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep.• Opposes the DPV2 alternatives• Questions the need for the DPV2 project given that CA does not seem to need the new transmission line, and the growth of AZ will most likely consume all locally produced energy in the future.• Recommends non-development alternative such as the implementation of energy conservation programs and the use of renewable/sustainable energy sources to offset the DPV2 project. |
| January 20, 2006 | Lon Stewart | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports the No Project Alternative and recommends that SCE offset the power supplied by the DPV2 project by implementing energy conservation measures and other "clean" methods.• Questions the need and usefulness of the DPV2 project. When DPV1 was built 25 years ago, Phoenix was small and there was excess power to transmit to CA; however currently Phoenix is rapidly growing and by some estimates will consume all of the power produced by AZ power plants in 5 years.• CA has managed fine without DPV2 for 15 years since it was initially permitted.• SCE should generate needed power in CA using "clean" methods. Likely that SCE would try to offset the "dirty" power imported into CA by swapping power or classifying "clean" or renewable power with "dirty" or coal generated power coming into CA.• Transmission lines are inefficient and lose power through heat loss. Instead of constructing DPV2, SCE should build smaller "clean" power plants close to the energy demand markets in CA.• Need to explore alternatives, such as energy storage systems that reduce peak local energy demand and shave peak power consumption. References ice thermal storage system used in Phoenix.• DPV2 project would create impacts to wildlife, especially desert tortoise and bighorn sheep in Kofa NWR, and to visual resources.• ROWs and access roads would encourage people to access the Kofa NWR.• Construction would create ground disturbance in the delicate desert ecosystem that would facilitate the establishment of invasive species and take a long time to recover. |
| January 23, 2006 | Alvin Johnson President, La Paz Valley Concerned Citizens | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attached a petition signed by 48 La Paz Valley landowners, known as the La Paz Valley Concerned Citizens.• Opposes DPV2 traversing the La Paz Valley, which is Subalternate Route 1. |

| | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| January 23, 2006 | Donald G. Begalke | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Member of Harquahala Valley group that was not notified about the DPV2 project or the scoping meetings, and therefore can not make an informed comment for the whole group, only himself.• DPV2 project is not necessary because SCE has not shown that its facilities/sources in its service area are unproductive, and therefore does not warrant supplemental power from AZ.• AZ is growing rapidly, and therefore the power produced in AZ must stay in the state.• If CA needs temporary supplemental power from AZ in the future, this could be accomplished using the existing system of transmission lines.• AZ residents should be concerned about the DPV2 project based upon its connection with a transmission line project originating at an Idaho coal-fired power plant. (Mentioned at scoping meeting in Avondale, AZ)• DPV2 project should be delayed due to the lack of notification provided about the Project and the scoping meetings.• Questions when scoping meeting attendees will receive a transcript of all comments made at NOP (CA) and NOI (AZ) scoping meetings. |
| January 24, 2006 | Jacoba van Sitteren | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposes DVP2 project.• Construction and maintenance of DPV2 project would cause impacts such as negative effects to desert tortoise and bighorn sheep, destruction of desert vegetation, introduction of invasive species, and illegal use of off-road vehicles.• Do not believe CA needs the power from DPV2. DPV2 has been proposed for 15 years and has not been necessary in that time span.• AZ, especially Phoenix area is growing rapidly and will consume all the energy that would be transmitted to CA via DPV2. |
| January 25, 2006 | Harry Thomas | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposes new transmission lines that would impact visual resources.• CA should build the power plant in CA, and not destroy AZ• Suggests routing DPV2 north of I-10 where there are existing access roads. |

APPENDIX D-5

Summary of Oral Comments

D-5a. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

D-5b. Summary of Oral Comments Received on the Project Hotline

APPENDIX D-5a

Summary of Oral Comments Received at
Scoping Meetings

Appendix D-5a. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

| Date | From | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| Scoping Meeting, January 18, 2006 (2:00 pm – 4:00 pm) – Avondale, AZ | | |
| January 18, 2006 | Harquahala Valley Irrigation District (HVID) William Baker (via Ellis & Baker Attorneys at Law) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes any consideration of the Harquahala West Subalternate Route (Harquahala West Alternative). This Subalternate Route traverses the middle of the HVID. • Understands the reason DPV2 would tie-in to the Harquahala Generating Station because it is bankrupt and the only way to make it operational from an economic point-of-view would be to enable it to connect to transmission lines, such as DPV2, to distribute the power it generates. However this does not justify taking private property and disrupting productive agricultural operations for the DPV2 project. • Agriculture in central Arizona (AZ), especially Maricopa and Pima Counties, is disappearing due to AZ water issues and the Indian Water Rights Settlement Act. Therefore remote areas of AZ, such as Harquahala, are the only viable areas for agriculture in AZ and Maricopa County. • The Harquahala West Subalternate Route would adversely impact the Harquahala Valley and its residents through destruction of the rural atmosphere; harm scenic and visual resources; remove cropland from production; interfere with tilling, irrigation and cropdusting practices; devalue land; and harm endangered species. • Believes the best option is the Proposed Project, which exits the Harquahala Generating Station switchyard to the east and parallels I-10 north of the Harquahala West Subalternate Route. The area to the east has less cropland; therefore there would be fewer impacts to agriculture. Also the option to the PVNGS (SCE Palo Verde Alternative) would also be more appropriate. • Intends to vigorously fight the Harquahala West Subalternate Route through processes offered by CPUC/BLM, Maricopa County, and Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC). |
| January 18, 2006 | Central Arizona Project /Central Arizona Water Conservation District Richard Gibson | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Arizona Project (CAP), also known as the Central Arizona Water Conservation District, (CAWCD) which is a municipal corporation of AZ and empowered by AZ and federal government. • CAP was turned over to the CAWCD for operation, maintenance, reconstruction, and repayment for infrastructure. In addition, it manages the lands under the CAP canal. • CAP contact and correspondence should be directed to Sharon Hood. • Map identifies that DPV2 crosses CAP canal in two locations and parallels it for several miles. SCE must obtain license to cross CAP canal and associated land. • CAP has a 22-foot diameter pre-stressed concrete cylinder pipe located in the area where DPV2 would run parallel to it after it crosses I-10. CAP has noticed that electromagnetic interference from DPV1 has potential to degrade the pipe. This pipeline is critical as it supplies all of AZ with water, and would require that any impacts from DPV2 to this pipeline be mitigated. |

Appendix D-5a. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

| Date | From | Comments |
|--|---|--|
| January 18, 2006 | Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter John Findley, Chair of Energy Committee | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand DPV2 project has been “in the works” for many years. The Project Purpose section of NOP only mentions that California (CA) needs the DPV2 project; there is no need for this project in AZ. Yet, CA portion of DPV2 project follows existing ROWs with little impact, but in AZ it would traverse new lands including Kofa NWR and agricultural lands. Therefore DPV2 project would be a benefit for CA, and a losing situation for AZ. AZ is growing and will need power, especially all the “clean” energy generated in AZ. CA requires clean energy through the importation of only “clean” energy, and does not allow “dirty” facilities. CA looking for “clean” energy sources, but AZ will need all the “clean” energy. There is a proposal for a transmission line from a coal power plant in Idaho to central AZ. CA will not permit this dirty energy to be directly imported into the state, therefore it is being routed to AZ where AZ will use the “dirty” energy and ship “clean” energy generated via wind or solar sources in AZ or New Mexico to CA. This proposal appears to be a “laundering scheme” in which CA can get energy from “dirty” sources while appearing to be actually using “clean” energy. Supports the No Project Alternative. |
| January 18, 2006 | Jim Walters | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that DPV2 project would traverse Kofa NWR, and cause impacts to native AZ wildlife resources that already have been decimated. DPV2 and its impacts are not necessary. |
| January 18, 2006 | City of Scottsdale; Harquahala Valley Farms; Vanderbilt Farms, LLC; ABCDW, LLC; Torrey Pines Development, LLC Valorie D. Melton, Consultant (via Five Star, Inc.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports William Baker’s (HVID) comments. Approximately 27 years ago, SCE attempted to route DPV1 through the same Harquahala Valley area. Opposes the Harquahala West Alternative, and objects that any routes through the Harquahala Valley are being considered again. There are numerous possible routes, but the decision has already been made because the Harquahala Valley land is the most financially attractive. Why is a route through the Harquahala Valley being considered again when there is much opposition to it. It is because SCE implies that the Harquahala Valley should not fight this because they are too small. There are many reasons why the Harquahala Valley should not be considered including the existence of prime agricultural lands, and landowners’ investment of \$100 million on their property. Landowners were not aware of the potential for DPV2 to traverse their property and the Harquahala Valley. Not a small concession to traverse the Harquahala Valley that consists of 20,000 acres of private and municipal land. A transmission line route through the Harquahala Valley was denied in the past; why has this route been identified again for use in DPV2? |
| Scoping Meeting, January 18, 2006 (6:30 pm – 8:30 pm) – Tonopah, AZ | | |
| January 18, 2006 | Martori Farms Peter Martori | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to Harquahala West Alternative or any other alternatives that bifurcates the Harquahala Valley. Supports the Proposed Project due to impacts that the Harquahala West Alternative would create including significant impacts to agricultural lands, visual/aesthetic resources, and property values. <p><small>*Submitted letter on behalf of Maricopa County dated 1/6/06 from Don Stapley, Chairman of Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, and Mary Rose Wilcox, Maricopa County Supervisor from District 5 to ACC documenting Maricopa County Board of Supervisors’ opposition to the Harquahala West Alternative and support for the Proposed Project that follows the existing DPV1. See Appendix D-1.</small></p> |

Appendix D-5a. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

| Date | From | Comments |
|---|---|--|
| January 18, 2006 | Jim Vaaler | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CA must generate its own power through wind or solar sources, or implementing energy conservation measures. • AZ does not need more transmission lines. • All alternatives would adversely impact bighorn sheep, desert tortoise, and viewsheds in wilderness areas. |
| January 18, 2006 | Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter Sandy Bahr | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly questions the need for the DPV2 project because AZ is growing quickly and may consume all the power produced in AZ. • Proposed Project and Alternatives would significantly impact Kofa NWR and other wilderness areas; wildlife in the area, including desert tortoise and bighorn sheep, and their habitat; and the viewshed. • CA should implement energy conservation measures, energy efficiency practices, and use of renewable energy sources, such as solar and wind to meet needs to offset energy supplied by DPV2. • Use of CA energy crisis as a scare tactic to illustrate the need for the DPV2 project and its approval is inappropriate because this crisis was not due to lack of transmission, but rather market manipulation. |
| January 18, 2006 | Lon Stewart | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Sierra Club's (Sandy Bahr) comments. • Showed an aerial photo of Phoenix (from AZ Republic advertisement entitled "Building Dreams") that identified planned new developments in the area. These developments will require more energy in the future; therefore the power generated in AZ should stay in AZ and not be transmitted to CA. |
| Scoping Meeting, January 19, 2006 (2:00 pm – 4:00 pm) – Quartzsite, AZ | | |
| January 19, 2006 | Al Johnson | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President of informal community group called La Paz Valley Concerned Citizens. • Understands that DPV2 is necessary and the associated benefits to society, but group does not want to sacrifice its lifestyle to accommodate DPV2. • Does not object to the existing DPV1 transmission line, but strongly opposes Subalternate Route 1. |
| January 19, 2006 | Vanguard Development LLC Jim Kunisch | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must have a good reason to deviate from the Proposed Project because the desert has already been disturbed (for DPV1) and there is no reason not to use this previously disturbed route for DPV2. |
| January 19, 2006 | Jewel Seim | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stray electric power and voltage is very dangerous to people, farm animals, and wildlife. • DPV2 goes through private land. • Opposes DPV2. |
| January 19, 2006 | Robert Heisel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 500 kV transmission line is too dangerous to develop within a 1/8th mile of people and residents. • Suggests locating DPV2 along the existing DPV1 ROW. |

APPENDIX D-5b

Summary of Oral Comments Received on
the Project Hotline

Appendix D-5b. Summary of Oral Comments Received on the Project Hotline

| Date | From | Comments |
|------------------|--|--|
| January 10, 2006 | The Tahiti Group Jack Vander Woude, Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Follow-up to 1/10/06 e-mail comment regarding a newspaper article about a proposed substation in Calimesa.• Owner of land in Beaumont traversed by existing transmission lines that is adjacent to proposed Calimesa substation.• Requests to speak with SCE spokesman, Paul Klein, referenced in newspaper article. |
| January 18, 2006 | Bill O'Brien | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objects to the DPV2 project traversing the Harquahala Valley.• Requests that DPV2 follow the same route as the transmission line that crosses the I-10 west of Tonopah. |

APPENDIX D-6

Summary of Agency Consultations

Appendix D-6. Summary of Agency Consultations

| Agency | Date | Issues Discussed |
|--|--|--|
| Federal | | |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | October 6, 2005 (phone call) November 1 and 3, 2005 (meeting) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting held in Blythe on November 1, 2005 with Refuge Manager for Kofa NWR to discuss the proposed project, potential effects and alternatives that would avoid Kofa NWR land.• Coachella Valley NWR manager attended scoping meeting on November 3, 2005. |
| U.S.D.A., Forest Service, San Bernardino National Forest | December 2005/ January 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contacted the San Bernardino National Forest via telephone, and a meeting has been scheduled for early/mid February 2006. |

APPENDIX D-7

Summary of Tribal Government Consultations

Appendix D-7. Summary of Tribal Government Consultations

| Tribal Government | Date | Issues Discussed |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Cahuilla Tribal Environmental Office (Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians) | November 7, 2005 (Tribal Response) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM notification letter sent on 10/24/05, including DVP2 project information, initiation of scoping comment period, BLM contact information, and an attachment of project fact sheets and maps. • Require that there is a Native American Monitor onsite during the project due to known/unknown sites in the area. |
| Cabazon Band of Mission Indians | November 4, 2005 (Tribal Response) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM notification letter sent on 10/24/05, including DVP2 project information, initiation of scoping comment period, BLM contact information, and an attachment of project fact sheets and maps. • Tribe has no archival information indicating that there may be cultural activity or resources on the DPV2 project site. |
| Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe | November 18, 2005 (Tribal Response) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM notification letter sent on 10/24/05, including DVP2 project information, initiation of scoping comment period, BLM contact information, and an attachment of project fact sheets and maps. • Arizona (AZ) portion of DPV2 project is within the boundaries of traditional Tribal territories, and would like to participate in cultural resources and environmental review portions of the project. |
| Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Tribal Planning & Development | December 22, 2005 (Tribal Response) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM notification letter sent on 10/24/05, including DVP2 project information, initiation of scoping comment period, BLM contact information, and an attachment of project fact sheets and maps. • DPV2 project crosses exterior boundaries of the Reservation • Tribe has ordinance regulating development of public utility projects within the Reservation. Ordinance would require SCE to secure approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) prior to project construction. CUP requires written explanation of direct benefits gained by the Tribe and members through allowing DPV2 project to cross the Reservation. • Requests mitigation measure be added to DPV2 project requiring approval of Tribal CUP prior to project construction. |
| White Mountain Apache Tribe, Historic Preservation Office | January 5, 2006 (Tribal Response) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM notification letter sent on 10/24/05, including DVP2 project information, initiation of scoping comment period, BLM contact information, and an attachment of project fact sheets and maps. • Reviewed DPV2 project information, and there is no need to send additional information. • No threat to Tribe's cultural properties or religious places. • DPV2 project can proceed with "No historic properties effected." • Any inadvertent discovery of sites/items with Apache cultural affiliation would require stoppage of DPV2 project construction and notification of proper authorities. |

APPENDIX D-8

Summary of Comments by Issue Area

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date ¹ | Mode ² | Comment |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Project Description | | |
| 1/6/06 | W | Commenter requests that the EIR/EIS include a description and related graphics regarding the proposed facilities, including access roads and maintenance buildings, and sight lines within the City of Calimesa. |
| 1/19/06 | W | Commenter would like to know the schedule for project construction in Arizona. |
| 1/19/06 | W | Commenter would like to know how many times and the specific locations of where DPV2 would cross I-10 and US 95 in Arizona. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter requests that possible proposed development be considered in the EIR/EIS. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know why the Harquahala West Alternative is not the proposed route (Proposed Project) given that it seems to be the most logical way to reach the switchyard. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter states that the transmission of power from AZ to CA has numerous social, environmental, and economic impacts that should be addressed. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know how many miles of new road will be constructed. |
| Alternatives | | |
| 1/9/06 | W | Commenter supports the Palo Verde Subalternate Route. |
| 1/9/06 - 1/20/06 (16) | O, W | Commenter supports non-development/non-transmission alternatives including the implementation of energy conservation programs, energy efficiency measures, and the use of renewable energy resources as an alternative to the DPV2 project that would reduce energy demand in CA and offset the energy delivered by DPV2. |
| 1/16/06, 1/17/06 (12) | W | Commenter opposes any project routes that traverse Kofa NWR because it would create impacts to desert tortoise, bighorn sheep, other wildlife, plant species, cultural and geologic resources, as well as disrupt views. |
| 1/17/06 - 1/20/06 (7) | O, W | Commenter prefers the Proposed Project because it would follow the previously disturbed DPV1 corridor, which would minimize impacts to wildlife, agricultural lands, Harquahala Valley and is wide enough to accommodate DPV2. Question why currently undisturbed pristine desert areas would be destroyed when the existing previously disturbed DPV1 route could be used. |
| 1/16/06, 1/17/06 (2) | W | Commenter supports the implementation of energy conservation programs and energy efficiency measures in CA as a way to offset the energy supplied through DPV2. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter requests that the following issues be analyzed in the EIR/EIS: the implementation of energy conservation programs, energy efficiency measures, and the use of renewable energy resources as a mechanism to reduce energy demand in CA and offset the energy delivered by DPV2. |
| 1/16/06 - 1/18/06 (4) | W | Commenter states that CA should generate its own power, preferably through renewable or sustainable energy sources such as solar, wind, and biomass resources. |
| 1/17/06 - 1/24/06 (4) | W | Commenter opposes the DPV2 project and all alternatives because it would have significant negative environmental impacts. |
| 1/18/06 | W | Commenter opposes all new transmission lines, especially on Courthouse Road. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter objects to Harquahala West Alternative or any other alternatives that bifurcates the Harquahala Valley. This alternative would have impacts including significant impacts to agricultural lands, visual/aesthetic resources, property values, and city segregation |
| 1/18/06 (4) | O | Commenter is concerned about and objects to the Harquahala West Subalternate Route. It would adversely impact the Harquahala Valley, its residents, and its future through destruction of the rural atmosphere; harm scenic and visual resources; remove cropland from production; interfere with tilling, irrigation and crop-dusting practices; traverses the middle of the HVID; devalue land; and harm endangered species. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter is concerned that the Harquahala West Alternative is being considered again after it was previously denied. |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date¹ | Mode² | Comment |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter understands that DPV2 is necessary and the associated benefits to society, but group does not want sacrifice its lifestyle to accommodate DPV2 |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter states that Subalternate Route 1 would be devastating to the area, development company's project and property, and the La Paz Valley community. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter believes that the Harquahala West Alternative is not financially viable because the high land acquisition cost would negate any savings that would occur from the need for fewer towers due to the alternative being shorter than the Proposed Project route. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter objects to the Proposed Project and the Alternatives because they create visual and biological impacts to the desert environment and people who live in the vicinity. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter opposes all new projects that impact the natural desert landscape. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter suggested placing the entire DPV2 transmission line within the I-10 corridor as it already has significant impacts to wildlife movement. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter states that, if CA environmental compliance regulations are going to make it easier for CA to create energy in AZ, CA should generate enough energy to meet its own demand through energy conservation and development of new energy sources within its own borders. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter states that other alternatives need to be explored, such as energy storage systems that reduce peak local energy demand and shave peak power consumption. References ice thermal storage system used in Phoenix |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter states that transmission lines are inefficient and lose power through heat loss. Instead of constructing DPV2, SCE should build smaller "clean" power plants close to the energy demand markets in CA. |
| 1/18/06, 1/20/06 | O, W | Commenter states that SCE should generate needed power in CA using "clean" methods. Likely that SCE would try to offset the "dirty" power imported into CA by swapping power or classifying "clean" or renewable power with "dirty" or coal generated power coming into California. |
| 1, 18, 06, 1/20/06 | O, W | Commenter supports the No Project Alternative. |
| 1/18/06, 1/23/06 | O, W | Commenter opposes the DPV2 project, especially Subalternate Route 1, traversing the La Paz Valley. |
| 1/23/06 | W | Commenter suggests that CA should build its own power plant, and not destroy AZ landscape. |
| 1/23/06 | W | Commenter suggests that DPV2 be constructed north of I-10 where there are existing access roads. |
| 1/31/06 | W | Commenter (CDFG) requests that alternatives be considered that avoid or otherwise minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources. |
| Agriculture | | |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project would impact irrigated farmland. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter is opposed to the Harquahala West Alternative because it would impact prime agricultural lands in Harquahala Valley that property owners have invested \$100 million. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter is concerned that the Harquahala West Alternative would traverse the Harquahala Valley, which in one of the only viable areas for agriculture in AZ and Maricopa County. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the Proposed Project and Harquahala Subalternate Route could impact land it owns within the HVID that is currently being used for agriculture. Commenter is particularly concerned that it could impact the City of Scottsdale's continued use of this land for farming, receipt of ongoing water irrigation deliveries, and ability to use its land for a previously identified water pipeline corridor connecting to the CAP canal. The Harquahala Subalternate Route would cross our pipeline corridor at Harquahala Valley Road (south of the I-10). |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date ¹ | Mode ² | Comment |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Air Quality | | |
| 1/6/06 | W | Commenter recommends several sources for guidance for air quality analysis (SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, CARB approved URBEMIS 2002 Model); localized significance and air quality analysis; mobile source health risk assessments (Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis); sample air quality mitigation measures (Chapter 11 SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust, SCAQMD Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning); and general information (SCAQMD Public Information Center). |
| 1/6/06 | W | Commenter states that CPUC/BLM should identify air quality impacts from all phases of the project, including construction, operations, as well as indirect impacts. |
| 1/6/06 | W | Commenter recommends performing a localized air quality significance analysis and localized air quality impact analysis. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter is concerned that the wind from the southwest would impact residents by bringing dust into the area. |
| Biological Resources | | |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter states that special status species have been documented in the vicinity of the Proposed Project and Subalternate Routes. |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter states that Subalternate Route 2 would traverse critical wildlife habitat in the Plomosa and Dome Rock Mountains and have significant adverse impacts to bighorn sheep and other wildlife species. In addition, Subalternate Routes 3 and 4 could have significant adverse impacts to wildlife depending on project details. |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter objects to DPV2 traversing Kofa NWR as it is used for bird watching and nature/wildlife studies. |
| 1/17/06 - 1/24/06 (4) | W, O | Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project would impact wildlife, particularly bighorn sheep and desert tortoise. |
| 1/17/06 - 1/24/06 (20) | O, W | Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project would create impacts to Kofa NWR including habitat fragmentation, harm to bighorn sheep and desert tortoise, introduction of non-native plant species, and illegal off-road vehicle use. |
| 1/18/06 | W | Commenter is concerned about desert wetlands and riparian areas. |
| 1/20/06 | W | The incompatibility between the mission of the NWR System with the use of Kofa NWR for DPV2 must analyzed. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that construction would create ground disturbance in the delicate desert ecosystem that would facilitate the establishment of invasive species and take a long time to recover. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter states that he ROW through Kofa NWR is prime desert big horn sheep and desert tortoise habitat. Commenter also states that Kofa is important desert tortoise and Sonoran desert tortoise habitat because it forms a contiguous large protected habitat with the Yuma Proving Ground. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter states that construction of the project concrete tower footings and use of necessary equipment would disturb land in the ROW and possible outside of the ROW, which would eliminate the ground cover needed by some species for protection to traverse this area, in effect limiting species' range or making them easier prey; and would disturb soil facilitating the establishment of non-native plant species. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter states that the existence of the DPV1 line already has significant impacts to the native flora and fauna, therefore the construction of DPV2 would surely impact these resources further. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter states the existing DPV1 and proposed DPV2 transmission lines have impacts to wildlife migration. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know what mitigation measures would be used to limit the impacts or death of birds perching on the transmission lines and towers. |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date ¹ | Mode ² | Comment |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know how SCE would ensure the DPV2 project does not impact existing wilderness due to trespass during construction, and how it would ensure that construction activities stay within the designated ROW |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter states that Kofa NWR should be protected from transmission lines, and therefore would like to know how the DPV2 project would help achieve the protection of the natural resources in the Kofa NWR. |
| 1/21/06, 1/24/06 (2) | W | Commenter is concerned that birds perching on the transmission lines or towers would be killed, and requests that DPV2 be constructed according to “raptor-safe” specifications that would minimize electrocution hazards to perching or nesting birds. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter stated that roads have a significant impact on wildlife and natural hydrologic cycles as the existence of roads facilitates the spread of noxious weeds, specifically Saharan mustard. |
| 1/31/06 | W | Commenter (CDFG) stated that the project traverses portions of the Reche Canyon/Badlands planning area of the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and the proposed Coachella Valley Habitat Conservation Plan. Recent (within 2 years) and focused biological studies needed to evaluate impacts of the project. A thorough discussion of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts is needed of the project. |
| Cultural Resources | | |
| 11/7/05 | W | Commenter (Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians) requires that there is a Native American Monitor onsite during the project due to known/unknown sites in the area. |
| 1/5/06 | W | Commenter states that DPV2 project would have no impact on White Mountain Apache Tribe’s cultural resources; however inadvertent discovery would require construction stoppage and notification of proper authorities. |
| 1/9/06 | W | Commenter would like to know if the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) area being crossed by DPV2 has been surveyed for cultural resources, and the specific impacts to and mitigation measures for natural and cultural resources in YPG. Commenter would also like to know who was contacted at YPG regarding the DPV2 project. |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter states that the DPV2 project would traverse the aboriginal home of the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, and is concerned about the impacts to cultural resources, especially bighorn sheep, which are culturally significant to the Tribe. Commenter also requests that archaeological surveys be performed, and the Tribe have the opportunity to identify any cultural properties found. |
| 1/18/06 | W | Commenter states that the DPV2 project would impact cultural resources. |
| Geology | | |
| 1/18/06 | W | Commenter states that the DPV2 project would impact geologic resources. |
| Health and Safety | | |
| 1/9/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the NOP fails to consider the direct impacts of increased dependence on nuclear power, and therefore increased nuclear waste. Commenter also states that it is environmentally irresponsible to construct DPV2 which relies on and transmits energy generated from hazardous materials, i.e. nuclear power at PVNGS. |
| 1/18/06 (2) | O | DPV2 contains strong electric voltage that is dangerous to people, farm animals, and wildlife. DPV2 should not be located near housing developments. |
| 1/18/06 | O | CAP/CAWCD is concerned that the electromagnetic forces in DPV2 would interfere with its pipeline that is critical for supplying water to AZ. The DPV2 project appears to cross the CAP canal in two locations and parallels it for several miles where CAP has a 22-foot diameter pre-stressed concrete cylinder pipe. CAP has noticed that electromagnetic interference from DPV1 has potential to degrade the pipe. CAWCD would require that any impacts from DPV2 to this pipeline be mitigated. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter is concerned that there are health and safety issues associated with transmission lines. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter is concerned that DPV2 would traverse two housing developments and would expose residents to strong electricity, which is dangerous. Subalternate Route 1 is too close to residential areas. |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date ¹ | Mode ² | Comment |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter states that it would be dangerous to have transmission towers in developments. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter is concerned that the strong voltage from the transmission line could affect farm animals. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter states that the electromagnetic force in DPV2 could harm the steel reinforced pipes of HVID's irrigation distribution system. |
| Land Use | | |
| 1/6/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project could potentially impact planned future development in the City of Calimesa. |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project would impact BLM lands. |
| 1/18/06 | W | Commenter believes that the Harquahala West Alternative would impact the Harquahala community and its future. |
| 1/19/06 | W | Commenter states that the DPV2 project appears to cross State Route 78 near Palo Verde in Imperial County. |
| 1/19/06, 1/20/06 (2) | W | Commenter states while the Desert Wilderness Act included a clause that allowed for a second transmission line ROW in the KOFA Wilderness, she considers this incompatible with the wilderness and with the refuge. Commenter states that the use of Kofa NWR for the DPV2 transmission line corridor is incompatible with the mission of the NWR System, which is to conserve fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats for the benefit of the general public. |
| 1/18/06 - 1/20/06 (4) | O, W | Commenter states that construction of the DPV2 project in Kofa NWR would disturb land and create additional ROW and access road, which would increase the illegal use of off-road vehicles in the area. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter is concerned about impacts to BLM lands, including impacts to areas that are currently being considered for wilderness protection in the Ranegras Plain region east of the Kofa NWR. |
| Recreation | | |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project would impact recreation. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter states that the existence of the DPV1 line already has significant impacts to recreation, therefore the construction of DPV2 would surely impact recreational resources further. |
| Regulatory Compliance | | |
| 12/22/05 | W | Commenter states that the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians would require the approval of a conditional use permit prior to construction of DPV2 project based on an ordinance regulating public utilities. |
| 12/27/05 | W | Commenter requests that the EIR/EIS address the California Desert Conservation Area because it has a special management mandate from the federal government. |
| 1/3/06 | W | Commenter states that Imperial County would be required to modify the Palo Verde Community Area Plan if Subalternate Route 3 was selected. |
| 1/9/06 | W | Commenter states that required right of way applications through AZ Land Department land would take 18-24 months from time of application filing. |
| 1/18/06 | O | SCE must obtain license to cross CAP canal and associated land from CAWCD. |
| 1/19/06 | W | Commenter states that any work in a Caltrans right of way would require an encroachment permit including improvement plans and use of metric and English units, and environmental analysis of the work or improvement with impact analysis and creation of mitigation measures if needed. |
| 1/19/06 | W | Commenter states that any crossing of I-10 and US 95 in Arizona would require an encroachment permit from ADOT. |
| 1/31/06 | W | Project may required California Endangered Species Act Incidental Take Permit and Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement. |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date ¹ | Mode ² | Comment |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Socioeconomics | | |
| 1/18/0 | W | Commenter opposes the Harquahala West Alternative because it would decrease property values. |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the Proposed Project and the Harquahala Subalternate Route would have a negative impact on existing and future property values. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know if it is socially equitable to generate power in AZ, only to ship it to CA, while AZ experiences impacts to air quality, visual resources, and wildlife habitat. |
| Visual Resources | | |
| 1/9/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that the Harquahala West Subalternate Route would cause visual impacts to land owned by the State of AZ. |
| 1/17/06 - 1/25/06 (7) | W | Commenter is concerned that the DPV2 project would cause visual impacts, especially the pristine natural desert view in Kofa NWR. |
| 1/18/0 | W | Commenter opposes the Harquahala West Alternative because it would destroy views. |
| Water Resources | | |
| 1/31/06 | W | Commenter (CDFG) opposes the elimination of watercourses and/or their channelization or conversion to subsurface drains. |
| Mitigation | | |
| 1/20/06 | W | Commenter states that mitigation of negative impacts to plant resources (i.e., transplanting cacti) was not successful during construction of DPV1. |
| 1/21/06 | | Commenter suggests that SCE should analyze and propose and outline an implementation plan, including annual monitoring and eradication, to manage the spread of noxious weeds caused by the building of new roads. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know what assistance SCE would give to BLM, USFWS, and AZ Game and Fish to maintain existing wildlife population levels and how this would be monitored. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know if SCE can assist BLM in acquiring and enhancing other wildlife corridors to help mitigate the impacts of the DPV2 project. Similarly, the commenter would like to know if SCE could purchase private lands to the south of Saddle Mountain to help BLM maintain this valuable wildlife corridor |
| 1/22/06 | W | Commenter requests that a mitigation measure be added to the DPV2 project in which SCE would be required to get approval of a conditional use permit from the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians prior to construction based on an ordinance regulating public utilities. |
| 1/31/06 | W | Commenter (CDFG) does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species. |
| Project Information | | |
| 12/21/05 | O | Commenter is following up on a comment letter submitted during NOP scoping period regarding a parcel he owns in Banning. Commenter would like to discuss alignment and incorrect easements. |
| 1/5/06, 1/9/06 (2) | W | Commenter requests larger scale project maps. |
| 1/10/06, 1/11/06 | O,W | Commenter is concerned about the proposed location of a Calimesa substation near his property in Beaumont. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know why SCE does not use power produced in CA. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know when construction and operation are expected to occur. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know how the DPV2 project would provide low cost power. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know why wildlife issues are not recognized as impacts. |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date ¹ | Mode ² | Comment |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know what the final date to file comments is. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know about the notification process for the public scoping meetings. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if there is a proposed power plant south of I-10. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that there is a proposal for a transmission line from a coal power plant in Idaho to central AZ. CA will not permit this dirty energy to be directly imported into the state, therefore it is being routed to AZ where AZ will use the "dirty" energy and ship "clean" energy generated via wind or solar sources in AZ or New Mexico to CA. This proposal appears to be a "laundering scheme" in which CA can get energy from "dirty" sources while appearing to be actually using "clean" energy. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that most power generated south of Harquahala gets transmitted to CA because it is easier to build power plants in AZ, than in CA. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter stated that DPV2 project is the same proposal put forth 20 years ago. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if SCE bearing the cost of the entire DPV2 project. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the ACC is able to effect the routing of the DPV2 project within AZ. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the CPUC and ACC disagree. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the ACC makes the final decision for routing in AZ, except on federal land where BLM makes the decision. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the DPV2 route is based on economics. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know the economic impact of buying land. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if potential impacts take priority over economics. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the Proposed Project's ROW is granted in perpetuity, barring any environmental impacts. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know how wide is the easement would be for the alternatives. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know the heights of the towers. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the current uses of the land versus the potential uses in 8-10 years are considered for the Proposed Project. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if landowners can submit comments on potential future land uses. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if individual landowners can comment, and if it would be helpful. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know when notifications are sent for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know about the notification process? |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the ACC was notified. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know when the comment period closes, and when the processes are officially closed and no more comments can be submitted. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know why Harquahala landowners were not notified. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if barricades would be erected to restrict access to the NWR. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know how involved the USFWS has been in the process. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know the proximity of the DPV2 project to DPV1 and pipelines in Kofa NWR. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if there will be any new poles or towers. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if an alternative extends to PVNGS. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the DPV2 project would get energy from the Harquahala Generating Station. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know what the current ROW (width) on the Proposed Project, Palo Verde Alternative, and the existing DPV1 is. |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date¹ | Mode² | Comment |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know how long energy would be transmitted to CA using DPV2. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if energy could be returned to AZ if needed. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know why SCE can acquire power at a lower cost in AZ, as compared to CA. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the revenues from natural gas-fired power plants go to the state-needs market. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter would like to know what is preventing DPV2 from following the existing DPV1 (ROW). |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter would like to know what the likelihood of constructing Subalternate Route 1. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter would like to know the rationale for the Subalternate routes. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter would like to know what scoping report would look like. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the game reserve is being given a higher priority than human beings. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter would like to know why the first proposal (for DPV2) was withdrawn. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know if given AZ's rapid population growth and associated increasing demand for energy, would selling power to CA force AZ to construct more power plants and what would be the long-term impacts to AZ's air quality of these additional power plants. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know if it possible to upgrade the existing towers to carry additional transmission lines. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know if the DPV2 corridor could be made smaller to limit the impact on the desert landscape. |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know how SCE would mitigate and restore the impacts of new roads. Commenter would also like to know how much financial assistance would be allocated to restoration activities. |
| Public and Agency Notification | | |
| 1/3/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that Imperial County and its residents (Palo Verde area) did not receive proper notification of the DPV2 project or the November 2005 public scoping meetings. Requested re-notification with sufficient time to prepare comments, review plans, and attend meetings. |
| 1/3/06 | W | Commenter requests that the Palo Verde Improvement Association be sent a Draft EIR/EIS for public review. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that the landowners in the Harquahala Valley were not notified of the DPV2 project. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that those working on Kofa NWR did not receive any notice. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter requests the inclusion of definitive dates for the schedule of the process. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that property owners near Harquahala West Alternative would appreciate receiving a notification. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that a major (interested) party, the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC), has been left out of the process. It is important to communicate with the ACC and they must be brought into the process early. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter is concerned about deadline for scoping comments because he/she did not receive notice about the DPV2 project or the public scoping meetings. His/Her notification came from another group. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that those working at the ACC did not receive any notice. |
| 1/23/06 | W | Commenter requests that the DPV2 project be delayed due to the lack of notification provided about the Project and the scoping meetings. |
| 1/23/06 | W | Commenter would like to know when scoping meeting attendees will receive a transcript of all comments made at NOP (CA) and NOI (AZ) scoping meetings. |

Appendix D-8. Summary of Comments by Issue Area

| Date ¹ | Mode ² | Comment |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Purpose and Need | | |
| 1/17/06 | W | Commenter is concerned that clean power is being shipped out of AZ to CA. |
| 1/17/06 - 1/24/06 (21) | O, W | Commenter questions the need for the DPV2 project given that it has been in the planning stages for 15 years during which time CA has not needed it, and AZ, especially Phoenix, is rapidly growing and expected to consume all the power generated in AZ, thereby leaving no surplus power to transmit to CA. |
| 1/18/06, 1/19/06 (2) | O, W | Commenter understands the need for additional transmission lines given the rapid growth in AZ and CA. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states that there must be a good reason to deviate from the Proposed Project because the desert has already been disturbed for DPV1, and there is no reason not to use this previously disturbed route for DPV2 |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter would like to know if the DPV2 project is necessary and if the existing DPV1 transmission line isn't sufficient. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter states AZ is growing and will need power, especially all the "clean" energy generated in AZ. CA requires clean energy through the importation of only "clean" energy, and does not allow "dirty" facilities. CA looking for "clean" energy sources, but AZ will need all the "clean" energy. |
| 1/18/06 | O, W | Commenter does not believe there is a need for the DPV2 project or its impacts; CA should use renewable energy sources to generate power. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter believes that the housing/commercial developments being constructed and planned around Phoenix will require more energy in the future; therefore the power generated in AZ should stay in AZ and not be transmitted to CA. |
| 1/18/06 | O | Commenter understands the reason DPV2 would tie-in to the Harquahala Generating Station because it is bankrupt and the only way to make it operational from an economic point-of-view would be to enable it to connect to transmission lines, such as DPV2, to distribute the power it generates. However this does not justify taking private property and disrupting productive agricultural operations for the DPV2 project. |
| 1/18/06, 1/20/06 (2) | O, W | Commenter states that the use of CA energy crisis as a scare tactic to illustrate the need for the DPV2 project and its approval is inappropriate because this crisis was not due to lack of transmission, but rather market manipulation. |
| 1/18/06 (2) | O | Commenter states that only CA needs the DPV2 project; there is no need for this project in AZ. Yet, the CA portion of DPV2 project follows existing ROWs with little impact, but in AZ it would traverse new lands including Kofa NWR and agricultural lands. Therefore DPV2 project would be a benefit for CA, and a losing situation for AZ. |
| 1/19/06 | O | Commenter requests that the EIR/EIS include reasons for deviating from using the existing DPV1 ROW into presently untouched areas. |
| 1/18/06, 1/23/06 (2) | O, W | Commenter states that AZ is growing rapidly, and therefore the power produced in AZ must stay in the state. If CA needs temporary supplemental power from AZ in the future, this could be accomplished using the existing system of transmission lines |
| 1/21/06 | W | Commenter would like to know if SCE could implement new conservation measures and use renewable energy sources to supply CA's energy needs. |
| 1/23/06 | W | Commenter states that the DPV2 project is not necessary because SCE has not shown that its facilities/sources in its service area are unproductive. |

Notes: 1. Number in parenthesis is the number of similar comments received. 2. W: written comment, O: oral comment