

## **D. Transcript from Public Meetings**

This section provides responses to comments received from seven individuals during the public meetings on the Draft EIR, as listed in Table 3-1.

## Comment Set D

1

1

2

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3

EL CASCO SYSTEM PROJECT

4

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

5

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING

6

7

8

9

10

CITY OF BANNING

11

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

12

99 EAST RAMSEY STREET

13

BANNING, CALIFORNIA

14

15

JANUARY 9, 2008

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Comment Set D, continued

		2
1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	Introduction and Presentation by	
4	Chester Britt and Negar Vihidi	3-18
5		
6		
7	PUBLIC COMMENTS MADE BY:	
8	Dennis Sauer	19
9	Marvin Friedman	20, 27
10	Rosalyn Friedman	22
11	Phyllis Enet	23
12	Edward Leonhardt	25
13	Nancy Darwin	28
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## Comment Set D, continued

3

1 BANNING, CALIFORNIA

2 JANUARY 9, 2008; 3:00 P.M.

3

4 CHESTER BRITT: Good afternoon. We will  
5 go ahead and get started. I want to do a couple  
6 of housekeeping things before we get started.

7 My name is Chester Britt of Arellano  
8 Associates. We're part of the project team working  
9 with Aspen Environmental Group.

10 You should be here for the El Casco System  
11 Project Public Participation Meeting of the CPUC's  
12 draft of the Environmental Impact Report.

13 There were a number of handouts when you  
14 came in. If you did not sign in, we please ask you  
15 do that before you leave so that we have a record of  
16 all those who participated in today's meeting. And  
17 go ahead and do that if you have not done that yet.  
18 There is also a number of handouts and we want to  
19 make sure you have those. We have also the agenda,  
20 which talks about the background of the project.

21 We are having two sets of meetings today.  
22 One started at 1:30 and also there is one starting  
23 this afternoon or later this evening at 5:30. The  
24 meetings, each of those sets of meetings are broken  
25 up two different types of meetings: The first is an

## Comment Set D, continued

4

1 informational workshop where you have a chance to  
2 look at all the boards from 1:30 to 2:30. And now  
3 we will be starting the public presentation phase of  
4 the presentation. We will be giving a presentation  
5 and will have a chance for the people to make  
6 comments. That same format will be carried out  
7 later this afternoon as well.

8           We also have the contact information on  
9 there where you can mail the comments to. You do  
10 have until January 25 to mail in any comments.  
11 There is contact information and we have an e-mail  
12 and fax number and the website where you can find  
13 information.

14           There is also a notice of availability,  
15 which is a standard notice that was sent out when  
16 the environmental document is ready for public  
17 review. That was mailed out to the people. It also  
18 has a lot project information on there, including  
19 what we call the repository site in the back, in the  
20 lower half of that page. It lists the public  
21 libraires where the document can be found. You will  
22 be able to walk in any of those sites and be able to  
23 get a copy of the document to look at.

24           There is also a PowerPoint presentation,  
25 which will be made here in a second. We have

## Comment Set D, continued

5

1 provided a copy for that as well to make it easy to  
2 remember what we talked about today there.

3           There is also a comment form, which looks  
4 like this. You are welcome to fill this out today  
5 before you leave and drop it off in the box on your  
6 way out, or you can take it with you, think about  
7 what you would like to say, fill it out later and  
8 just fold it in half and just staple or tape it  
9 together, then put a stamp on it and send it back to  
10 us. The address is on there provided for you.

11           Again, the comment period ends January 25.  
12 So I need to have it postmarked by the 25th.

13           Lastly, the speaker registration card. If  
14 you would like to make a public comment this  
15 afternoon, we ask that you fill one of these out so  
16 we know who the people are that made the comments.  
17 I have already received four or five of those. So  
18 if you have any desire to make a comment, just fill  
19 this out any time while we are here today, walk up  
20 here and put it on the table. I will put it in the  
21 order that I receive it and we will call the people  
22 up. You will have three minutes to make a comment.  
23 We would like to keep your comments to three  
24 minutes, if possible.

25           And then last but not least, we also have

## Comment Set D, continued

6

1 a copy of, I believe it's the Executive Summary of  
2 the Environmental Document. And that is available  
3 up front when you walked in as well. And this is  
4 very useful if you care about this project.

5           And we have a CD, I believe this is of the  
6 entire document. So this a lot less weight than the  
7 entire document. And it is inside of the Executive  
8 Summary. So it makes it very easy for you to carry  
9 around the document.

10           So that is all of the handouts, I believe,  
11 that he we have for the meeting today.

12           We want to start with opening  
13 introductions.

14           I introduced myself, I'm Chester Britt  
15 from Arellano Associates. To my right is Negar  
16 Vahidi, she is the project manager for the  
17 consulting firm that is doing the technical  
18 evaluation. We also have Lynne Mosley with the  
19 California Utilities Commission. She is the project  
20 manager with them. And we also have Sandra  
21 Alarcon-Lopez with Aspen Environmental, who is also  
22 helping out with the project.

23           I want to just go over the agenda for  
24 today's meeting. We are going to define what CPUC's  
25 role is, what the CEQA process is, talk about

## Comment Set D, continued

7

1 project background, alternative screening process,  
2 overview of the Environmental Impact Analysis, talk  
3 about receiving public comments, then take your  
4 comments, then conclude our meeting.

5           The key players, I already mentioned some  
6 of them: The California Public Utilities Commission  
7 is the lead agency for the State of California. The  
8 Environmental Document that was prepared for them is  
9 under CEQA, which is the California Environmental  
10 Quality Act. And that document is basically done to  
11 get a permit issuance. We need to complete the  
12 Environmental Impact Report, and that is why we are  
13 here today, is the draft.

14           The Southern California Edison Company is  
15 the applicant. The way this works is they submit an  
16 application to the CPUC as the regulatory agency.  
17 And the regulatory agency has the responsibility for  
18 overseeing the evaluation of that application and  
19 preparing this Environmental Document as part of  
20 that evaluation. Typically the CPUC does not have  
21 enough staff to do all of the applications that they  
22 receive. So they traditionally hire a  
23 well-respected firm, like Aspen Environment, to do  
24 the evaluation and complete the Environmental  
25 Documentation, that is what is happening here in

## Comment Set D, continued

8

1 this process. Aspen, as I mentioned, is the  
2 environmental group that has been chosen to do that  
3 evaluation.

4           So just for a point clarification,  
5 sometimes people get confused: Edison is the  
6 applicant and the CPUC and Aspen are the regulatory  
7 agency and the consulting chosen to do the  
8 evaluation. Therefore, CPUC and Aspen are not  
9 advocates in the project, they are simply doing the  
10 evaluation for the regulatory agency to evaluate  
11 that application, which is put forth by the Southern  
12 California Edison Company.

13           With that, I will go ahead and turn it  
14 over to Negar Vahidi, she will go through the  
15 project itself and CPUC's role.

16

17           NEGAR VAHIDI: Thank you. Welcome and  
18 thank you for being here.

19           Just to go over CPUC's, California Public  
20 Utilities Commission's role: Southern California  
21 Edison is an investment-owned utility and as a  
22 private utility, they are regulated by the State  
23 Public Utilities Commission.

24           This project required what is called a  
25 Permit to Construct. So Edison, the process is that

## Comment Set D, continued

9

1 they file an application for a Permit to Construct  
2 with the CPUC. And that application includes all  
3 sorts of documentation materials, current costs,  
4 economics of the project and so forth, and  
5 environment components, environmental assessment.

6           In the State of California in order to  
7 get any large development project permitted, you  
8 have to have environmental clearance. And that is  
9 under the State of California Environmental Quality  
10 Act as a requirement.

11           So once Edison has filed the Permit to  
12 Construct, the CPUC goes into the process of  
13 reviewing the project. The Environmental Review  
14 Process under the California Environment Quality Act  
15 is a portion of CPUC's overall review of the project  
16 for approval or to make a decision on it.

17           One other component is the cost aspect of  
18 it. And that is not part of the environmental  
19 realm. You will notice in the document there is no  
20 section on discussion of cost. We are mainly  
21 focused on the environmental issues.

22           Under the California Environmental Quality  
23 Act, the CPUC is what is called a lead agency. So  
24 they will review and prepare the document and they  
25 will do what is called, once the final document is

## Comment Set D, continued

10

1 out, they will certify it. The State Agency has to  
2 have a certified document before they can make a  
3 decision on the project.

4           As Chester pointed out, Lynne Mosley, the  
5 CPUC environmental project manager is in the  
6 audience. There is an assigned commissioner. Out  
7 of the five commissioners out of the CPUC, there is  
8 one assigned to each project. The one assigned for  
9 this project is Dian Gureneich. There is also an  
10 administrative law judge who assisted in the  
11 preparation of the decision and overseeing the  
12 proceeding, and that is Victoria Kolakowski. And  
13 you may have met her at the Scoping meetings back in  
14 August.

15           Now, The sequel process as to the  
16 environmental review process, they can start once  
17 the Permit to Construct application was filed. For  
18 this project it was back in February '07. Then the  
19 CPUC decided to prepare an Environment Impact Report  
20 and file a Notice of Preparation, which started the  
21 Scoping Process.

22           And the Scoping Process basically solicits  
23 input on the scoping content of the Environment  
24 Document. And that helps us as the preparers to go  
25 and address the comments from the agencies and the

## Comment Set D, continued

11

1 public.

2           The scoping was throughout the months of  
3 July and August. And then we started preparing the  
4 Draft Environmental Impact Report, which included  
5 development alternatives, doing analysis of the 11  
6 issues areas. And I'll talk about the rest of that  
7 later.

8           We are currently in the drafting of our  
9 public review period, which is a 45-day period that  
10 will end on the 25th of January. Once we have  
11 everybody's comments, we will prepare responses to  
12 those comments and issue what is called a final EIR.  
13 At that point the CPUC will take that final EIR, the  
14 administrative law judge along with the  
15 commissioners will prepare a proposed decision.  
16 The proposed decision will be out for 30 days. And  
17 then they will basically, after that 30 days have  
18 elapsed, at an evidentiary hearing they will decide  
19 on the project, what gets approved.

20           Just to give you a very brief overview of  
21 the document, it's over a 1,000 pages long, so I  
22 cannot get all the details:

23           The purpose of the project is to increase  
24 the system reliability of the electrical system to  
25 the area and operation flexibility, and also to

## Comment Set D, continued

12

1 prevent overloading of the system and to meet the  
2 forecast of demand in Riverside County to the amount  
3 of development that is going on. The major  
4 components of this project include a new substation  
5 called the El Casco Substation on the west end of  
6 the route, upgrades to Edison's existing Banning  
7 Substations, and upgrades of 15 miles of Edison's  
8 existing 15 kilovolt sub-transmission line,  
9 installation of fiberoptic communication lines on  
10 existing conduits and on existing towers or poles,  
11 and install a new microwave communication tower at  
12 the Mill Creek site, which is located in the San  
13 Bernardino National Forest.

14           When we go to prepare an Environmental  
15 Impact Report we develop alternatives. And it is  
16 the CPUC's policy, unlike many other state or local  
17 agencies, to analyze alternatives that are an  
18 equivalent level of this project. Even though the  
19 the California Environmental Equality Act does not  
20 require it, we analyze or consider eight  
21 alternatives, screening most of them out and  
22 analyzed four in total.

23           Where we get the information to develop  
24 those alternatives: One is from Edison's propounded  
25 environmental assessment, which is the part of the

## Comment Set D, continued

13

1 application. The rest is basically items the, PIR  
2 technical team develops, along with the CPUC based  
3 on their foreseeable alternatives of fiber cons and  
4 so on, and alternatives that are suggested by the  
5 public agencies during the Scoping Process, and  
6 anything that is required by CEQA, which in this  
7 particular case they are required to analyze an  
8 alternative for every project.

9           And CEQA requires that alternatives meet a  
10 certain number of criteria: They have to meet most  
11 of the project objectives as laid out by the  
12 applicant. They have to be equal from a regulatory  
13 prospective, technical and legal prospective, and  
14 they have to either reduce or eliminate the method  
15 impact of the proposed project.

16           So you cannot just develop an alternative  
17 for the sake of developing an alternative. It has  
18 to be better than the proposed project.

19           Once you consider -- we went through a  
20 very rigorous training process. You have considered  
21 eight alternatives, and other than the proposed  
22 project, two route alternatives were looked at: One  
23 was the CPUC Route Option 3, which basically it's a  
24 totally different route than what was proposed. It  
25 goes through the northern part, north of the

## Comment Set D, continued

14

1 proposed route for Edison. And the maps put out are  
2 back there in the document. The partial underground  
3 alternative, which is underground, the 15-mile  
4 proposed sub-transmission line route, only in a  
5 one-mile portion through the Sun Lakes Community.  
6 And obviously the project alternative which is  
7 required by CEQA. And CEQA requires us not to just  
8 look at the whole project, but to look at the most  
9 reasonable foreseeable scenario if the project were  
10 not being built. Which in this case would be  
11 construction of nine miles of distribution line and  
12 updates to three of Edison's existing substations.

13           If you look at the draft, there is  
14 detailed information, project description, we have  
15 the analysis of alternatives. The two route  
16 alternatives, project alternatives were analyzed at  
17 the same level of detail as the project in each  
18 issue area section.

19           We have 11 issue area sections. Then you  
20 will notice mitigation measure proposals to review  
21 for environmental impacts. Then also you have an  
22 analysis of cumulative and gross impacts in the  
23 documents.

24           You'll see up on this slide the issue  
25 areas that were analyzed as required by CEQA.

## Comment Set D, continued

15

1           Once we are finished with all of the  
2 technical analysis, the team gets together and does  
3 what is called a Comparison of Alternatives to come  
4 up with the environmental superiorly alternative,  
5 because the CEQA guidelines require us to reveal the  
6 environmental superior alternative in the document.  
7 And we are required to actually pick that. And  
8 when we come up with the environmentally superior  
9 alternative, it's based on many, many factors. If  
10 you look at Section E of the document, it lays out  
11 what the methodology and we did to compare the  
12 different alternatives to each other and to the  
13 proposed project.

14           One of the things to note is the partial  
15 unground alternative for that one-mile portion in  
16 Sun Lakes came out as an environmentally superior  
17 alternative. Again, it's preferred over the  
18 project, the three issue areas mainly because of  
19 long-term impacts. The CPUC when they look at and  
20 compare the alternatives, they focus on the long  
21 term and not the short term with the attitude that  
22 those short-term impact will go away eventually.

23           Those three issue areas are: land use,  
24 noise, and visual resources.

25           Partial underground is feasible and meets

## Comment Set D, continued

16

1 most of the project objectives, and has fewer  
2 impacts than the route alternative options for the  
3 proposed project.

4           So at this point what next is, again, the  
5 review period will end January 25. We expect to  
6 have the final EIR document completed in March, and  
7 CPUC will issue a proposed decision in March or  
8 April, the end of March or the beginning of April,  
9 and for the CPUC to certify the EIR and issue a  
10 final decision on the project in May. Then we go to  
11 into construction monitoring.

12

13           CHESTER BRITT: After today's meeting  
14 there is variety of ways you can still get the  
15 project information: There is a website that is  
16 listed on your materials and also on the screen  
17 for your benefit. You can see that there. I also  
18 mentioned the repositories are in the document is  
19 being placed for your convenience, at local  
20 libraires and universities. There is also a way  
21 to e-mail us if you have any comments. You can  
22 e-mail us at the extension there and the project  
23 information line gives a number that you can call,  
24 I believe it's toll free. So you can call that  
25 toll-free number and also provide information or

## Comment Set D, continued

17

1 ask questions as well.

2           In terms of making a comment today, I  
3 mentioned that you can fill out a speaker  
4 registration card. If you will want to speak,  
5 please do that now if you have not done so already.  
6 When you come up to the microphone, we ask that you  
7 speak clearly. Please start by saying your name and  
8 your address so we have a record as to who you are  
9 when making your comments. Again, try to keep your  
10 comments to three minutes and provide your comment  
11 as precisely and clearly as possible.

12           Then moving forward, initially we also  
13 have a comment card that you can fill out today if  
14 you do not want speak in public. You can fill that  
15 out and provide a comment in writing. It will be  
16 given the same weight as those comments received  
17 either verbally or in written form. And you can  
18 submit that here today or mail that to us. Again,  
19 the mailing address is on our screen. The due date  
20 for the mail-in comments is to be postmarked by  
21 January 25. And again, the contact information is  
22 there as well. If you would, you can see at the  
23 very bottom of the screen, include your name,  
24 address and telephone number on your written  
25 comments. Again, as part of the record, if we need

## Comment Set D, continued

18

1 your clarification it helps to be able to call the  
2 people. Sometimes we cannot read your writing as  
3 clearly as we would like. So it will help if you  
4 provide contact information on your written comment  
5 card.

6           So with that, I will go ahead and start  
7 with the speaker cards. I will call the three  
8 people in order that I received them and then come  
9 up one at a time.

10           The first person is Dennis Sauer, and then  
11 Martin Friedman and Rosalyn Friedman. Those are the  
12 first of these.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Comment Set D, continued

19

1 BANNING, CALIFORNIA

2 JANUARY 9, 2008; 3:19 P.M.

3 PUBLIC COMMENTS

4

5 DENNIS SAUER: My name is Dennis Sauer.

6 I live at 6225 Turnberry Drive in Sun Lakes

7 Country Club area.

8 And the greenbelt that the project is

9 going to start on the western end is in my backyard.

10 The first thing I want to say is that

11 unfortunately there are not as many people from Sun

12 Lakes as I had hoped personally. But I did talk to

13 a lot people and they were discouraged at the

14 meeting with Edison in the south clubhouse. And

15 they said, "To hell with it, you cannot fight City

16 Hall." So there was a lot of apathy in that area.

17 I do want to say that I have read

18 everything. And I will only speak on the personal

19 point that I was charged an additional fee by the

20 seller for our particular plot in Sun Lakes. I was

21 charged an additional fee because I do not have

22 anybody behind me. There is a greenbelt behind me.

23 I looked at the piece of land before I bought. The

24 existing way the poles are off just east of me, and

25 I cannot see poles from my backyard that area to the

**D1-1**

## Comment Set D1, continued

20

1 west of me. The changes that are necessitated by  
2 putting in the new metal poles, I will have one of  
3 the poles directly behind my backyard. And that  
4 does not please me in the least. To me going  
5 underground is preferable. And I know what we have  
6 been told, that it is five times the cost to go  
7 underground versus overhead.

8           My question is: How many people are  
9 benefiting from this proposed project? Take that  
10 and divide it into the difference between what we  
11 were told. We were told \$1 million a mile overhead;  
12 \$5 million a mile underground. Whether those are  
13 correct or not, but those are what are what was  
14 being thrown about at the Edison meeting. So divide  
15 that into the difference of four million homes and  
16 the people that are going to benefit by this project  
17 and how much it is going to cost per household.

18           So that is one of the considerations to  
19 look into. Thank you.

20

21           MARVIN FRIEDMAN: My name is Marvin  
22 Friedman. I live at 5136 Breckenridge, Banning,  
23 California, part of the Sun Lakes Community.

24           I am a former registered professional  
25 engineer in the State of California and reviewed the

**D1-1  
Cont.**

## Comment Set D, continued

21

1 draft environmental impact report for the proposed  
2 El Castro System Project released on December 12,  
3 2007.

4           Let me first thank the California Public  
5 Utility Commission for commissioning the research  
6 from an independent source. The CPUC project team  
7 is to be thoroughly commended for their leadership.  
8 In addition, my thanks goes to the EIR preparers and  
9 reviewers of the Aspen Environmental Group that  
10 provided us with a professional analysis along with  
11 supporting documentation.

12           In my professional opinion, the research  
13 is exceptionally well done reflecting the excellent  
14 background qualifications and experience of the  
15 Aspen Group.

16           I want to thank the City of Banning in  
17 their leadership for encouraging this research and  
18 providing an opportunity to discuss this project at  
19 various public forums in the past and giving the  
20 City of Banning citizens an opportunity to express  
21 their concerns.

22           The recommendations that the Environmental  
23 Report concludes for the Sun Lakes Community should  
24 be accepted without reservation in my opinion.

25           I personally thank all of those involved

**D2-1**

## Comment Set D, continued

22

1 with this project for concluding the environmental  
2 recommendation for the underground option.

3           The health and safety of our immune  
4 compromised senior citizen community is now assured  
5 by the forward-looking decision.

6           There were hundreds of senior citizens  
7 that petitioned for this report, and I'm not  
8 speaking for them, but I know where their hearts  
9 are.

10           I am asking the CPUC, SCE, and the City of  
11 Banning and the leadership of Sun Lakes to now come  
12 together and accept the conclusions of the report.

13           Thank you, very much.

14

15           ROSALYN FRIEDMAN: My name is Rosalyn  
16 Friedman. I live at 5136 Breckenridge in Banning,  
17 Sun Lakes.

18           I'm a concerned resident of Sun Lakes and  
19 I want to thank the people who did the thorough  
20 Independent Environmental Report on the El Casco  
21 Project for considering the health and safety of the  
22 senior citizens of Sun Lakes.

23           Any inconveniences on the golf course will  
24 be temporary, but long-term benefits will be  
25 beneficial for a long time for our health and safety

**D2-1  
Cont.**

**D3-1**

## Comment Set D, continued

23

1 and property value.

2           Thank you, again.

3

4           PHYLLIS ENET: My name is Phyllis Enet  
5 and I live at 5018 Singing Hills Drive in Banning,  
6 which is also called Sun Lakes Community.

7           I do not represent Sun Lakes. I am a  
8 former social worker, I represent my feelings of  
9 concern for the health and welfare of our  
10 environment of our community.

11           I'm particularly appreciative of what I  
12 was able to get through in your report. I felt  
13 quite happy about the fact that it was so  
14 comprehensive. I was really impressed with the  
15 depth and competence of this research.

16           My concerns are not just the health and  
17 welfare of the people that live in Sun Lakes, I'm  
18 also concerned with issues of the tall poles, which  
19 is the original plan of Edison. I'm concerned with  
20 the impact of any earthquake or fire that may occur,  
21 since we already had two fires in our community and  
22 that concerns me. In fact, where I lived for a  
23 considerable period of time, we were evacuated in  
24 1996 due to fire. Then recently you could see the  
25 fire from my home on Breckenridge where there are

**D3-1  
Cont.**

**D4-1**

## Comment Set D, continued

24

1 also power lines.

2           Historically we have here in California  
3 fires caused by such electrical buildings that are  
4 put up by Edison.

5           We also have difficulty leaving Sun Lakes  
6 if we should have disaster of any kind, earthquake  
7 or whatever. And if any of these wires fall on  
8 homes or on people who happen to be playing golf or  
9 whatever, it may be a fire again. We could really  
10 have difficulty leaving in an orderly fashion.

11           I also have concerns about the  
12 firefighters. We lost a lot of firefighters in the  
13 Esperanza fire. And low fire flames taking wires,  
14 where firefighters are trying to put out a fire in  
15 Sun Lakes would create quite a bit of difficulty and  
16 perhaps some fatalities. We have to look at the  
17 broader picture.

18           I do realize that there will be an  
19 inconvenience to golfers and to those who live close  
20 by. It's an unfortunate situation, but on the other  
21 hand, it's a very short period of time. It's only  
22 going to be a developmental thing. It's not going  
23 to be the entire golf course at the same time.  
24 Everything will be done piecemeal, that is what I  
25 understand. So all of the golf course areas will

**D4-1  
Cont.**

**D4-2**

## Comment Set D, continued

25

1 not all be dug up at once. It will be in stages.  
2 So that will give golfers someplace to play. We can  
3 play twice I suppose, I do not think that that would  
4 be too difficult.

5           Knowing that your health will be okay and  
6 that the aesthetics will be more attractive, that  
7 the golf course value will certainly grow from it  
8 and so will your real estate values, for those  
9 people who are interested in that.

10           Once again, I thank you for your report.  
11 I do hope that the commission will take this at  
12 least seriously that they will follow through with  
13 your recommendation. I'm very pleased and I do  
14 appreciate it. Thank you.

15

16           EDWARD LEONHARDT: My name is Edward  
17 Leonhardt. I live at 4837 Mission Hills Drive in  
18 Banning. My home is located adjacent to the  
19 Southern California Edison's proposed project  
20 through Sun Lakes. I'm also a formal party to the  
21 proceeding No. A0702022, and the author of the  
22 formal protest against the proposed project.

23           The primary objective of my protest was to  
24 assure that the commission would prepare a  
25 Environmental Impact Report. And that has truly

**D4-2  
Cont.**

**D4-3**

**D5-1**

## Comment Set D, continued

26

1 happened.

2           I would like to thank the commission and  
3 Aspen for doing a fine report and coming up with a  
4 conclusion that the environmental superior  
5 alternative will be the partial underground  
6 alternative.

7           It's my further request that the  
8 commission's final decision will be to direct Edison  
9 to implement the partial underground alternative for  
10 the El Casco project.

11           Thank you.

12

13           CHESTER BRITT: Is there anyone else  
14 that wishes to speak?

15           That being said, the meeting is basically  
16 adjourned. We will be here for a little while to  
17 answer any questions you have.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**D5-1  
Cont.**

**D5-2**

## Comment Set D, continued

27

1                               BANNING, CALIFORNIA

2                               JANUARY 9, 2008; 6:44 P.M.

3                               PUBLIC COMMENTS

4

5                       MARVIN FRIEDMAN: I made some comments  
6 earlier today, but I would like to go back and  
7 repeat the additional comments, the same comments  
8 again because there are some people that were not  
9 here earlier this afternoon. So I will repeat  
10 these comments, if that is okay with the Chair.

11                    My name is Marvin Friedman. I reside in  
12 the community of Sun Lakes in Banning, California,  
13 and I'm a former registered professional engineer in  
14 the State of California and reviewed the draft  
15 environmental impact report for the proposed El  
16 Castro System Project released on December 12, 2007.

17                    Let me first thank the California Public  
18 Utility Commission for commissioning the research  
19 from an independent source. The CPUC project team  
20 is to be highly commended for their leadership. In  
21 addition my thanks go to the EIR preparers and  
22 reviewers of the Aspen Environmental Group who  
23 provided us with a professional analysis along with  
24 the supporting documentation.

25                    In my professional opinion, the research

## Comment Set D, continued

28

1 is exceptionally well done reflecting the excellent  
2 background qualifications and experience of the  
3 Aspen Group.

4           I want to thank the City of Banning and  
5 their leadership in this research and providing the  
6 opportunity to discuss this project at various  
7 public forums in the past and giving the citizens of  
8 Banning an opportunity to express their concerns.

9           The recommendations that the Environmental  
10 Report concludes for the Sun Lakes Community should  
11 be accepted without reservation in my opinion. The  
12 Sun Lakes Community thanks all of those involved  
13 with this project for the concluding of  
14 environmental recommends for the underground option.

15           The health and safety of our  
16 immune-compromised senior citizen community is now  
17 assured by their forward-looking decisions.

18           I'm asking the CPUC, SCE, the City of  
19 Banning and the leadership of Sun Lakes to now come  
20 together in accepting the conclusions of the report.

21           Thank you very much.

22

23           NANCY DARWIN: First of all, my name is  
24 Nancy Darwin, and I live in Sun Lakes. And I'm  
25 sorry that I missed the earlier meeting. But

**D6-1**

## Comment Set D, continued

29

1 Wednesday is my day with the ladies. Sometimes  
2 that is more important. It gives me my sanity.

3 I would like to also thank the CPUC for  
4 all of the work that they have done, especially  
5 Juralynne Mosley. I sent her an e-mail shortly  
6 after the California fires because I was worried and  
7 concerned about leaving Sun Lakes, having to leave  
8 Sun Lakes in a hurry in case of fire.

9 It was documented in the Los Angeles Times  
10 and in the San Diego Tribune that two of the most  
11 recent fires were caused by downed power lines.  
12 There are 5,000 homes in Sun Lakes.

13 It would greatly concern me to see people  
14 stuck at home and not be able to get out of their  
15 homes as quickly as the people in Malibu or San  
16 Diego area.

17 By reading the report, it confirmed my  
18 concerns, and I'm glad that it's on the record, and  
19 I'm glad to see that CPUC is taking what our  
20 concerns are, and I really appreciate it and so do  
21 the residents in my community.

22

23 CHESTER BRITT: That is all of the cards  
24 I have is there anyone else that would like to  
25 make a verbal comment?

**D7-1**

### Comment Set D, continued

30

1 (This concluded the verbal comments made by the  
2 Public on January 9, 2008.)  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## Comment Set D, continued

31

1 CERTIFICATE

2 OF

3 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

4 The undersigned Certified Shorthand Reporter and  
5 deposition Officer of the State of California does  
6 hereby certify:

7 That the forgoing Presentation and Statements  
8 made by the Public were taken before me at the time and  
9 place therein set forth.

10 That the Presentation and all statements  
11 of the Public were recorded to the best of my  
12 ability stenographically and thereafter transcribed,  
13 said transcript being a true and as correct a copy  
14 of the proceedings thereof possible without the  
15 benefit of interrupting the speakers for  
16 clarification.

17 In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name  
18 this date: January 16, 2008.

19

20

21

22

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
Tina Blackmore, CSR No. 12409

24

25

## Responses to Comment Set D1 – Dennis Sauer

**D1-1** Your support for the Partial Underground Alternative is noted.

An economic analysis of the Proposed Project and alternatives is not required by CEQA as part of the environmental analysis. As cited in Section D.13.7.1 and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, economic or social effects of a project *per se* are not considered significant effects on the environment unless physical effects can be identified. Note that the CPUC will consider project cost when making a decision on the project.

## **Responses to Comment Set D2 – Marvin Friedman**

**D2-1** Please see response to Comment Set C4.

## Responses to Comment Set D3 – Rosalyn Friedman

**D3-1** The impacts of the Partial Underground Alternative are discussed in Section D, Environmental Analysis.

A discussion of the effects of the Proposed Project on property values is located in Section F.2.2, Property Values. In summary, as shown in detail in Section F.2.2, although there is evidence that transmission and subtransmission lines may have affected property values in some cases, the effects are generally smaller than anticipated, and greater detailed studies on the subject are required to determine a direct correlation between the siting of industrial facilities (such as subtransmission lines) and property values.

## Responses to Comment Set D4 – Phyllis Enet

**D4-1** The potential effects of earthquakes and associated mitigation are discussed in Section D.6, Geology and Soils. Impact GEO-6 (Project structures would be damaged by surface fault rupture at crossings of active and potentially active faults) discusses the location of active faults near and within the Proposed Project and potential damage to project facilities due to fault rupture. However, Mitigation Measure GEO-6 has been proposed to minimize damage to project structures in the event of an earthquake, and states:

**Minimize Project Structures within Active Fault Zones.** Perform a geologic study to confirm location of active and potentially mapped traces of the Beaumont Plain, San Andreas, and Crafton Hills faults where crossed by the Project alignment. Tower locations shall be adjusted as necessary to avoid placing tower footings on or across mapped fault traces. Towers on either side of a fault shall be designed to provide a significant amount of slack to allow for potential fault movement

The effects of the Proposed Project relating to wildfires are discussed in Section D.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Impact HAZ-8 (The project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires) discusses the potential for construction and operation of the Proposed Project to contribute to wildfires. Mitigation, including the implementation of a Fire Management Plan, County Fire Department review of construction methods, safe welding procedures, and fire preventive construction equipment would minimize the risk of wildfire posed by the Proposed Project.

**D4-2** A description of the construction of the Proposed Project and alternatives is located in Section B (Project Description) and Section C (Alternatives), respectively. Impacts associated with construction and operation of the Proposed Project and alternatives can be found in Section D, Environmental Analysis.

**D4-3** Please note that placement of the subtransmission line underground is not a recommendation by the EIR authors or CPUC Project Staff. The final decision on the alternative that will be approved is up to the vote of the five-member California Public Utilities Commission subsequent to the certification of the Final EIR.

## **Responses to Comment Set D5 – Edward Leonhardt**

**D5-1** Thank you for your comment.

**D5-2** Your support for the Partial Underground Alternative has been noted.

## **Responses to Comment Set D6 – Marvin Friedman**

**D6-1** Please see response to Comment Set C4.

## Responses to Comment Set D7 – Nancy Darwin [Darling]

**D7-1** Thank you for your comment.

The effects of the Proposed Project relating to wildfires are discussed in Section D.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Impact HAZ-8 (The project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires) discusses the potential for construction and operation of the Proposed Project to contribute to wildfires. Mitigation, including the implementation of a Fire Management Plan, County Fire Department review of construction methods, safe welding procedures, and fire preventive construction equipment would minimize the risk of wildfire posed by the Proposed Project.