

## Appendix C-1. Agency/Tribal Government Meeting Notes

These notes include summaries of three meetings:

- Morongo Band of Mission Indians (May 20, 2014)
- City of Redlands (May 20, 2014)
- City of Grand Terrace (May 21, 2014)

### 1. Morongo Band of Mission Indians

#### May 20, 2014 – Meeting with Roger Meyer, CEO, and Karen Woodard, Realty Administrator

- **Preferred Route and Alternatives on Tribal Land.**
  - Looked at 3 to 4 routes for the transmission line, tribal members voted on the preferred route and have accepted the Federal Aviation Administration-required hazard markings.
  - An official but brief response to the CPUC’s Data Request will be submitted to the CPUC soon (Note that the CPUC received the letter on May 22, 2014).
  - Package deal on the corridor, and there are no alternatives that the tribe would accept to replace the preferred route; the EIR/EIS should not consider alternatives to the agreed upon preferred route unless just to dismiss them in the EIR/EIS’s Alternatives Screening Report.
  - Tribe has chosen to have SCE install tubular steel poles (TSPs) where they will be most visible to tribal members (from the western end of the Tribal Land to the outlet mall area); however, engineering and construction may require changes from TSP to lattice-steel towers in some locations (e.g., washes).
- **Library Repository.** For the library repository, use the administration building address, which is 12700 Pumarra Road, Banning CA, 92220
- **Future Transmission Lines.** Morongo stated that it is not currently discussing future transmission lines within the existing ROW with SCE. However, based on the Tribe’s previous discussions with SCE, it is the Tribe’s understanding that the 220 kV lines would be on the north and south sides and the potential future single- or double-circuit 500 kV line would be between these two new 220 kV lines. [Note: the preliminary engineering that the CPUC and consultants have received from SCE indicates that the proposed new 220 kV lines would be separated by only about 50 feet in the tribal segment, as they are proposed for much of the rest of the project’s length. Therefore, it will not be possible to install any new line between the proposed future lines.] It is possible that the 500 kV line may be routed around the Reservation in this segment.
- **No Project/Action Alternative for the EIR/EIS.** The renegotiated SCE-Morongo 50-year ROW lease agreement is contingent on the West of Devers Upgrade Project moving forward. Therefore, the No Project/Action Alternative should state that SCE and the Morongo would need to renegotiate their ROW agreement or SCE would have to remove/relocate its existing lines/ROW around the Reservation.
- **Cumulative Projects.** Cumulative projects that should be considered:
  - Seminole Drive extension, south of Interstate 10
  - Interstate 10 bypass: Banning to Cabazon Project (County of Riverside environmental review process has been completed; contact: Patti Romo)

- Gas-fired power generation facility on the Morongo Reservation (east of the outlet mall). Too far in future to consider, at least 5 years away from development given current Power Purchase Agreement interest from utilities
- Gateway Center Warehouse project proposed in Cherry Valley (in planning, but locally controversial)
- Outdoor Amphitheater for 50,000 to 60,000 people for events like the Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival.

## 2. City of Redlands

### May 20, 2014 – Meeting with Don Young, Engineering Manager, and two other members of engineering staff, City of Redlands

- Vehicular traffic on Mountain View Avenue is a concern to the City, because of upgrades and staging at San Bernardino Substation. The City asked how big and how many trucks will there be, and what impact will they have to the local roadways?
- The City asked what will be the truck routes (i.e., will trucks use the local roadways or SCE's existing ROW)?
- How will this project mitigate for impacts on local roads? Long-term use of roads break the "cake" (cake and frosting analogy), so damage to local roads needs to be addressed by area in the EIR/EIS, both for construction and operations. Other projects are assessed a per truck charge or fee to address damage to local roads
- **Cumulative Projects to Consider** include:
  - Mountain View Avenue Widening Project (by Inland Valley Development Agency). This project has created some restrictions that should be considered in the EIR/EIS, such as restrictions on left turns along some areas of this project; may need to install traffic signals to address impacts
  - Aggressive city-wide paving program will be conducted in the City that may be impacted by the WOD project; within next 3 to 5 years will be paving 2/3 of the streets and other locations throughout the City (640 lane miles)
  - Water project is also underway that will affect paving; Inland Valley Development Agency part of the Norton Air Force Base Reuse project
  - Alabama Street – street will be widened and the electrical poles (near the K-Mart) will be relocated to accommodate this widening project; this will be done by November 2014
  - Redlands Passenger Rail along Alabama Street (2017-2019); NOP has been issued through SanBAG (San Bernardino Association of Governments)
  - Citrus Plaza, Phase II, in unincorporated San Bernardino County north of Lugonia Avenue, should also be considered in the cumulative scenario; grading/construction is underway
- Send detailed map book pages and draft meeting notes/comments to Don Young for review and concurrence before including in the scoping report
- Send the cumulative project request to the Engineering Department for capital projects (in addition to the Planning Department) at the City of Redlands.

### 3. City of Grand Terrace

#### May 21, 2014 – Meeting with Kenneth Henderson, Interim City Manager, and Sandra Molina, Deputy Director of Community Development

- The CPUC gave a brief summary of the project, explained that SCE’s application has not been deemed complete, and summarized the City of Redlands’ concerns regarding potential traffic and roadway impacts.
- The City of Grand Terrace worked with the City of Colton on the Washington Street/Mt Vernon Avenue Interchange (I-215) Project, located behind the existing shopping center, which is in California gnat-catcher habitat as well as a potential landslide area.
- Slope stability is an issue where the towers are currently located near the border of Grand Terrace and Colton; a house deck collapsed recently from slope failure. The CPUC stated that these issues would be addressed in the EIR/EIS.
- The City stated that its biggest concerns will likely be the heights of the new towers and construction effects, and requested that the CPUC provide a tower by tower height comparison table showing existing tower heights compared with proposed heights, and copies of applicable map book pages.
- The City is concerned with dust mitigation during construction due to high winds in the area, and asked whether the construction would abide by local requirements. The CPUC stated that dust suppression would be in accordance with the local air district and that the CPUC has a Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program that Aspen Environmental Group will monitor in the field during construction.
- The City asked whether construction hours would be during the day. The CPUC said that the project would be in accordance with local noise ordinances and SCE would need exemptions at the discretion of local agencies to perform after-hours work. Additionally, the CPUC usually requires mitigation for construction notification and a hotline for public questions and complaints.
- The City said that it would submit a list of cumulative projects, including both capital and development projects
- The City asked if the CPUC is considering routing alternatives. Given the existing corridor and the route on Tribal land that is specified by the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, the CPUC said that it will primarily be looking at redesign of tower locations or underground alternatives in certain segments, among others. It was noted that the southern existing transmission corridor through Grand Terrace (which is unaffected by the West of Devers Upgrade Project) could potentially be the location of future transmission upgrades by SCE.
- The City stated that it is impressed with the positive and proactive outreach by the CPUC.
- The City mentioned that they were meeting with the City of Colton and may be submitting joint comments on this project

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts**

Date	From	Comments
<b>State Agencies</b>		
June 5, 2014	<b>California Department of Water Resources</b> David M. Samson State Water Project Operations Support Office Division of Operations and Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project will cross DWRs ROW near Barton Road along West of Devers at MP1 in community of Grand Terrace</li> <li>• Improvements that encroach or impact ROW will require review and possible permit from DWR</li> <li>• Provide subsequent environmental documents to specific contact noted in letter, and keep DWR informed about the project</li> </ul>
June 12, 2014	<b>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</b> Ali Abhili Senior Environmental Scientist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources</li> <li>• EIR/EIS should include sufficient, specific, and current biological information on existing habitat and species</li> <li>• Species-specific surveys may be necessary; document should present current data</li> <li>• EIR/EIS must consider project's consistency with approved habitat conservation plans in the project area; 2 plans cover the project area</li> <li>• Permittee must demonstrate consistency with both plans; the letter includes a brief discussion of the procedures for obtaining compliance with the plans</li> <li>• Document must also consider project's impact on streambeds and need for Lake or Streambed Alteration; letter outlines the information that should be considered</li> <li>• All direct and indirect cumulative impacts to biological resources must be considered</li> <li>• Analyze a full range of alternatives including ones that reduce biological impacts of project</li> <li>• Address off-site compensation for unavoidable impacts and acquisition/protection of high-quality habitat</li> <li>• Consider these issues in the EIR:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Quantify impacts to habitats and species; provide map</li> <li>– Use recent surveys conducted in appropriate time of year; consult CNDD; consult agency survey protocols and guidance documents, including those of the USFWS</li> <li>– Provide analysis of habitat conservation plans</li> <li>– Analysis should be consistent with LSA and CESA requirements</li> <li>– Obtain ITP if project results in "take" of State-listed species; early consultation is recommended</li> <li>– Thorough analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts</li> <li>– Analyze a range of alternatives to the project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Special Districts</b>		
May 27, 2014	<b>South Coast Air Quality Management District</b> Ed Eckerle Program Supervisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments are recommendations regarding analysis of potential air quality impacts</li> <li>• Send copy of the Draft EIR when complete with appendices and technical documents</li> <li>• Use SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook (1993) for guidance on air quality analysis</li> <li>• Impacts from construction, operation, and demolition should be calculated as well as direct and indirect sources</li> <li>• Use SCAQMD regional and localized significance thresholds</li> <li>• If project will have heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles recommend a mobile source health risk assessment</li> <li>• Refer to SCAQMD guidance documents for possible mitigation measures for the project</li> <li>• SCQAMD website includes rules, reports and data</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts**

Date	From	Comments
June 11, 2014	Metropolitan Water District Deirdre West Manager, Environmental Planning Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colorado River Aqueduct (CRA) extends in east-west direction and is bisected by proposed project (MP38, MP42)</li> <li>• Project could interfere with ongoing operation, maintenance, and repair activities on the CRA</li> <li>• EIR/EIS must evaluate potential impacts of MWD facilities and fully mitigate</li> <li>• Require design plans for any activity near MWD pipelines or facilities; MWD must approve design plans for portions that could impact facilities</li> <li>• Letter provides information on how to obtain information on MWD facilities from the Substructure Information Line</li> <li>• Letter includes "Guidelines for Developments in Area of Facilities, Fee Properties, and/or Easement of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California"</li> </ul>
<b>Local Agencies</b>		
June 4, 2014	County of San Bernardino Sundaramoorthy Srirajan, P.E. Public Works Engineer III Environmental Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciate the opportunity to provide comments when more information is available regarding hydrology and water quality</li> </ul>
June 11, 2014	City of Colton Mark R. Tomich Development Services Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taller, wider towers and larger conductor may significantly impact scenic vistas in the city</li> <li>• Two additional towers (D-V6 and D-V12) will be highly visible from nearby residential areas and heavily traveled roadways including Mount Vernon Ave., Barton Road, and I-215; need detailed visual simulations</li> <li>• Undergrounding should be considered as mitigation</li> <li>• Project may impede residential development with Reche Canyon by creating physical barrier and requiring greater setbacks; review City's General Plan, Zoning Code and Reche Canyon Specific Plan</li> <li>• Expanded corridor may increase fire risk; consider impacts of risk of fire and mitigation such as emergency response plan and undergrounding to remove risk of fire</li> <li>• Analyze impact of road closures and limited access in the cities of Colton and Grand Terrace</li> <li>• Consider impacts to recreation trails and off-road activities and the limitation of recreational connectivity between Colton and Grand Terrace</li> <li>• Slope stability and erosion must be considered especially property acquired by Grand Terrace because of geological stability issues</li> <li>• Short- and long-term impacts must be considered and because of high winds in the area include dust suppression measures</li> <li>• Short- and long-term noise impacts must be adequately evaluated and mitigated.</li> </ul>
June 11, 2014	City of Banning Zai Abu Bakar Community Development Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide specific information on:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Structures to be removed and their locations</li> <li>– Structures to be upgraded and their locations</li> <li>– Structures that would be relocated and their locations</li> <li>– Timeline for the start and completion of above items</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Confirm whether towers at East Pit of Robertson's Mine will be relocated, at NE corner of Banning corporate boundary to west of MP 30</li> <li>• Need more detail in order to determine how the project impacts existing and future land uses in city</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies and Special Districts**

---

Date	From	Comments
June 12, 2014	City of Grand Terrace Sandra Molina Community Development Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taller, more massive towers are proposed to support heavier conductors</li> <li>• two additional towers (D-V6 and D-V12) proposed near Grand Terrace and Colton; towers will be highly visible from two heavily-traveled roads (Mount Vernon Avenue and Barton Road)</li> <li>• Need thorough analysis of visual impacts including simulations and undergrounding as mitigation</li> <li>• Project close to residences and commercial areas; assess short and long term noise impacts; no construction from 7 pm to 7 am</li> <li>• Must consider road closures and limited access in EIR/EIS</li> <li>• California gnatcatcher and its habitat in Segment 2. Potential impacts must be assess and mitigated</li> <li>• Slope stability and erosion must be considered; Mount Vernon slope has experienced stability issues and area has open undeveloped hillsides</li> <li>• Must consider airborne dust and construction vehicle emissions; area experiences high winds, mitigate with dust suppression measures</li> <li>• Expanded corridor may increase fire risk in open undeveloped areas; issue must be considered and mitigate with emergency response plan, enhanced fire protection and undergrounding to remove fire risk</li> <li>• Consider impacts to recreation trails and off-road activities and the limitation of recreational connectivity between Colton and Grand Terrace</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
May 12, 2014	Cherry Valley Lakes Resort Randy Wright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No objection as long as proposed project does not adversely affect current RV storage in project area</li> <li>• Stored RVs in project area for over 10 years</li> </ul>
June 4, 2014	Southern California Gas Company Anthony A. Klecha Principal Environmental Scientist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project crosses over 2 dozen SCG distribution pipelines and 3 natural gas transmission pipelines as described in letter</li> <li>• Applicant should call Underground Service Alert at least 2 business days prior to performing any excavation work</li> <li>• If any SCG facilities need to be abandoned then the EIR/EIS must consider potential impacts of this work</li> </ul>
June 9, 2014	San Gorgonio Farms Inc. Bradford W. Adams Vice President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter prepared on behalf of 5 energy and other organizations</li> <li>• Notice fails to address severe impacts that need to be addressed and mitigated; effect of curtailing existing power plants specifically renewable energy projects for several years without reimbursement</li> <li>• Address in all or one of these – land use, socioeconomics, public health and safety, public services and utilities</li> <li>• SCE will allow companies not on grid to sell their power to the market</li> <li>• SCE will take existing power lines out of service for upgrade and will curtail existing suppliers</li> <li>• SCE proposes to stop payments; notice to stop generating or reduce generation without regard for debt obligations, PPA, or other issues</li> <li>• This has negative trickle-down affect to land owners, other entities</li> <li>• SCE should compensate affected generators for lost production</li> <li>• WOD is not for system reliability or for maintenance; upgrades to allow new generators to interconnect to the system</li> <li>• Request SCE to mitigate damages to renewable generators, and that the construction schedule limit the amount of time for curtailment and require construction at low generation times (Oct-Feb)</li> </ul>
June 12, 2014	Painted Hills Wind Developers Brian Halloran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Painted Hills owns and operates a 19 MW wind project in Riverside County and in vicinity of Devers Substation</li> <li>• Same comments as noted above for San Gorgonio Farms Inc.</li> </ul>
June 12, 2014	Desert Wind Energy Association Fredrick W. Noble Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coachella Valley wind energy projects - 500 MW of installed capacity</li> <li>• Local landowners implored to build wind farms by SCE to facilitate licensing of San Onofre reactor No. 2; SCE has turned on wind farms – Edison's guerrilla war against wind energy</li> <li>• Now SCE wants to unnecessarily curtail wind projects</li> <li>• PUC should not allow SCE to get rid of wind projects</li> <li>• Other comments the same as noted above for San Gorgonio Farms Inc.</li> </ul>
June 12, 2014	BayWa r.e. Renewable Energy Kat Valentine Assistant Project Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discussion of proposed mitigation to existing generators affected by curtailment with proposed upgrades</li> <li>• Curtailing existing generators for up to 4 years without reimbursement is a severe impact that needs to be mitigated</li> <li>• Has lost money from previous curtailments at the Devers Substation; an additional 4 years to benefit new energy facilities at the expense of existing generators is untenable and discriminatory</li> <li>• Construction should be done at low generation time, minimize during peak energy producing times (Oct-Feb) and bring one line on as soon as possible to carry load of existing lines</li> <li>• Compensate existing generators that have been in service and will continue to be in service</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Organizations and Companies**

---

Date	From	Comments
June 12, 2014	Energy Unlimited, Inc. David S. Lamm, Esq. EUI President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Operate a 25 MW wind power generator facility 2 miles west of SCE Devers substation</li><li>• Need to address costs and damages resulting from curtailing projects in immediate area of project</li><li>• Need a plan for mitigating the curtailment related losses</li><li>• Turning wind facilities off and on creates a safety concern especially in high winds, shutting down substations also a safety concern</li><li>• If curtailment occurs on windy days, will lose production revenue, not able to store power we do not sell</li><li>• Uncompensated curtailment in spring and summer can have devastating impact on ability to fund operations</li><li>• Mitigate damages to existing renewable generators</li><li>• Construction should be done at low generation time, minimize during peak energy producing times (Oct-Feb)</li></ul>

---

---

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Written Comments Received from Tribal Governments**

---

Date	From	Comments
May 29, 2014	Cabazon Band of Mission Indians Judy Stapp Director of Cultural Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project is located outside Cabazon Reservation lands.</li><li>• No specific archival information on cultural activity or Native American burial or religious sites</li></ul>

## Appendix C-5. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens

Date	From	Comments
May 19, 2014	Joel and Virginia Mendoza	<p><i>Comments translated from Spanish</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don't speak English</li> <li>• The electrical towers pass less than 200 feet from my house</li> <li>• We have two young sons that play under the transmission lines, we want to know if there is a high risk of danger or if an accident were to happen who is responsible to resolve the problem.</li> <li>• Thank you for your attention.</li> </ul>
May 19, 2014	Edward Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any effect of the project on the connection to the Banning electric utility?</li> </ul>
May 22, 2014	Robert Wyser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not able to attend meeting in Loma Linda</li> <li>• Have 4 transmission towers on land, they will be replaced by 4 new towers</li> <li>• Need clarification of terms in Agricultural resources: temporary, potential, and long-term impacts</li> <li>• Interested in assessment and solutions to removal of orange trees and damage to other trees in making room for new towers</li> <li>• Concerned with statement: "Project would potentially converted farmland to non-agricultural use" – will zoning be changed?</li> <li>• Provide approximate schedule or time table for relocating towers</li> </ul>
May 29, 2014	Bill Souder	<p><i>Comments also presented at Beaumont scoping meeting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently towers are ~100 feet from property but new towers will be closer; there should be compensation to property owners; move towers on the north side of corridor away from houses</li> <li>• Use pole-type towers instead of the truss style</li> <li>• EMF needs to be evaluated</li> <li>• SCE should revisit easement agreements and come to new agreement with property owners; should allow parks, RV storage, and other uses; provide latest copies of easement language</li> <li>• SCE should be required to restore landscaping after construction</li> <li>• If SCE is abandoning 100 feet of ROW on the north side, this area should be relinquished back to property owners</li> <li>• Association has considered outdoor concert area, additional parking, replacing grass with plants, and game courts in the easement.</li> </ul>
June 4, 2014	Steve Ferguson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with replacement towers; new towers (D-V117 and DEC-10) will be more obtrusive</li> <li>• Move towers away from homes and to the middle of the corridor or on the north side, please consider this to help homeowners</li> </ul>
June 11, 2014	Vincent and Martha van Rooijen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Live near segment 4, towers are already too close to our home they do not need to be moved closer</li> <li>• Deny project, move project, or underground this nightmare they are dropping on our homes</li> <li>• Negatively impacted because SCE wants to replace existing towers with taller towers and they want to install 50' from ROW where it is steep and close to our property</li> <li>• Space is only buffer and they are taking that away</li> <li>• Will suffer from unmitigated noise, severe visual impacts, slope destabilization, EMF, air quality, loss of buffer, fire threats, loss of wildlife and vegetation, loss of habitat, dust, access roads</li> <li>• SCE is piecemealing, trying to escape cumulative and growth-inducing review under CEQA</li> <li>• Look at the decision for El Casco, which removed a potential route near our house – found to be infeasible by CPUC</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-5. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New application for WOD is a mirror of former rejected, infeasible Northerly Route option; why wasn't the need for additional capacity brought up in the El Casco project; piecemealing the system</li> <li>• Plans show 200' on north side of corridor; obvious that they will come in again for the 200 feet on northern hillside and further intensify the towers, where there is 1 there will be 4</li> <li>• Northerly Route (Option 3) was found to have more receptors (our homes) and would unavoidable noise, visual, air quality, biological resources, hazards and fire impacts (page ES-42)</li> <li>• All of the issues identified in Table ES-2 of the El Casco EIR should be addressed</li> <li>• Request that agencies meet with the Fairway Canyon HOA</li> <li>• Make the project a topic of the monthly "Beaumont Cares" meeting sponsored by the City at city hall</li> <li>• Letter provides suggestions for newspapers and websites to place project information</li> <li>• Letter provides 18 issues that it believes need detailed studies including environmental impacts noted above, cumulative impacts, growth-inducing effects, alternatives, and effective mitigation</li> <li>• Alternatives suggested:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Move to El Casco route; route that merges with Morongo line but does not affect homes</li> <li>– If can't find route that does not affect homes then it needs to go underground; CPUC needs to flexible on undergrounding</li> <li>– Move towers 200' on north side hill where there are no homes</li> <li>– If vacant property on north side gets develops, the developer can plan a better buffer from homes rather than having no options</li> <li>– Make SCE accountable for not addressing this route in the El Casco application and review; if SCE knew they wanted both lines then deny this project and make them provide projects in full</li> <li>– Need rules on piecemealing</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Letter includes photos of the towers location near Hagen Heights homes in Beaumont</li> <li>• Find another route or underground</li> </ul>
June 12, 2014	Horst Schnur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to project, it is too close to my house; should not be able to move them closer</li> <li>• Move route, underground project, or move 200 feet on other side of hill near vacant land</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-6. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name & Organization	Comments
<b>Scoping Meeting, May 19, 2014 (6:00 pm to 8:00 pm) – Banning, CA</b>	
David Doherty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan shows towers will move 35 feet south, which is right across from my back yard; footings have been marked and show that the tower (DEC106) will be right next to my house</li> <li>• Why move closer to homes when there is vacant land behind me</li> <li>• Submitted pictures of his property for consideration in the EIR/EIS</li> </ul>
Edward Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Banning has its own electric utility; will there be any change in the connection of these power lines to the utility?</li> </ul>
Susan Savolainen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projected length of time from one segment to another?</li> <li>• No mention of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act</li> <li>• Are public routes of transit going to be identified?</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, May 20, 2014 (6:00 pm to 8:00 pm) – Loma Linda, CA</b>	
Linda Rehm Corporate Business Center Property Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate Business Center consists of 31 office industrial buildings right off of Mountain View Avenue</li> <li>• Want verification that we are in segment 2 of project, and if in this segment we would find out on the map where our location is in relation to the project</li> <li>• Owner wants to know if the towers currently on his property will be replaced; what would the sizes be of the new towers?</li> </ul>
Bill Olinger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Live at base of Loma Linda hills; see towers from front yard</li> <li>• Will towers be replaced with larger ones? Will visual impact be tremendous on the hills?</li> <li>• Will there be lengthy road closures in residential areas or lots of construction noise?</li> </ul>
Terrence Emershay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slide showed removal of 116 towers in San Timoteo Canyon and replace with 133 towers, where will towers go</li> <li>• Family has property in San Timoteo Canyon in Segment 3</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, May 21, 2014 (3:00 pm to 5:00 pm) – Beaumont, CA</b>	
Patrick Rafter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can this power line be placed underground? Has it been considered?</li> <li>• Asking that undergrounding the line be considered, it is safer not only for public but for SCE too</li> </ul>
Eric Johnson Wagner Wind Power (Palm Springs) and Baywa Energy Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not see any mitigation for existing energy producers that are going to suffer serious curtailments over the next 3 to 4 years</li> <li>• Possibly an issue with PPAs also</li> </ul>
Lanny Swerdlow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the transmission lines are on my property, what effect will it cause for me using the property after it is done?</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, May 21, 2014 (7:00 pm to 9:00 pm) – Beaumont, CA</b>	
Tom Harris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have property in San Mateo Canyon, 10 acres, towers in rear portion</li> <li>• SCE included mitigation measures in their application but mitigation measure have not yet been proposed? I understand we will have an opportunity to review mitigation measures at some point.</li> <li>• Aesthetics is very important, how much of a voice do I have on placement of the towers, currently there are 3 towers</li> <li>• Want to explore possibility of shifting towers back in 400-foot ROW so they are less prominent to me</li> <li>• What will be mitigated with regard to EMF, distance and placement from each other (towers)</li> <li>• How will we be advised about the project from this point forward?</li> </ul>

---

### Appendix C-6. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

---

Name & Organization	Comments
Thomas Covey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I live near segment 6, MP 45, right at Devers Substation; I did not receive the notice</li><li>• Live very close to substation, have lived there for 30 years, my property is worthless, need to address as socioeconomic issue</li><li>• Address public health and safety along with EMF</li><li>• Have a recording studio/record label; substation not at full capacity, when at full capacity I will be out of business</li><li>• Concerned with cumulative impact of this stuff going in</li><li>• Concerned with safety of clients, have million-dollar rock stars coming to business, afraid somebody will get electrocuted</li><li>• Do you prefer comments in the mail or email?</li></ul>
Bill Souder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Biggest concern is moving towers within 50 feet of residential property lines</li><li>• Corridor has lots of room to move towers to the center or to the north</li><li>• Pole-type towers are much nicer looking towers, don't know cost but these poles should be considered</li><li>• EMF is a concern; would like information on EMF mentioned earlier and on the project website</li><li>• People will be concerned with property values with the towers being moved closer to homes; move towers to the north side of ROW</li><li>• We have had run-ins with SCE regarding the use of the easement; easements should be updated because we would like to have flexibility on the use of the easement</li><li>• Will SCE replace landscaping that it removes?</li></ul>
Phyllis Lichtenstein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How long will construction take in Segment 4? Months? Weeks? Years?</li><li>• During construction how will the project effect businesses and homes as far as electrical power ability and outages?</li><li>• Will construction be done at night?</li></ul>

---