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KRISTI BLACK: I think we're going to get started. Can everyone hear me?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

KRISTI BLACK: Welcome to the public meeting for the Draft EIR for SCE's Valley-Ivyglen Subtransmission Project and Alberhill System Project. This is the second of two meetings. Last night we held a meeting in Lake Elsinore.

So if you could please sign in, if you haven't already. You're welcome to sign in on the way out.

If you would like to make a verbal comment today, if you can please fill out a speaker card, you can do so at any time during the meeting. We have such a small group here, during the comment period we might as well go by a raised hand. You can also fill out a comment card there or submit written comments, and we'll also go over how to submit written comments after the meeting today.

So if you could turn off your cell phone or turn it to silent, that would be much appreciated. Exit
locations are all three doors around the room. The restroom is out the door to the left and then go left again.

So the agenda for the presentation -- and I see some familiar faces -- it's the same one as yesterday. First we'll introduce the team that's here. We'll go over the purpose of the meeting. We'll discuss how to comment on the Draft EIR. We'll talk briefly about CEQA and the CPUC review processes, give a description of both proposed projects, talk about the objectives for both proposed projects, and go over briefly the environmental impacts, and then talk about alternatives and provide a little bit more information.

We'll have an informal Q and A period after the presentation, and then we'll get into the formal comment period after that.

INTRODUCTIONS

KRISTI BLACK: First, for introductions, from the California Public Utilities Commission I have the project manager, Jensen Uchida, and he's sitting back here.

I am from Ecology and Environment. We're the contractor for the California Public Utilities Commission, and we prepared the Draft EIR under their
direction.

    My name is Kristi Black. I'm a senior planner.

    Rachel James wasn't able to make it tonight, but she will be the project manager going forward. I wanted to introduce her name so that it's familiar to everyone as the project moves forward.

    Caitlin Barns is also here. She is the deputy project manager and also the biologist on the project.

    Silvia Yanez is also here. She's a senior environmental specialist.

    And also Jessica Midbust is also here.

    PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

    KRISTI BLACK: So the purpose of this meeting is to talk about the Draft EIR for both projects.

    Southern California Edison submitted two separate applications, one for each project.

    CPUC, as the CEQA Lead Agency, prepared and released a Draft EIR discussing both projects and is hosting this meeting to share information about the Draft EIR, and to get your input on what to include in the Final EIR.
HOW TO COMMENT ON THE DRAFT EIR

KRISTI BLACK: Here is some information on how to comment on the Draft EIR. And we have handouts of this information, as well, for you to take with you.

We'll accept verbal comments today. The public comment period for the Draft EIR ends on May 31st, which is the day after the holiday. There are a few ways to comment. They're all listed here.

CEQA AND CPUC REVIEW PROCESSES

This graphic explains the CPUC'S review process for projects that are submitted to the CPUC.

You can see on the left is the CEQA process, and we're at the public comment stage on the Draft EIR.

That environmental review process runs concurrently with the CPUC Administrative Law Process, which is shown on the right here.

Ultimately the CEQA process is one part of the decision-making process at the CPUC.

Once the final EIR is prepared and certified, it's part of what the commissioners take into consideration when deciding whether or not to approve SCE's application, deny it or approve an alternative.
You can also be involved in the Administrative Law Judge Proceeding process, and there's a couple of links here on how to do that if you would like to get involved. We also have some handouts up front on how to do that, and there's also the Public Advisor. One of their roles is to help the public figure out how to be involved in this other parallel process.

So as I mentioned, there are actually two projects that the EIR covers. There are two separate permits that would have to be considered by the commission, but the CPUC decided to put both projects in one EIR for several reasons. They're in close proximity. In some cases transmission lines proposed in the Alberhill Project would actually be on poles proposed for the Valley-Ivyglen Project. There would be overlapping impacts, and also similar construction timing.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

KRISTI BLACK: So this is a brief overview of what the Valley-Ivyglen Project involves. The main element would be a new single-circuit 115-kilovolt subtransmission line. Some of you might remember that this project in another form was approved in 2010.

The project that the CPUC is considering today
mostly follows the route that was approved in 2010, but this line would be approximately 27 miles long and construction within about 23 miles of the new right-of-way. The project would also involve some new fiber optic lines for telecommunications.

This is a map -- and the EIR contains more detailed maps and more segments. This is an overview map of where the Valley-Ivyglen Project is located.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

KRISTI BLACK: There are several objectives of the Valley-Ivyglen Project.

First, is to serve the electrical demand in the Electrical Needs Area, which was outlined in blue on the previous graphic; also, increase electrical reliability to the Electrical Needs Area, and also improve operational and maintenance flexibility.

The Draft EIR made a few conclusions related to significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, and those were that during construction air quality emissions would be significant and unavoidable as would noise from construction.

Several other resource areas would experience significant impacts, but the Draft EIR concluded that
with implementation and mitigation measures those impacts could be reduced to less than significant levels, and those resource areas are listed on the slide.

In addition to significant project level impacts, in combination with other projects that are taking place at the same time as the Valley-Ivyglen Project, there could be cumulative significant impacts.

The Draft EIR concluded that for air quality and for noise the Valley-Ivyglen Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to those cumulative impacts.

So the EIR also had to consider alternatives to SCE's proposed projects. In the alternative screening report that was prepared we looked at 14 alternatives. Five of those alternatives were carried forward in the EIR in addition to the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative is what would happen if the commission denies the project and SCE is not allowed to build the project.

The Draft EIR identifies Alternative C as the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative C involves undergrounding Segment VIG6 along Temescal Canyon Road and Horsethief Canyon Road instead of having an overhead segment to the west of I-15.

For the Alberhill Project there are a couple
other additional components in addition to a 115-kV transmission line. SCE is proposing to construct a 500-kilovolt substation, and also to construct two 500-kilovolt transmission lines to connect that substation to an existing 500-kilovolt transmission line. There will also be, as I stated, a new 115-kV transmission line, about 20 total miles, and also, just as with Valley-Ivyglen, there will also be some telecommunication lines.

This is an overview of the Alberhill Project. It includes the existing substations as well as the existing 500-kV line, which is on the upper portion of this picture.

For Alberhill there's three objectives. One is to relieve a projected electrical demand in the area. Second objective is to construct a new 500-kilovolt substation in the Electrical Needs Area. The third is to maintain the system ties between the new 115-kilovolt System and another 115-kilovolt System, and that gives the SCE maintenance flexibility.

For environmental impacts for the Alberhill System Project there are several impacts identified in the Draft EIR that would be significant and unavoidable. One of those is aesthetics during operation and
maintenance of the project, also air quality emissions during construction, and also noise during construction.

For cumulative impacts, the same three were found to be cumulatively considerable -- aesthetics, air quality, and noise.

For the Alberhill Project the alternative screening report that was prepared identified 34 alternatives to SCE's proposed project. Two alternatives were carried forward with full analysis in the EIR, including, as with Valley-Ivyglen, a No Project Alternative.

The Draft EIR identifies Alternative DD as the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative DD involves an alternate substation site location that is approximately 4 or 5 miles north of SCE's proposed substation site.

So both projects have their own website posted by the CPUC.

Quick ways to get to those are up on the slide now, but if you Google CPUC Alberhill or CPUC Valley-Ivyglen, it should be the first result that comes up.
KRISTI BLACK: So now I'd like to do an informal Q and A. I know that was a lot, covering a lot of ground in a short amount of time. So if anybody has any questions about the project or the contents of the EIR or the process, we can do that. And we do have a court reporter here. She's over here. So if we could speak up, or we have a microphone if you need it, that would be great.

SPEAKER 1: I can speak loudly. I think it was slide 14 or around there, you indicated that the Ivyglen Project needed to connect Valley-Ivyglen. Is that what I understood?

KRISTI BLACK: Is it Objective 2 on this slide?

SPEAKER 1: Yes. Valley-Ivyglen. This project doesn't do that. This project connects -- no line will go from Valley to Ivyglen.

KRISTI BLACK: So if you can see on the map here Ivyglen Substation is here. The proposed route goes up here to Valley Substation which is on the right.

SPEAKER 1: Well, in your Draft EIR it shows the line goes from Valley to Alberhill.

Is Ivyglen going to be a 500-kV Substation as well as Alberhill?
KRISTI BLACK: Ivyglen is an existing substation.

SPEAKER 1: I understand. It's not 500.

KRISTI BLACK: It's not 500.

SPEAKER 1: Is it going to be 500?

KRISTI BLACK: No.

SPEAKER 1: Then Valley is a 500. When you're saying it's connected Valley to Ivyglen --

KRISTI BLACK: Sorry. Ivyglen is 500 -- Can SCE clarify this? Because Valley steps down the power to 115-kV.

SCE SPEAKER: Valley Substation is currently a 500 to 115. Ivyglen Substation is a 115 to 33. So the line will connect from Valley to Ivyglen.

SPEAKER: So it's a 115 line, not a 500 line.

KRISTI BLACK: No. The 500-kV is proposed as the Alberhill Project.

SPEAKER 2: The segment of line along Temescal Canyon Road, is that proposed as above ground or underground? I know in the alternative it is underground, Alternative C. Right, I mean you can see like where the lake is; so just northwest of there.

KRISTI BLACK: Sure, let me pull up. We have a web viewer and I can use the pointer on that to help.

Sir, you're talking about this segment here?

SPEAKER 2: No, just north of it.
KRISTI BLACK: So the segment that doesn't have the red dots on it is proposed as underground. That's Segment Valley-Ivyglen 8.

SPEAKER 2: Okay. Thank you.

SPEAKER 3: On the Alberhill side, my brother-in-law lives there right off Concordia Ranch Road, and it looks like those two lines are going right up over the top of his house, and I'm trying to find out if those are still going there or if that's what this DD, Alternative DD would be. I think they're 500.

KRISTI BLACK: So under Alternative DD the 500-kV lines would not be constructed where SCE is proposing to construct them.

SPEAKER 3: Alberhill Substation.

KRISTI BLACK: Correct.

SPEAKER 3: Because you can see them on the map right there where they go up from there. He's right under them.

KRISTI BLACK: So under alternative DD the 500-kV lines would be located here.

Are there other questions?

SPEAKER 4: One of the ways that the Draft EIR indicates as a way of mitigating noise from helicopter construction is going to, quote, "SCE will be designating flight paths away from residential areas."
How is that going to be achieved, given that most of the landing pad zones are next to homes, and all the lines are along the homes. So how will Edison avoid residential areas when everything is in a residential -- virtually residential area.

KRISTI BLACK: That would be a good comment on the Draft EIR.

SPEAKER 4: Okay.

KRISTI BLACK: Part of the CEQA process is that any comments on the Draft EIR, we have to respond to them in writing in the Final EIR. So if you want clarification on how mitigation measures are going to be implemented or if you don't think it's sufficient to mitigate the impact, that would be a great comment.

SPEAKER 4: I just don't see how you address it.

KRISTI BLACK: That would be a perfect comment as well.

SPEAKER 4: Okay.

KRISTI BLACK: Sure.

SPEAKER 5: Edison is claiming this is needed for reliability. Have they given -- what powerful studies have they done, and what overloads have they shown, and do they include the fact that over the next 10 years distributive generation will be substantially expanded in this area because of what was just signed?
Six or eight months ago we wrote a 50 percent growth.

KRISTI BLACK: Chapter 1 -- we're in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR -- shows the date that Edison has provided that shows that additional capacity is needed to meet the directed growth in the area.

SPEAKER 5: That's all. There's no other data other than that? Because I looked at that data. So that was it?

KRISTI BLACK: That's what we have to work with, yes.

SPEAKER 6: For the Ivyglen Project I noticed one of the mitigation measures was to underground Segment No. 2. What was the reasoning behind that?

Was it the proximity to the residential development?

Why was that the only segment that's undergrounded?

KRISTI BLACK: For aesthetic impacts.

I'm remembering this off the top of my head, but briefly, in a bigger picture, State Route 74 is designated as an eligible scenic highway, and we concluded that what is proposed along SR 74, given the sensitivity of the viewers, as an eligible scenic highway, given the existing visual character and quality,
what is proposed did not fit in with that and would
substantially degrade that.

SPEAKER 6: I'm more concerned with Segment 6. And
I actually didn't realize it was one of the alternatives
to underground that. So all of Segment 6 is right now
proposed to be above ground?

KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

SPEAKER 6: Can you clarify what that, being an
alternative, really means in the grand scheme of things;
so that CEQA can choose that alternative to accept that
instead of --

KRISTI BLACK: Yeah. The commission, when it's
making its decision whether or not to issue Edison a
permit, can decide to approve one of the alternatives.

SPEAKER 6: Okay. Thank you.

SPEAKER 7: On the Alberhill Project on the
substation, my understanding is that Edison doesn't
currently control the land that they're proposing for the
substation, and that the owners of the land are not that
cooperative; so there's the Alternative DD for an
alternate location.

What's the likelihood that Alternate DD would
end up being implemented?

KRISTI BLACK: Yeah, I don't have an answer for
that. I guess I would clarify, Edison does own the
proposed substation property.

SPEAKER 7: Okay.

SPEAKER 8: I have a -- I guess it's a philosophical question. This project is intended to provide single point of connection for this 115-kV service area and the new Alberhill Substation, and disconnect the 115 from the Valley. So it will serve all of these venues. Those will be served by a single point of connection. This is about a half a billion dollar project.

At the same time, the commission is being asked to approve an SDG&E project that's a half billion dollars. It's being proposed to provide two connections to catalyze a grid because SDG&E claims that a single source of connection to catalyze it is not reliable. So these two objectives of these two projects are diametrically opposed, and the commission is being asked to approve both of them.

Has that been factored in here whether or not it really is more reliable that we have all of these residential areas served by a single catalyzed or connection point? Looking at the reliability, is it really more reliable?

MR. UCHIDA: Maybe Edison could help us with that answer.

SCE SPEAKER: We have a card that we can give you
and have that conversation outside this meeting.

SPEAKER 8: Okay.

KRISTI BLACK: Because this meeting is really to talk about the CEQA process.

SPEAKER: But you justified all this based on a purpose that the commission has to agree to before it's approved; so the purpose is completely opposite from another purpose from another utility. You know what I mean?

KRISTI BLACK: In the document we're looking at the objectives of this project and whether -- the objectives are what we used to define the alternatives. So we're looking at this project and using objectives to define alternatives. The alternatives also have to substantially reduce or avoid an environmental impact.

So as far as how this fits into the entire grid, I think that might be beyond the scope of our document for this project. That's not to say that the commission can't consider that in the broader decision-making process, but I can't answer questions about the Draft EIR in that process.

Are there any other questions?

SPEAKER 9: I have one. Alternative DD, under that alternative, would there be any adjustment to the Valley-Ivyglen lines should that alternative be adopted?
KRISTI BLACK: Alternative DD is an alternative to the proposed Alberhill Project. It looks at just the modifications to the Alberhill Project.

SPEAKER 9: I was wondering how that would affect the transmission lines if there would be any impact where the Valley Ivyglen portion would have to be modified with that new station.

KRISTI BLACK: Modifications to the Valley-Ivyglen Project are included as part of an Alternative Alberhill DD.

SPEAKER 10: Can you show Valley-Ivyglen Alternative C on your maps, or is your connection out?

KRISTI BLACK: I have a handout here that shows it. I don't have it on the computer.

SPEAKER 10: Okay.

SPEAKER: Just going back and looking at that explanation for that Alternative C, so that's not undergrounding the entire Segment 6. It's just doing it on Horsethief and Temescal Canyon; so everything on De Palma would still be above ground?

KRISTI BLACK: Yes. It's just the portion that's moved.

SPEAKER: When I first saw it I thought it was the entire segment.

KRISTI BLACK: If there are other alternatives that
you would like to see considered in the EIR, that would be a great comment.

SPEAKER: I'll look at it.

KRISTI BLACK: Do you have any other questions?

SPEAKER: The existing line that now goes from Valley to Fogarty and Elsinore, according to EIR, that's the Draft EIR, it's going to be switched off or disconnected but remain, I think they call it power -- energized but not carrying power. What does that mean?

KRISTI BLACK: I think it means it's still there, but it's not actually serving the load. What you're looking at are schematics of the power flow, not necessarily all of the lines.

SPEAKER: These aren't all the 115 lines? Because it runs parallel to the new lines that are being built. Why build new lines if you already have a 115 line that you're just going to not use?

KRISTI BLACK: That would be a good comment on the Draft EIR. I'm doing my best.

SPEAKER: I know. If there's a reason, I won't make the comment. It isn't obvious to me why that would be.

KRISTI BLACK: That would be a great comment because we have to respond to it in writing.

Are there any other questions, or should we move on to the comment period? Okay.
VERBAL COMMENTS

KRISTI BLACK: We have one commenter, Jacqueline Ayer.

JACQUELINE AYER: I'm the only one? Okay.

This project includes extensive helicopter construction and impacts will be mitigated, as I said, by avoiding residential, although the project is in a residential area.

Edison has, on other projects, has a habit of putting helicopter staging, fueling and assembly areas anywhere it wants after the EIR is approved, certified, and the project's approved.

For example, on the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project Segment 6, the EIR specifically prohibited helicopter operations outside the Angeles National Forest to ensure minimal impacts on residents. But as soon as the project was approved, Edison constructed many helicopter fueling station staging areas and landing pads miles outside of the forest, even residential areas.

For two years the residents of Acton had to endure over 200 flights a day, every day, 50 feet off the deck over their homes, back and forth, for this construction project because they put all these landing
pads and helicopter fueling areas and everything in residential areas where they were not supposed to -- where the EIR specifically prohibited them. It got so bad that the Acton Town Council filed a complaint with the CPUC. The proceeding was open. And Edison argued that "Well, the EIR simply represents initial engineering," and since there was a line in the EIR that said, "Well, final engineering may change the location of these sites slightly," that's why they were allowed to put them miles and miles outside.

In the decision, the commission agreed saying that the EIR resolved preliminary and final engineering to cause extensive changes to where these pads need to go.

How are the residents of this area going to be protected from helicopters being placed -- we had helicopter pads right next to homes, literally. So how is that not going to happen on this project?

We need to make sure that the conditions you put in protect the people of these areas. Because it was so bad, we had a Vietnam vet who for two years endured post traumatic stress. He was curled up in a little ball, literally, in his home, because there were so many helicopters outside flying over his house. So I'm concerned about that. And I guess I'll make all the
other comments on the single point.

Was that taken down or should I repeat that?

KRISTI BLACK: She is transcribing the entire meeting. We'll go through the Q and A and make sure that we address those.

JACQUELINE AYER: Thanks.

KRISTI BLACK: Would you like a microphone, or do you feel okay without one?

JERRY SINCICH: I'm okay without one. My voice will pick up. Just two comments.

The first one is, with the Alternative DD replacing the Alberhill, currently that area that's been identified is an approved Serrano specific plan approved by the county. It is a development that has not broken ground yet but is approved by the county. That site also is surrounded by a number of residential areas up in those hills, Dawson Canyon as well as Spanish Hills. Residents would be affected by that, and obviously it would also have a visual impact. I'm not sure that you can hide all of that. But with any station, there's probably landscaping that could be put around to block some of the effect.

But the impact of putting that station there further limits the land use of the surrounding project.

So whatever land is not used for that substation will be
impacted. And I think its use, land use, will be limited as well. So what kind of businesses, what kind of industry can go in there will be very limited. So my comment would be either the original site on the land that is now owned by Southern California Edison or maybe some other place.

The second is, as you -- by Horsethief Canyon you have the Valley Ivyglen lines jumping over the freeway, running along either De Palma Road or Temescal Canyon Road and then jumping back over the freeway.

My concern is we already have 500-kV lines in place that go over the freeway. Adding additional lines that go over the freeway do represent a huge safety issue because if somehow, either by nature or by earthquake, those lines come down -- because of the fact that there's only two major corridors in that area, travel corridors, and one would be the I-15 the other would be Temescal Canyon Road -- if any of those are blocked, residents trying to escape would have a heck of a time, couldn't leave until you had crews come out to move those lines. And couldn't be a case where first responders could handle those lines, and who knows how long it would take to get the appropriate personnel on site to be able to move anything. It could be weeks. And you would have a large number of citizens, probably around 23,000,
affected by it. That was my second comment.

My point being, I would like to see them not jumping over the freeway, you know, and ideally buried underground and running along and into the appropriate roads.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you.

Would anyone else like to make a comment?

So I think we'll end the official comment period, but we're ending early; so we'll be around for questions if you want to talk with any of us individually or together. We'll still be here.

Thank you very much for coming, and again please submit your written comments by May 31st, e-mail, mail, fax.

SPEAKER: Just real quick, what kind of time frame are we looking at to where a decision will be made?

KRISTI BLACK: So if I can look into my crystal ball -- so we're looking at responding to comments and preparing a Final EIR. It depends on the type of number of comments, but that's maybe a 3- to 5-month period. So then after that, once it goes to the commission, the Administrative Law Judge has to draft a proposed decision, then the commission has to hear it.

So I don't know, Jensen, if you have an estimate, but up to a year from now?
MR. UCHIDA: Yeah.

KRISTI BLACK: It's not a fast process.

SPEAKER: I know it's been going on for a long time. My only comment is we've got property there that is trying to be sold. My brother-in-law is really stuck because they don't know if that Alberhill Station is going to be below him and the lines are going over the existing residence or if it's going to be moved. So I just, yeah --

KRISTI BLACK: It might be a little bit of time before that decision is made.

SPEAKER: They have hearings.

KRISTI BLACK: No. The decision hasn't been made.

SPEAKER: I have a follow-up question about the timing. At last night's meeting I heard you say, and I may have heard incorrectly, that once -- the PUC will certify the Final EIR as adequate, then ALJ will prepare a draft decision. So that suggests that the normal course in public agency action is that they, as an agency, will concurrently adopt, approve a final EIR and adopt findings, and whatnot, and approve the project, but what you suggested last night was something a little different. So I was hoping you could clarify.

KRISTI BLACK: Jensen, can you speak to that, when the EIR is certified in relation to when the CPUC makes
its decision?

MR. UCHIDA: It's at the final decision meeting.

SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that.

KRISTI BLACK: It's at the final decision meeting.

I apologize for the confusion.

Was there another hand that I saw?

SPEAKER: Yes. If Edison has to go over private property, don't they need an easement?

KRISTI BLACK: They would have to get the appropriate documents.

SPEAKER: What if his property were not giving an easement.

KRISTI BLACK: If the commission approves the project, there would be a controlling eminent domain on it.

MR. UCHIDA: Ideally SCE would negotiate with the land owners to purchase the property through the normal process.

SPEAKER: I didn't hear him.

KRISTI BLACK: He said ideally SCE would work with the land owners.

SPEAKER: We have been in contact with SCE and it is a possibility, but right now it stopped because of the DD, you know, possibly it goes a different way.

KRISTI BLACK: Any other questions?
Okay. Thank you all for coming.

(Whereupon the proceedings concluded)
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, ELIZABETH EGGLI, CSR NO. 6241, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY:

THAT I TOOK IN SHORTHAND THE PROCEEDINGS IN THIS MATTER, AND THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I HAVE NO INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME OF THE ACTION.

WITNESS MY HAND THIS _____ DAY OF

______________, ____.

ELIZABETH EGGLI, CSR NO. 6241
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN
AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA