

# J. Public Participation

## J.1 Introduction

The scoping process and public participation program for the Sunrise Powerlink Project are described in this section. To collect agency and public input for the Sunrise Powerlink (SRPL) Project environmental review process, the CPUC and BLM administered a program of public notice and participation. [This has led to the publication of the Final EIR/EIS in October 2008.](#)

## J.2 Public Participation Program

While public scoping requirements for CEQA and NEPA differ slightly, the intent of both processes is to initiate the public scoping for the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), provide information about the SRPL Project, and solicit information that will be helpful in the environmental review process.

### J.2.1 EIR/EIS Scoping Process

The scoping process of the EIR/EIS consisted of six elements, each described in more detail below:

1. Publication of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Notice of Intent (NOI) of a joint EIR/EIS and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings soliciting comments from affected public agencies, as required by CEQA and NEPA, and from the public.
2. Initial public scoping meetings and meetings with agencies (October 2006).
3. Second public scoping meetings on alternatives (February 2007)
4. Summary of scoping comments in a two-part Scoping Report (November 2006; March 2007).
5. Distribution of the Scoping Report to the commenting agencies, scoping meeting attendees, the EIR/EIS team members for use in work planning and impact analysis, and to public libraries designated as project repository sites for members of the public interested in reviewing the report and comments.
6. Creation and maintenance of an Internet web site, an electronic mail address, a telephone hotline, and local EIR/EIS Information Repositories.

### J.2.2 Public Notification

The CPUC issued the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a joint EIR/EIS for the Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project on September 15, 2006, distributing it to the State Clearinghouse, federal, State, regional, and local agencies, elected officials of affected areas, and the general public. The CPUC mailed over 6,600 copies of the NOP to public agencies and members of the general public, including 236 representatives of over 65 different agencies, 52 environmental groups; 64 tribal government representatives; and 41 elected officials. English and Spanish language copies of the NOP were available at 26 local repositories. The 30-day public scoping period extended from the issuance of the NOP to October 20, 2006 as required by CEQA.

The BLM published the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare a joint EIS/EIR and Proposed Land Use Plan Amendment for the Proposed SRPL Project on August 31, 2006 in the Federal Register. A Notice of Public Scoping Meetings was mailed to federal, State, regional, and local agencies, elected officials of affected areas, and the general public. Copies of the NOI were available at 26 local repositories. The comment period began on August 31, 2006, the day of the NOI publication, and ended October 20, 2006.

### J.2.3 Second Round of Scoping on Alternatives

A notice with the EIR/EIS publication schedule and preliminary assessment of alternatives to analyze in the EIR/EIS announced the February round of public meetings to over 12,000 individuals and agency representatives. This notice was called the Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings on Alternatives to the Proposed Project, mailed on January 24, 2007. While this second round of meetings was not required by CEQA or NEPA, the lead agencies desired additional public outreach for comprehensive alternatives screening.

All public notices appeared on the CPUC's project website. Newspaper advertisements appeared in 11 local and regional newspapers between September 15 and 22, 2006 for the October scoping meetings and in eight newspapers between January 20 and February 2, 2007 for the February meetings. As part of outreach to Spanish-speaking populations, newspaper advertisements were published in two Spanish-language newspapers. Comments on this notice received between January 24, 2007 to February 24, 2007 were included in the March 2007 Scoping Report.

### J.2.4 Informational Meetings and Public Hearings on the Draft EIR/EIS

In October 2006 and February 2007, the CPUC and BLM held a total of 15 public meetings to receive comments from the public on the scope of the EIR/EIS and for alternatives and mitigation measures to consider. The February meetings had an additional focus on alternatives under consideration. The CPUC and BLM hired court reporters to record over 260 spoken comments. In addition, live Spanish translation services were offered at the El Centro and Borrego Springs meeting locations. The section J.2.4 Scoping Report includes more information on comments.

Over 260 members of the public and representatives from organizations and government agencies attended the following October 2006 meetings in California.

- October 2, 2006 at 4:30 p.m. in the Imperial County Board of Supervisors building, El Centro
- October 3, 2006 at 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. at Charles Nunn Performing Arts Center, Ramona
- October 4, 2006 at 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. at the Borrego Springs Resort, Borrego Springs
- October 5, 2006 at 2:00 p.m. at the Mission Valley Hilton Hotel, San Diego
- October 5, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. at the Doubletree Golf Resort in Rancho Peñasquitos, San Diego

About 600 members of the public and representatives from organizations and government agencies attended the following February 2007 meetings:

- February 5, 2007 at 12:30 p.m. at the Imperial County Board of Supervisors building, El Centro
- February 5, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. at the Doubletree Golf Resort in Rancho Peñasquitos, San Diego
- February 6, 2007 at 2:00 p.m. at Wynola Pizza Express, Julian
- February 6, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. at the San Vicente Inn, Ramona
- February 7, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. at the Boulevard Fire Dept, Boulevard

- February 7, 2007 at 6:30 p.m. at the Alpine Community Center, Alpine
- February 8, 2007 at 2:30 p.m. at the Borrego Springs Resort, Borrego Springs
- February 9, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. at the City of Temecula City Hall, Temecula

## J.2.5 Scoping Report

### November 2006 Scoping Report, Part One

The first part of the Scoping Report was published in November 2006 and accounted for the scoping comment period for the NOP/NOI. It summarized issues of concern in 323 comments from public, private, and tribal agencies and from members of the public. Agencies, parties on the CPUC's Service List, and individuals who requested copies received a total of 284 copies of the Scoping Report. The notice of availability for the November 2006 Scoping Report was sent to 6,052 recipients. The Scoping Report was available for review at 26 repositories, on the Internet at the web address in Section J.4, and by mail to agencies, parties on the CPUC's Service list, and individuals who requested copies.

The categories below summarize issues of concern in the Scoping Report.

- Human Environment Issues and Concerns
- Physical Environment Issues and Concerns
- Alternatives
- Environmental Review and Decisionmaking Process

### Human Environment Issues and Concerns

Some public comments focused on the potential effect of the Project on the human environment, including conflicts with existing land uses, impacts to property values, safety and fire risk issues, noise, construction impacts, and health and safety impacts of electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) from increased EMF emissions.

- **Conflicts with Existing or Planned Land Uses.** There was widespread objection from individuals, organizations, and the California State Parks and U.S. Forest Service to the use of public lands, particularly State and National Parks, for proposed and alternative routes. Imperial County and dairy organizations expressed concern that the Proposed Project could restrict or damage a growing dairy industry in Imperial County. Residents of Carmel Valley, Rancho Peñasquitos, and Del Mar Mesa communities objected to additional lines near existing transmission lines.
- **Impacts to Property Values and Socioeconomic issues.** Some residents feared that the value of their property would decrease if additional lines or new lines were placed near their homes. In rural low-income areas of eastern San Diego County, residents commented that the Project would force them to accept the impacts of transmission lines intended to benefit urban consumers.
- **Fire Risk and EMF.** The U.S. Forest Service and property owners in San Diego County were concerned that the potential for wildfires would increase and proposed towers would obstruct fire management and fighting efforts. Health and safety-related issues resulting from increased EMF emissions were a primary concern of some members of the public, particularly in addition to existing lines in the City of San Diego.
- **Noise.** Some commenters also expressed concern with the noise associated with transmission towers, especially in addition to existing lines near residences, and asked that noise be sufficiently evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

## Physical Environment Issues and Concerns

Comments expressed concerns with the potential impacts that the SRPL project may have on the physical environment, particularly to biological resources. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has requested that protocol surveys for sensitive species be completed prior to release of the Draft EIR/EIS to ensure that biological resource issues are effectively addressed and mitigated in the draft document.

## Alternatives

There were a substantial number of suggested alternatives received from agencies, private organizations, and citizens. Suggestions included routing alternatives as well as regional transmission and non-wires alternatives, such as renewable In-Area generation, to meet project objectives.

## Environmental Review and Decisionmaking Process

Some commenters expressed a concern with the number or timing of scoping meetings held and wanted to have meetings held in other locations in San Diego (East County) and Imperial Counties in order to provide an opportunity for more involvement in the project. A few comments argued for a longer comment period and three homeowner groups and the Cleveland National Forest received additional time to respond to the NOP.

## March 2007 Scoping Report, Part Two

The second part of the Scoping Report was published in March 2007 and accounted for comments in response to the Notice of Second Round of Scoping Meetings. It summarized issues of concern in 445 comments received between January 24 and February 24, 2007. Comments were from public, private, and tribal agencies and members of the public. In March 2007, 430 copies of Scoping Report Part Two were distributed to agencies, parties on the CPUC's Service List, and individuals who requested copies. In addition, a notice of availability of the March 2007 Scoping Report reached 11,853 recipients. It is available for review at 26 repositories and on the Internet at the site specified in Section J.3.

Because the second round of scoping focused on alternatives to the Proposed Project, a summary of comments below is organized according to alternatives that were preliminarily retained for EIR/EIS analysis in the notice.

---

**Table J-1. Summary of Comments from Second Round of Scoping**

---

Retained Project Alternatives	Comment Summary
No Project Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of comments stated a preference for the No Action Alternative. The comments generally indicated that there was no solid basis established for the need for the SRPL Project and therefore the No Action Alternative was the preferred option.</li> <li>• County of San Diego requested that the No Project Alternative consider regional energy need and multiple options for achieving regional need.</li> </ul>

---

**Table J-1. Summary of Comments from Second Round of Scoping**

<b>Retained Project Alternatives</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
<b>Imperial Valley and Anza-Borrego Link</b> a. SDG&E Desert Western b. Imperial Valley FTHL d. Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2 d. Overhead 500 kV ABDSP within existing ROW e. SDG&E Bullfrog Farms f. Huff Road Bullfrog Farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were a number of organization and individuals that opposed the Imperial Valley FTHL Alternative.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E expressed concern with the SR78 to S2 alternative because of technical, engineering, and environmental concerns. Requested consideration of Borrego Valley Underground Alternative instead of underground route through the Park. Strongly encourages lead agencies to carry forward the ABDSP Borrego Valley Alternative.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E also encourages consideration of an alternative to the Imperial Valley FTHL Alternative to avoid impacts to a proposed development. Also encourages consideration of West Main Canal–Huff Road Modification Alternative to avoid impacts to a proposed race track.</li> <li>• County of San Diego requested that the SDG&amp;E Desert Western Alternative be eliminated due to wilderness impacts. Supports the underground option of the 230 kV ABDSP SR78 to S2 Alternative.</li> </ul>
<b>Central Link</b> a. Santa Ysabel Existing ROW b. Santa Ysabel Partial Underground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support for the Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Alternative from the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Park agency.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E encourages consideration of a Santa Ysabel Partial Underground modified. States that the Existing ROW alternative would have significant visual and cultural impacts.</li> <li>• County of San Diego recommends eliminating the Santa Ysabel Existing ROW and Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Alternative due to insignificant reduction of potential visual impacts. Urges retaining the Santa Ysabel SR79 All Underground Alternative.</li> </ul>
<b>Inland Valley Link</b> a. CNF Existing 69 kV Route b. Oak Hollow Road Underground	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Starlight Mountain Estate owners and several property owners stated their support for the Oak Hollow Road Underground Alternative.</li> <li>• County of San Diego supports retaining these two alternatives.</li> <li>• The Forest Service agrees with retaining the CNF Existing 69 kV Route Alternative with mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Coastal Link</b> a. Pomerado Road to Miramar Area North b. MCAS Miramar All Underground and Underground/Overhead d. Rancho Peñasquitos Blvd. Bike Path e. Carmel Valley Road f. Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road g. Black Mountain to Park Village Road Underground h. Coastal Link System Upgrade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West Chase Homeowners Association and several property owners requested retaining State Route 56 as an alternative in the interest of the community and public.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E states that the MCAS Miramar Alternative may not be feasible because of land rights, narrow roads, and unfavorable terrain.</li> <li>• Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Residents expressed support for transmission upgrades over the coastal link portion and alternatives. Requests further consideration of MCAS Miramar and disagrees with elimination of Mercy Road to Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Alternative.</li> <li>• County of San Diego supports studying all of these alternatives except requests more information on the Coastal Link System Upgrade.</li> </ul>
<b>Substation Alternatives</b> a. SDG&E Central South Substation b. Mataguay Substation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few commented on the substation alternatives. However, the Vista Irrigation District and the Boy Scouts of America strongly oppose the Mataguay Substation because of its impact on the Warner Valley and its impact on the Mataguay Scout Ranch.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E also stated concerns regarding the Mataguay Substation Alternative because of potential impacts to Stephen's kangaroo rat habitat.</li> </ul>

**Table J-1. Summary of Comments from Second Round of Scoping**

<b>Retained Project Alternatives</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>
<b>Southwest Powerlink (SWPL)</b> a. Route D b. Interstate-8 (I-8) c. BCD d. West of Forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial comment from agencies, organizations, and individuals regarding the I-8 and West of Forest Alternatives. Many comments supported the implementation of the I-8 Alternative, while the majority of the comments opposed the West of Forest Alternative. There was one comment in favor of the West of Forest Alternative.</li> <li>• Received one comment in favor of eliminating routes B and B-C from consideration. However, one tribal government urged that routes B and C be considered in the evaluation because of the wind energy available along these routes. Another tribal government endorsed the I-8 Alternative but suggested it cross the Campo Reservation north of the I-8.</li> <li>• The Forest Service agrees with the elimination of SWPL Alternatives B, C, and B-C, and recommends elimination of Route D Alternative east of Loveland Substation, and the I-8 Alternative. Agrees with retaining a modified version of Routes BCD and Route D south of Loveland Substation as well as West of Forest Alternatives with mitigation..</li> <li>• Hang gliding and Paragliding Association objects to I-8, BCD, and West of Forest Alternative because of impacts to two popular hang gliding/paragliding locations. Concerned Residents of Boulder Creek objects to I-8, BCD, and D routes.</li> </ul>
<b>Non-Wires</b> a. New In-Area Renewable Generation b. New In-Area All-Source Generation c. Resource Bundle 1: In-Area All-Source Generation Plus Demand Response d. Resource Bundle 2: In-Area All-Source Generation, Demand Response, and Renewable Energy Certificates e. In-Area Generation Plus Transmission Upgrades	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial comment was received on the need to pursue non-wires alternatives instead of the SRPL project. Organizations and individuals favored in-basin generation and stated that they preferred these alternatives for San Diego County.</li> <li>• San Diego government agencies provided comments that supported the consideration of In-Area generation.</li> <li>• Environmental Health Coalition recommends removing South Bay Replacement Project because of its regulatory infeasibility.</li> </ul>
<b>System Alternatives</b> a. LEAPS Project or Serrano/Valley-North 500 kV b. Mexico Light 230 kV c. Path 44 Upgrade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal comment received on these alternatives, but the Community Alliance for Sensible Energy expressed support for the Mexico Light and the Path 44 Alternatives.</li> <li>• Some landowners objected to the LEAPS Project because it would impact their homes while others thought it would be less expensive and would be a less invasive alternative.</li> <li>• The Forest Service agrees with the elimination of the Serrano/Valley Central 500 kV Full Loop Alternative and finds that retaining the LEAPS Project Alternative should depend on FERC approval.</li> </ul>

On March 16, 2007, the Sunrise Powerlink EIR/EIS team mailed a notice announcing the conclusions on alternatives to be fully analyzed in the EIR/EIS. The March Notice was based on the feedback received from the public and agencies summarized above, along with research conducted by the EIR/EIS team.

### May 2007 Notice Regarding an Additional EIR/EIS Alternative

Among agencies that requested and received an extension on the January-February 2007 scoping comment period was the Cleveland National Forest (Forest), which in April 2007 requested that an alternative be fully analyzed that would not require an amendment to the Forest's 2005 Land Management Plan. As a result, a new route alternative called the Modified Route D Alternative was designed using portions of the Route D Alternative that were considered and eliminated in March 2007, combined with new route segments, and is analyzed in this EIR/EIS.

To notify the public and to allow the public to respond to this additional alternative, on May 16, 2007 the EIR/EIS team mailed a notice describing the new alternative and the rationale for its consideration, as well as a map of the route. The notice reached 12,347 members of the project EIR/EIS mailing list and was available at 26 repositories and on the Internet at the site specified in Section J.3. A 30-day comment period followed, closing on June 16, 2007 with over 90 comments received from individuals, organizations, agencies, and the Applicant. All comments postmarked during the comment period were published on the project website.

## J.2.6 EIR/EIS Information and Repository Sites

The CPUC and BLM have established a telephone hotline for project information: (866) 711-3106. This line can receive faxes and voice messages.

EIR/EIS information, including Proposed Project information, the Scoping Report, the Draft EIR/EIS, the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, the Final EIR/EIS and other information on the environmental review process will be are available on the project website:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/asp/sunrise/sunrise.htm>

This site hosts all public documents during the environmental review process and announcements of upcoming public meetings.

To maximize accessibility of project information to the public, the CPUC and BLM have placed documents in repository sites. All SRPL-related documents are available for review at 26 repositories and documents are also available at the CPUC in San Francisco. EIR/EIS-related documents, including the Scoping Report, have been made available upon release to the public at the locations defined in Table J-2.

**Table J-2. Repository Sites**

Repository Sites	Address and Phone
<b>Imperial County – Public Libraries and BLM Office</b>	
Brawley Public Library	400 Main Street, Brawley, CA (760) 344-1891
Calexico Public Library	850 Encinas Avenue, Calexico, CA (760) 339-2470
El Centro Public Library	539 West State Street, El Centro, CA (760) 337-4565
Imperial Public Library	200 West 9th Street, Imperial, CA (760) 355-1332
BLM – El Centro Field Office	1661 South 4th Street, El Centro, CA (760) 337-4400
<b>San Diego County – Public Libraries and CPUC Office</b>	
Alpine Branch Library	2130 Arnold Way, Alpine, CA (619) 445-4221
Borrego Springs Public Library	571A Palm Canyon Drive, Borrego Springs, CA (760) 767-5761
Campo-Morena Village Branch Library	31356 Highway 94, Campo, CA (619) 478-5945
Carmel Mountain Ranch Library	12095 World Trade Drive, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8181
Descanso Branch Library	9545 River Drive, Descanso, CA (619) 445-5279
El Cajon Branch Library	201 East Douglas, El Cajon, CA (619) 588-3718
Jacumba Branch Library	44605 Old Highway 80, Jacumba, CA (619) 766-4608
Julian Branch Library	1850 Highway 78, Julian, CA (760) 765-0370
Lakeside Branch Library	9839 Vine Street, Lakeside, CA (619) 443-1811
Pine Valley Branch Library	28804 Old Highway 80, Pine Valley, CA (619) 473-8022

**Table J-2. Repository Sites**

Repository Sites	Address and Phone
Potrero Branch Library	24883 Potrero Valley Road, Potrero, CA (619) 478-5978
Poway Public Library	13137 Poway Road, Poway, CA (858) 513-2900
Ramona Public Library	1406 Montecito Road, Ramona, CA (760) 738-2434
Rancho Peñasquitos Library	13330 Salmon River Road, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8159
San Diego City Central Library	820 E Street, San Diego, CA (858) 484-4440
Scripps Miramar Ranch Library	10301 Scripps Lake Drive, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8158
Spring Valley Branch Library	836 Kempton Street, Spring Valley, CA (619) 463-3006
CPUC – San Diego Office	1350 Front Street, Room 4006, San Diego, CA (619) 525-4217
<b>Other Government Offices</b>	
BLM – North Palm Springs Field Office	690 West Garnet Avenue, North Palm Springs, CA (760) 251-4849
CPUC – Los Angeles Office	320 West 4th Street, Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA (213) 576-7000
CPUC – San Francisco Office	505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2103, San Francisco, CA (415) 703-2074

## J.2.7 Document Distribution List

Appendix 6 to the Draft EIR/EIS presented a list of all those who were initially sent copies of the draft document. Additional copies were provided upon request.

The initial EIR/EIS **information** mailing list included SDG&E’s list of property owners within 300 feet of the Proposed Project as well as groups and individuals the EIR/EIS team identified or who identified themselves to be stakeholders. In addition, all attendees at scoping meetings were added to the mailing list. The mailing list includes all individuals on the CPUC’s proceeding service list for this application.

All those on the EIR/EIS mailing list and landowners on or adjacent to SDG&E’s proposed route and the alternative routes considered in the Draft ~~will~~ received a Notice of **Availability Release** of the Draft EIR/EIS in ~~January~~ **2008, for the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS (July 2008), and for the Final EIR/EIS (October 2008)**. The Notices ~~will~~ included information on accessing the **Draft EIR/EIS documents**, the Environmentally Superior Alternative(s), and the dates, times, and locations for informational workshops on the Draft EIR/EIS, **Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS**, and the CPUC’s Public Participation Hearings.

Attendees at the Informational Workshops and all commenters on the Draft EIR/EIS were added to the Project mailing list and received the Notice of Availability of the Recirculated Draft EIR/ Supplemental Draft EIS and the Final EIR/EIS. Attendees at the Informational Workshops and all commenters on the Recirculated Draft EIR/ Supplemental Draft EIS received the Notice of Availability for this Final EIR/EIS.

## J.2.8 Consistency with Executive Order 12898

The SRPL public participation program was consistent with the Executive Order on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Executive Order 12898, 1994). This Order is designed to focus federal attention on environmental and human health conditions in minority and low-income communities, and the provision for information access and



public participation relating to such matters. The public participation program for SRPL is consistent with this Order through the efforts described below:

- Project-related notices were mailed to over 11,000 property owners along the proposed route regardless of their economic status or ethnicity.
- Newspaper ads were published in Spanish in El Latino, ~~and~~ Adelante Valle, and Enlace newspapers to advertise public meetings and the release of project-related information.
- Live Spanish translation services were available at ~~three two~~ meeting locations (Borrego Springs, ~~and~~ El Centro, and Jacumba) to accommodate a wider audience at these meeting sites
- A wide range of organizations and community interest groups were included in the noticing efforts to capture a broader profile of impacted communities
- Tribal governments were contacted directly to solicit interest in government-to-government consultation and to obtain comments or concerns regarding the proposed project

Project-related materials and handouts documented all avenues for public participation (phone, fax, email, mail, meetings) to ensure access to information and participation throughout the impacted communities.

### J.3 Draft EIR/EIS Public Review Period

The Draft EIR/EIS was released for public review on January 3, 2008 with a 90-day comment period (ending on April 11, 2008). The CPUC and BLM allowed written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS to be submitted by U.S. mail, fax, or at the Informational Workshops and oral comments to be received at the Public Participation Hearings described below. The comments received by the CPUC and BLM during the public review period and at the Information Workshops and Public Participation Hearings are reproduced in this Final EIR/EIS along with responses to comments.

#### J.3.1 Informational Meetings and Public Hearings on the Draft EIR/EIS

~~There will be a 90-day public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS, as defined in the Notice of Availability accompanying this document.~~ Following the release of the Draft EIR/EIS the CPUC and BLM ~~will hold~~ held nine (9) Informational Workshops as shown in the cover letter to this document. The intent of the workshops is to help affected communities understand the Proposed Project and the Draft EIR/EIS, and to suggest ways to participate in the CPUC's decisionmaking process. The EIR/EIS Team and CPUC and BLM staff will be available to respond to questions and to clarify the EIR/EIS analyses and conclusions. Three hundred and nineteen (319) members of the public, including representatives of organizations and government agencies were documented in attendance at the CPUC Informational Workshops.

The CPUC ~~will~~ also hosted five Public Participation Hearings (PPHs) ~~and informational workshops~~ on the Draft EIR/EIS after its release ~~(see also cover letter for information on dates, times, and locations)~~. The public ~~was~~ will be invited to speak informally on the record on any other issues of concern related to SDG&E's Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) Application. – Administrative Law Judge Weissman ~~held~~ will hold these PPHs at the times and dates below. For more information on the PPHs please contact the Public Advisor at (866) 849-8390 or public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov.

Two additional Public Participation Hearings were held on May 12, 2008 by the Administrative Law Judge and attended by Commissioners Peevey, Grueneich, Simon, and Bohn. Comments made at these May 12 hearings will be considered by the Commission in its Decision on the project, but are not part of the EIR/EIS process.

The CPUC and BLM will collect written comments by fax on the project hotline at (866) 711-3106, email at the project address sunrise@aspenerg.com, or postal mail at:

Billie Blanchard and Lynda Kastoll  
c/o Aspen Environmental Group  
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Written comments are due or must be postmarked on or before the closing day of the comment period, and must include a name and return address. To ensure accurate records, spoken comments are acceptable only at the Public Participation Hearings.

### J.3.2 Newspaper Notices

Newspaper notices, including information on the Draft EIR/EIS, the project website address, and the dates and times of the Informational Workshops and Public Participation Hearings were printed at least once and up to five times in January and in April and May 2008 in the following papers: San Diego Union Tribune, Enlace, Imperial Valley Press, North County Times, Borrego Sun, Adelante Valle, Ramona Sentinel, El Latino, San Diego Business Journal, The Valley News, Press Enterprise, Alpine Sun, and Julian Journal.

## J.4 Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS Public Review Period

The Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS was released for public review on July 11, 2008 with a 45-day comment period (ending on August 25, 2008). The CPUC and BLM allowed written comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS to be submitted by U.S. mail, fax, or at the informational workshops. The comments received by the CPUC and BLM during the public review period and at the workshops are reproduced in this Final EIR/EIS along with responses to comments.

### J.4.1 Informational Meetings on the Recirculated Draft EIR/ Supplemental Draft EIS

Following the release of the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS the CPUC and BLM held two Informational Workshops in Jacumba, California on August 4, 2008. The intent of the workshops was to help affected communities understand the Proposed Project and the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, and to suggest ways to participate in the CPUC's decisionmaking process. The EIR/EIS Team and CPUC and BLM staff were available to respond to questions and to clarify the EIR/EIS analyses and conclusions. Eighty-two (82) members of the public, including representatives of organizations and government agencies were documented in attendance at the CPUC Informational Workshops.

### J.4.2 Newspaper Notices

Newspaper notices, including information on the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, the project website address, and the dates and times of the Informational Workshops were printed at least once and up to two times in July 2008 in the following papers: San Diego Union Tribune, Enlace, Imperial Valley Press, North County Times, Borrego Sun, Adelante Valle, Ramona Sentinel, El Latino, San Diego Business Journal, The Valley News, Press Enterprise, and Alpine Sun.