

## F. Public Participation and Consultation

This section presents two key components of the EIR preparation process: (1) public participation and (2) consultation with agencies and tribal governments. This information describes how input was received on the EIR, who was contacted, and what agency information was reviewed as part of the preparation of this document. In addition, this section provides a list of the EIR preparers as required by the CEQA Guidelines.

### F.1 Public Participation and Notification

Public participation included collection of agency and public input on the proposed Project and the environmental review process as well as providing different avenues for reviewing Project information and providing public comment. These activities are summarized below.

#### F.1.1 EIR Scoping Process

The scoping process for the VSSP EIR included the following elements that are detailed in the subsections below.

- Establishment of a Project-specific website, electronic mail address (email), dedicated telephone and fax line, and local EIR information repositories.
- Publication of a Notice of Preparation of an EIR to solicit comment from affected public agencies and the public, as required by CEQA.
- Preparation of a Scoping Report that documented and summarized the written comments received on the Project.

#### Notice of Preparation

On May 5, 2015, the CPUC issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, which summarized the proposed project, stated its intention to prepare an EIR, and requested comments from interested parties (see Appendix 1). The purpose of the NOP was to inform recipients that the CPUC had begun preparation of an EIR for the VSSP and to solicit information that could be helpful in the environmental review process. This notice included a description of the proposed Project, a summary of potential Project impacts, information on how to provide comments to the CPUC, and information on where agencies and citizens could obtain Project updates and Project-related documents. The NOP started the 30-day comment period where responsible, trustee, interested agencies, the State Clearinghouse, tribal governments, and private citizens had the opportunity to comment on the project. The 30-day public comment period went from May 5, 2015 through June 8, 2015.

On May 5, 2015, more than 680 copies of the NOP were mailed out via first-class mail to responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, State Clearinghouse, tribal governments, and property owners/residents within 300 feet of the project alignment. The initial mailing list was generated by SCE and was updated as appropriate to add other agencies and tribal governments.

#### Newspaper Advertisements

The preparation of the EIR was advertised in three different newspapers. The newspaper advertisements provided a brief synopsis of the proposed Project and included a map of the proposed Project route, information about the scoping period, the contact information and address for submitting written comments on the proposed Project, and the address of the Project website. Table F-1 lists the newspapers where the advertisements were published and Appendix 1 includes the proof of publication for these newspapers with a copy of the advertisement.

Publication	Language	Date
Anza Valley Outlook	English	Fri, May 15
The Californian	English	Fri, May 8
The Press Enterprise	English	Fri, May 8

## Project-Related Information

Project-related information, including the Draft EIR and other information on the environmental review process, has been made available to the public on the CPUC ~~p~~Project website, noted below:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/aspen/valleysouth/ValleySouth.htm>

This site hosts all public documents during the environmental review process and announcements of upcoming public meetings. SCE's Proponents Environmental Assessment (PEA) is also available for review on the website. The PEA includes a full description of the Project, as well as SCE's evaluation of the potential impacts of the Project.

An email address (Valley-South-Project@aspeneg.com) was established for the proposed Project to provide another means of submitting comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The email address was provided on the NOP that was distributed at the start of the scoping period, posted on the website, and included in the newspaper advertisements. Comments received by email have been considered in the preparation of this EIR; for a more complete summary of the scoping comments please see Appendix 1 and its associated appendices.

The CPUC has also established a telephone hotline for project information: **(888) 400-3930**. This line can receive faxes and voice messages. The phone/fax line serves as a method for private citizens and agencies to submit questions via voice messages on the proposed Project or submit written comments via fax if they are unable to utilize the other methods to submit formal comments on the proposed Project.

## Scoping Report

The proposed Project received a total of nine written comment letters submitted by US mail or by email. Appendix 1 contains the Scoping Summary Report with supporting information such as the full text of all written scoping comment letters. Four local and regional agencies submitted comments on the proposed Project. The public agency comments focused on recommendations for the assessment and analysis of impacts, potential and/or required permits, and design input. The Project also received input from two Tribal governments. The comments from the Tribes included requests for consultation and monitoring as well as recommendations for impact analysis to cultural resources. Three comments from private citizens were received regarding the proposed Project. These comments provided input on additional potential routes, and expressed opinions on the aesthetic design of the proposed Project.

### F.1.2 Draft EIR Distribution and Public Review

The CPUC issued the Draft EIR for a ~~46~~45-day comment period (January 29, 2016 to March 14, 2016) consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15105(a). The Draft EIR evaluated ~~13~~ 13 environmental issue areas and addresses the cumulative impacts of the proposed Project. The EIR also includes consideration of alternatives to the proposed Project and a comparison of the alternatives to the Project.

## Notice of Availability

A Notice of Availability (NOA) was distributed to all contacts on the EIR Mailing List including landowners within 300 feet of SCE's proposed ~~p~~Project alignment. The NOA included information on accessing the Draft EIR, a list of the significant environmental effects anticipated as a result of the ~~p~~Project, to the extent which such effects are known to the lead agency at the time of notice, and the starting and ending dates

for the review period during which the lead agency ~~will~~ would receive comments on the Draft EIR (January 29, 2016 to March 14, 2016).

The following additional activities were conducted as part of the noticing for the release of the Draft EIR for the proposed Project:

- The NOA was filed with the County of Riverside County Clerk as required by CEQA Guidelines 15087[d].
- A Notice of Completion (NOC) form was filed with the State Clearinghouse (CEQA Guidelines 15085[a]) along with multiple copies of the EIR.
- Notices were published in three newspapers: The Press-Enterprise (January 30, 2016 and February 12, 2016), The Californian (An Edition of the UT San Diego, February 12, 2016) and The Anza Valley Outlook (February 19, 2016) (CEQA Guidelines §15087[a][1]). The newspaper notices included information on the proposed Project, where to obtain information on the EIR, and details regarding the public meeting.

**Draft EIR Distribution List**

As noted earlier in the EIR Scoping Process, a project-specific mailing list with over 680 entries was compiled for the proposed project. This list includes responsible, trustee, and interested agencies, State Clearinghouse, tribal governments, property owners/residents within 300 feet of the project alignment, and local libraries (document repository sites). The mailing list was updated based on contact information from the comment letters received during the scoping comment period and returned notices. This list will continue to be updated for use throughout the environmental review process to distribute public notices and to ensure all interested parties are notified of key project milestones.

Copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the State Clearinghouse, regulatory agencies, local agencies, and interested tribal governments. Other contacts on the mailing list received the NOA that provided information on where the document could be reviewed such as the document repositories and the project website, and provided contact information to request a copy of the report.

**Document Repository Sites**

To maximize accessibility of project information to the public, the CPUC ~~has~~ distributed the Draft EIR to the repository sites listed in Table F-2. All notices and the Draft EIR ~~have been~~ were provided to five local area libraries near the proposed Project alignment.

<b>Table F-2. Project Document Repository Sites</b>	
<b>Valley South – Library Sites</b>	
Cesar Chavez Library	163 E. San Jacinto, Perris, CA 92570
Grace Mellman Community Library	4100 County Center Drive, Temecula, CA 92591
Murrieta Public Library	8 Town Square, Murrieta, CA 92562
Paloma Valley Library	31375 Bradley Road, Menifee, CA 92584
Romoland Library	26001 Briggs Road, Sun City, CA 92585

**Draft EIR Public Meeting**

A public meeting was held on Monday February 22, 2016 at the Residence Inn Marriott (25407 Madison Avenue, Murrieta). The public meeting provided an opportunity for questions and comments to be heard, although these comments were not recorded or entered into the formal record. Attendees were advised to submit all comments in writing. During the review period, comments could be submitted by email, letter, or using a comment card provided at the public meeting.

~~In addition, the CPUC was invited to attend a meeting of the Winchester/Homeland Municipal Advisory Council on February 11, 2016 at the Francis Domenigoni Community Center in Winchester, CA. At this meeting, information regarding the proposed Project and an overview of the permitting and review process was provided. There was also an opportunity for the attendees to ask questions and receive responses regarding the proposed Project. Information on where written comments could be provided on the Draft EIR was also provided. The CPUC may hold a public meeting near the Project site to present the findings of the Draft EIR and to take public comment. The date, time, and location of the public meeting will be advertised in local newspapers and on the project website prior to the meeting date. Section A of this EIR includes information on how to present comments on the Draft EIR.~~

## **F.2 Organization and Tribal Consultation**

In addition to obtaining public and agency input through the EIR scoping process, the CPUC also reviewed agency websites, contacted agency representatives, and contacted tribal government representatives prior to completing this document. This section summarizes the consultation conducted and the agency resources reviewed in preparing the EIR.

### **F.2.1 Organizations Consulted**

The consultant team reviewed agency websites for data and regulatory information in preparation of this EIR. Most of the information regarding regulatory requirements can now be found on agency websites, therefore they are listed here to show that agency resources were used in preparing this document. Section F (References) also identifies these websites in relation to the respective technical chapter where the information was used. The list below identifies the agency websites that were consulted.

- AirNav
- Avian Power Line Interaction Committee
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Associated
- California Air Resources Board
- California Climate Change Center
- California Department of Conservation
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
- California Department of Motor Vehicles
- California Department of Public Health
- California Department of Water Resources
- California Energy Commission
- California Environmental Protection Agency
- California Geologic Survey
- California Joint Utility Traffic Control Committee
- California Natural Resources Agency
- California Office of the Attorney General
- California State Water Resources Control Board
- Center for Climate and Energy Solutions
- City of Menifee
- City of Murrieta
- City of Perris
- City of Temecula
- County of Riverside
- Federal Aviation Administration
- Federal Emergency Management Agency
- Federal Highway Administration
- Federal Transit Administration
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
- National Resource Conservation Service
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Southern California Earthquake Data Center
- U.S Center for Disease Control and Prevention
- U.S Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration
- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United States Geological Survey

In addition to the websites that were consulted, the Natural History Museum (Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, CA), the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM), the Eastern Information Center (EIC), and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) were contacted as part of the technical studies to obtain information for the cultural and paleontological resources section. Letters were also sent via email to representatives of the local cities and the County along the proposed Project alignment to request information on cumulative projects. Follow-up calls and emails were made to these local agencies to verify the status of these information requests.

## F.2.2 Tribal Consultation<sup>1</sup>

During scoping, the CPUC distributed the NOP to 11 different tribal governments and agencies. Written comment letters were received during the scoping period from two Native American tribes. The Pechanga band of Luiseño Indians and the Soboba band of Luiseño Indians submitted comment letters requesting consultation on the proposed Project. Although the proposed Project does not fall under AB 52<sup>2</sup>, the CPUC reached out to both tribes to get their input on the Project. Based on contact with the tribes the following activities took place:

- In July 2015, CPUC consultants called representatives of the tribes to schedule a meeting and identify key concerns regarding the Project. To date, only the Pechanga tribe has responded to the request for a meeting.
- On July 15, 2015, the CPUC consultant team met with the Pechanga tribe in their offices in Temecula to discuss the proposed Project and to listen to tribal issues and concerns regarding the Project. The tribe requested additional information, which was provided by the Aspen team the following day (July 16, 2015). At the meeting, the Tribe reiterated that the Project bisects two known Luiseño village sites and is also immediately adjacent to a known tribal resource (Double Buttes). The Tribe requested that direct impacts to these significant tribal cultural resources be avoided or properly mitigated.
- In follow-up communication with the Soboba Tribe, they have requested a formal consultation meeting with the CPUC after they have had adequate time to review the ~~d~~Draft EIR.
- On April 14, 2016, a conference call was held between the CPUC, CPUC consultant team, and the Pechanga Tribe to discuss the Tribe's comments on the Draft EIR. As a result of the call, revisions were made to the Cultural Resource mitigation measures to include the Pechanga Tribe in document review and monitoring efforts. During the conference call, the Pechanga Tribe also noted their concerns about indirect visual impacts of the Project to Double Buttes. A separate conference call was scheduled to discuss visual impacts to sensitive Native American cultural resources.
- On April 26, 2016, a conference call was held between the CPUC consultant team and the Pechanga Tribe to review the potential for the Project to have an indirect visual impact to Double Buttes. Prior to the

---

<sup>1</sup> The discussion in this section addresses tribal consultation that was conducted as part of the environmental review process carried out by the CPUC. It does not address the consultation conducted by SCE as part of its application process with the CPUC. In total, SCE contacted 13 Native American representatives that were identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. SCE received responses from Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, the Pechanga Cultural Resources office of the Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians, the Cultural Committee of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, the Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office, and the Cahuilla Tribal Environmental Protection Office. SCE documented this initial consultation in Section 4.5.1.4 (page 4.5-11) of its PEA.

<sup>2</sup> Assembly Bill 52 took effect on July 1, 2015 and requires lead agencies to begin consultation with Native American Tribes prior to the release of an environmental document if requested by the tribe. This bill also requires that environmental documents consider tribal cultural resources and establishes a consultation process for all California Native American Tribes on the Native American Heritage Commission List.

conference call, the CPUC consultant team conducted a brief viewshed analysis of the northern Project area in relation to Double Buttes. Several factors were taken into consideration during the viewshed analysis, such as the specific locations on the western and eastern Double Buttes that are important to the Pechanga Tribe, existing conditions of the current landscape, and how the current landscape would change with the implementation of the proposed Project and alternatives. The additional viewshed research noted that the proposed Project would have an indirect visual impact to cultural resources and Double Buttes; however, the impact would not be significant. The Pechanga Tribe agreed that the Project would not have a significant visual impact. Therefore, Mitigation Measure CR-6 (Reduce Adverse Visual Impacts) was removed from the Final EIR for the proposed Project.

Communication and consultation between the CPUC and interested tribes will be ongoing throughout the environmental review process. The CPUC will continue to work with interested tribes by providing project-related notices and information through US mail, email, and the Project website.

### F.3 EIR Preparers

A consultant team headed by Aspen Environmental Group prepared this document under the direction of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Consistent with Section 15129 of the CEQA Guidelines, the preparers and technical reviewers of this EIR are listed below.

#### Lead Agency

**California Public Utilities Commission, Energy Division**

Eric Chiang, Project Manager

#### Consultant Team

Personnel	Education	Role/Issue Area
<b>Aspen Environmental Group</b>		
Sandra Alarcón-Lopez	MA, Urban Planning BA, Speech and Hearing Science	EIR Project Manager Consultant Team Manager
Lisa Blewit	BS, Chemical Engineering	Deputy Project Manager Project Description, Alternatives, Noise
Scott Debauche, CEP	BS, Urban Planning & Design	Transportation and Traffic
Susanne Huerta, AICP	Master of Urban Planning BA, Geography	Agricultural Resources
Chris Huntley	BA, Biology	Biological Resources
Tatiana Inouye	Master of Environmental Science and Management BS, Biology	Land Use, Alternatives
Matthew Long	MESc, GIS/Water Resources Specialization MPP, Natural Resource Management Concentration BA, Comparative Literature	Hydrology and Water Quality
Patrick Meddaugh	BS, Environmental Science and Management (Natural Resource Management)	Cumulative Projects, Project Support
Jared Varonin, CFP	BS, Ecology and Systematic Biology	Biological Resources
William Walters, PE	BS, Chemical Engineering	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas
Justin Wood	MS, Biology BS, Biology	Biological Resources

<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Role/Issue Area</b>
Stanley Yeh	MPA, Environmental Science and Policy BS, Environmental Studies (Earth Sciences)	Recreation, Other CEQA Considerations
<b>Michael Clayton Associates</b>		
Michael Clayton	MS, Environmental Mgt. MA, Asia Pacific Environmental Affairs BA, Biology	Aesthetics
<b>Applied Earthworks</b>		
Susan Goldberg	MS, Anthropology BS, Anthropology	Cultural Resources, Native American Consultation
Joan George	BS, Physical Anthropology	Cultural Resources, Native American Consultation
Tiffany Clark	PhD, Anthropology MA, Anthropology	Cultural Resources, Native American Consultation
Jessica DeBusk	BS, Geology	Paleontological Resources
Heather Clifford	MS, Geology BA, Art	Paleontological Resources
<b>Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.</b>		
Aurie Patterson, PG	BA, Geology	Geology and Soils Hazards and Hazardous Materials
<b>PhaseLine LLC</b>		
Chuck Williams	BS, Civil Engineering	Transmission Line Alternatives, Engineering Feasibility, and Magnetic Fields
<b>Scheuerman Consulting</b>		
Paul Scheuerman	BS, Electrical Engineering	Transmission Planning and Alternatives