

ADDENDUM TO THE PUBLIC SCOPING REPORT

**SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
VALLEY-RAINBOW 500 KV INTERCONNECT PROJECT
CPCN APPLICATION NO. 01-03-036**

Lead Agencies:



**505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Contact: Billie Blanchard
Tel: (415) 703-2068**

**Palm Springs South Coast Field Office
690 West Garnet Avenue
P.O. Box 581260
North Palm Springs, CA 92258
Contact: John Kalish
Tel: (760) 251-4800**

Prepared by:



**605 Third Street
Encinitas, CA 92024**

MAY 2002

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

Table of Contents

Section **Page No.**

1.0 OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS 1

 1.1 Purpose of the Addendum 1

 1.2 Bureau of Land Management Scoping Process 1

 1.3 Public Notification 2

 1.4 Scoping Report Organization 2

2.0 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS 4

 2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS 5

 2.1.1 Human Environment Impacts 5

 2.1.2 Natural Environment Issues 6

 2.2 Alternatives 7

 2.3 CPUC/BLM Environmental Review and Decision Making Processes 8

APPENDICES

A Notification and Scoping Open House Meeting Materials

 A-1 Public Notice

 A-2 Notice of Intent

 A-3 Open House Meeting Materials

B Written Comments

 B-1 Written Letters Received in Response to the NOI

 B-2 Written Comment Forms Received in Response to the Public Scoping Open House

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Summary of Letters Received 9

Table 2 Summary of Written Comment Forms 24

SECTION 1.0

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE ADDENDUM

In July and August 2001 the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) conducted public scoping for the Valley-Rainbow Interconnect Project in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines by preparing a Notice of Completion and Notice of Preparation, conducting public scoping meetings and receiving written comments. A public scoping report was completed by the CPUC and BLM in October 2001, and fulfilled all of the scoping requirements of the CPUC pursuant to CEQA. In January 2002, to fully complete the public scoping requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the BLM prepared a Notice of Intent (NOI) and conducted a NEPA public scoping open house.

The BLM desires to provide documentation for completion of the NEPA scoping process, and desires to identify any issues brought up as part of the NEPA scoping process that were not previously documented in the October 2001 Public Scoping Report. The focus of this Addendum is therefore to identify and discuss environmental effects associated with implementation of the project that were revealed as part of the formal NEPA scoping process, and not included in the original October 2001 scoping report.

1.2 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT SCOPING PROCESS

On January 2, 2002, the BLM published in the Federal Register an NOI to prepare a joint EIR/EIS with the CPUC addressing the proposed Valley-Rainbow 500-kV Interconnect Project. The NOI was prepared and published in compliance with regulations 40 CFR 1501.7 and 43 CFR 1610.2. The NOI identifies the BLM as the lead Federal agency for preparation of the EIR/EIS in compliance with the requirements of NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulation for implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), and the Department of the Interior's manual guidance on NEPA. The NOI initiated the formal NEPA public scoping for the EIS and provides an opportunity for governmental agencies and the public to provide comments on the issues and scope of the EIR/EIS. The review period on the NOI officially extended to February 4, 2002. Written comments received during the scoping process are part of the project record and have been reviewed and will be considered by the BLM and CPUC in scoping the EIR/EIS.

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

In addition to the formal scoping process, the BLM held one public scoping open house on January 8, 2002 to provide the public and governmental agencies information on the NEPA process and to give them opportunities to identify environmental issues and alternatives for consideration in the EIR/EIS. The public open house was held from 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Embassy Suites Hotel, 29345 Rancho California Road, Temecula, California.

Eighty-six written letters were received during the NOI public scoping process from public agencies and private citizens, and 54 written comment forms were received in response to the public scoping open house. Approximately 200 persons attended the public scoping open house. The input received from the BLM's NEPA scoping process will assist the CPUC and BLM in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, issues and potential effects associated with the proposed project. All issues raised in the NEPA scoping open house and written comments received will be reviewed by the BLM, CPUC, and the environmental team to determine the appropriate consideration and level of analysis.

1.3 PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Public notification for the scoping open house included newspaper announcements and notification in the Federal Register. Notices for the scoping open house were published in the San Diego Union-Tribune on December 27, 2002, and the Riverside Press Enterprise on December 26, 2001. The Notice of Intent was posted in the Federal Register on January 2, 2002 (Vol. 67, Number 1, pages 100-101). *Appendix A* contains copies of the notification materials and the Notice of Intent.

1.4 SCOPING REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Addendum to the public scoping report summarizes the comments and issues identified through the NOI scoping process and the NEPA public scoping open house.

- **Section 2** provides an overall summary of the new issues that were brought up during the NEPA scoping process.
- **Appendix A** includes the scoping notification materials, including:
 - A-1 Public Notification
 - A-2 NOI
 - A-3 Open House Meeting Materials

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

- **Appendix B** provides:
 - B-1 copies of all written letters received in response to the NOI; and
 - B-2 comment sheets received from the open house scoping meeting.

SECTION 2.0

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

This section summarizes the issues raised during the NEPA scoping process for the Valley to Rainbow Interconnect Project EIR/EIS that were not previously documented in the October 2001 Public Scoping Report. This summary is based upon both written letters and comments that were received during the NOI review period, that officially ended February 4, 2002 and from the public comment forms submitted to the BLM in response to the public scoping open house held in the project area on January 8, 2002.

Eighty-six letters were received during the scoping process from two federal agencies, a school district, a water district, Riverside County, a local city, private and special interest groups and concerned public. *Table 1* provided at the end of this section lists all letters received and provides a summary of comments raised.

In addition to letters received, 54 written comment forms were received by the BLM in response to the public scoping open house. *Table 2* provided at the end of this section lists all comment forms received and provides a summary of comments raised. The majority of comments were provided by private citizens, homeowners, and private organizations. In addition to private individuals, comments were received from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, United States Marine Corps, Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District, Temecula Valley Unified School District, City of Temecula, County of Riverside, Cilurzo Winery, The Nevada Hydro Company, Inc., Redhawk Community Association, Greenpeace, Save Southwest Riverside County, Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association, Menifee Valley Ranch LLC group, Centex Homes, and Sempra Energy. APPENDIX B contains all written letters and comments received.

The majority of the issues raised during the NEPA scoping process were included in the October 2001 scoping report and are not mentioned in the text of this Addendum. However, additional issues and/or additional information regarding issues previously documented in the October 2001 Public Scoping Report, were brought up during the NEPA scoping process, and are discussed below according to the following major themes:

1. Environmental Issues and Concerns
2. Alternatives
3. CPUC/NEPA Environmental Review and Decision Making Processes

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS

2.1.1 Human Environment Impacts

Temecula Wine Industry and Agricultural Operations

The potential that the proposed project would: (1) Create a corridor in the middle of the citrus/vineyard (C/V) zone in the Temecula Valley where currently allowed land uses (other than farming only) will become impossible; (2) Establish the need to re-zone a corridor in the middle of the C/V zone to allow property owners to develop land compatible with a 500 kV line was raised in one letter. It was discussed that these adverse land use impacts would undermine and devalue an area much larger than the shadow of the transmission line, and that these incompatible surrounding land uses should be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

Public Health and EMF

Several letters stated that public safety and regional security should be analyzed in the EIR/EIS due to the confluence of utilities in the project area posing a potential threat to terrorists. Several letters and comments also recommended the money expenditures of SDG&E for existing and past line breaks, line kills, worker illness, and fire costs be analyzed in the EIR/EIS to compare to the project. One letter also requested that EMF effects on dairy cows and dairy farms be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.

Recreation

Several letters discussed that planned and existing recreation and utility uses adjacent to the west dam of Diamond Valley lake and the communities of Winchester and Hemet would not be possible with implementation of the project.

Cultural Resources

Several letters and comments discussed the proposed project's potential impact on cultural resources, and specifically discussed impacts to historical and cultural resources on the Pechanga Indian Reservation and the "Great Oak Property". It was stated that if the "Great Oak Property" is taken into trust, SDG&E will no longer be able to condemn a corridor across the property through eminent domain. It was recommended that the project should not cross the "Great Oak Property". It was stated that the Pechanga Great Oak Tree on the

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

Pechanga Great Oak Ranch would be impacted by the proposed project, and that the tree is 1,500-2,000 years old as researched by UCLA and the oldest oak in North America. It was discussed that the tree and the Great Oak Ranch are sacred to the Pechanga People, and also that cremation, religious and cultural sites must also be preserved on the "Great Oak Property".

School Districts

A letter from the Temecula Valley Unified School District stated that if the proposed project is approved, a state grant (\$52 million) for a new high school in Temecula could be lost because that 500 kV line would be too close to the school, or runs through the primary site and all potential alternative sites; preventing construction of the proposed school.

Future Development

One letter stated that the project would adversely impact Centex's current plans to develop a 120-acre parcel consisting of 446 single family residential lots located in an unincorporated portion of Riverside County, and next to the Pechanga Indian Reservation.

U.S. Marine Corp Camp Pendleton

The U.S. Marine Corp stated that the EIR/EIS should include discussion of how the second 230 kV circuit on the Talega-Escondido 230 kV line would be installed on Camp Pendleton, with identification of required coordination procedures to install the line, impacts to military training, and identification and schedule of access to ground or airspace for project construction and operation. It was also stated that the EIR/EIS should include a discussion of encroachment/impact/effects to military training and actions to be taken to minimize or mitigate those impacts. It was requested that this discussion include the impacts of EMF interference with systems on Marine Corp Base Camp Pendleton.

2.1.2 Natural Environment Issues

Issues were raised regarding future power plants built to feed electricity to the proposed Valley-Rainbow (V-R) Interconnect project would cause adverse environmental effects including: (1) air quality, (2) objectionable odors, (3) water quality in New River and Salton Sea National Wildlife Refuge, (4) reduction of water table in Mexicali and Imperial Valley,

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

and (5) construction of wastewater treatment facilities. It was stated that these adverse environmental impacts should be included for analysis in the EIR/EIS. It was also discussed that the proposed project would be expanding the market for dirty electricity and allows companies to avoid California environmental regulations by building power plants on the Mexican side of the border.

Several letters stated concerns about air quality during construction and operation of the project, and were particularly concerned with dust generated by helicopters and potential human health impacts from the dust.

2.2 ALTERNATIVES

Several new alternative routes to the proposed project were discussed, and two technical reports were submitted with maps and cost estimates for construction of the new alternatives. The two technical reports stated that there are at least four economically viable alternatives that would reduce potential land use and economic impacts (*see Watkins, Blakely and Torgerson, LLP letter dated February 4, 2002 and included in Appendix B for details*). The conclusion of the technical reports was that the best route from an environmental impact standpoint is east of Briggs Road as property in that area is zoned either Light Manufacturing or Commercial as opposed to residential. Written letters and comments also discussed that conservation measures, distributed generation, and upgrading existing lines should be included as alternatives in the EIR/EIS. One letter updated and supplemented information on several alternatives that were included in the October 2001 scoping report including: voltage support improvements, "Southern System" transmission improvements, transmission improvements north of San Onofre Nuclear Generation Station (SONGS), Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Transmission Line, underground 230 kV transmission line, and a transmission line south of Devers Substation.

LEAPS/TE/VS Alternative

Two letters from the Nevada Hydro Company (TNHC) and Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) requested that the Talega-Escondido/Valley-Serrano 500 kV Interconnect Project (TE/VS), formerly the "LEAPS" project, should be included as an alternative to the proposed project. One letter was submitted by Shute, Mihaly and Weinberger for the Save Southwest Riverside County group. This letter requested that the LEAPS Alternative be included in the EIR/EIS. Many letters were written in opposition to the LEAPS/TE/VS

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

alternative including: 24 form letters, a letter of opposition signed by 31 persons, written comment forms from the public scoping open house stating opposition signed and submitted together by 61 persons, a letter of opposition signed by 16 persons, four personal letters, and one letter from Sempra Energy. These letters were opposed to the TE/VS Alternative for the same reasons included in the October 2001 Public Scoping Report for the proposed project including but not limited to: home value, aesthetic impacts, property values, open space preservation, fire hazards, impacts to trails and privately maintained roads, and protected Wilderness area and habitat. Opposition letters also stated that impacts of the TE/VS alternative would be disastrous on the communities of La Cresta, Tenaja, and Lakeland Village. The letter from Sempra Energy stated that the requests of EVMWD and TNHC to prepare a joint EIR/EIS for the TE/VS Interconnect and V-R Interconnect projects are not supported by fact or law.

Riverside County Proposed Alternative

The letter from Riverside County recommended an alternative route to the proposed project that departs from the proposed routing in the Diamond Valley area and goes easterly through the foothills and then southerly around Vail Lake and connects with the “preferred” route around the southern perimeters of the Pechanga Indian Reservation/Cleveland National Forest.

2.3 CPUC/BLM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND DECISION MAKING PROCESSES

The TNHC and EVMWD requested that a joint EIR/EIS be prepared to allow for inclusion of TE/VS Interconnect as part of a single document with the Valley-Rainbow Interconnect project, and that this joint EIR/EIS commence with redesignation and renoticing. Sempra Energy stated in their letter that the requests of EVMWD and TNHC to prepare a joint EIR/EIS for the TE/VS Interconnect and V-R Interconnect projects are not supported by fact or law.

One letter stated that SDG&E’s method for route planning was improper due to negotiations with the Pechanga Tribe, and another stated that there could be a conflict of interest as the BLM would receive money from SDG&E renting their land for the project.

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

In addition, it was discussed that the CPUC and BLM may be piecemealing environmental review in conflict with CEQA and NEPA as larger projects than the Valley-Rainbow project would be needed to fulfill the purpose and need statement.

Several letters stated that it would be illegal for SDG&E to take eminent domain over property when the main purpose and object for the project is profit, and the need for the project has not been firmly established.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
Federal Agencies			
January 30, 2002	United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs Pacific Regional Office 2800 Cottage Way Sacramento, CA 95825 Amy Lutschke Regional Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant cultural resources and natural resources of high sacred value to the Pechanga Band have been identified. If the "Great Oak Property" is taken into trust, SDG&E will no longer be able to condemn a corridor across the property through eminent domain. Do not recommend the project to cross the "Great Oak Property." 	
February 4, 2002	United States Department of Defense Marine Corps Marine Corps Base Box 555008 Camp Pendleton California 92055-5008 S.W. Norquist Natural Resources Department Head by Direction of the Commanding General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EIR/EIS should include discussion of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How the second 230 kV circuit to the existing Talega to Escondido 230 kV transmission line will be installed on MCB Camp Pendleton, Identification of required coordination procedures to install the second line, including access to MCB Camp Pendleton, Discussion of encroachment/ impact/effects to military training and actions taken to minimize or mitigate those impacts, Identification and schedule of all access to ground or airspace for project construction and operation, Discussion of work at Talega substation that requires clearing of vegetation. 	
Special Districts			
January 29, 2002	Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District P.O. Box 3000 31315 Chaney Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92531-3000 Phillip M. Miller District Engineer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EVMWD's proposed alignment constitutes a feasible alternative to the V-R project and must be examined in the EIS/EIR. The EVMWD must evaluate a "non-forest" route as an alternative and the V-R alignment will serve as the "non-forest" alternative. Coordination and cooperation of all affected agencies on both the "LEAPS line" and V-R line will be required to devise a project-level NEPA/CEQA document. 	A resolution is attached encouraging the BLM, CPUC, USFWS, and other cooperating federal agencies to commence a dialogue leading to the execution of a "Memorandum of Understanding" allowing for preparation of a single EIR/EIS addressing both projects.

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 8, 2002	Temecula Valley Unified School District 31350 Rancho Vista Road Temecula, CA 92592 Director Facilities Services Department Dave Gallaher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A state grant (\$52 million) for a new high school in Temecula could be lost if the project is approved. • If the community loses the school other area high schools will be overcrowded, and traffic problems will be increased throughout the community. 	
Cities			
January 8, 2002	City of Temecula Mayor Ronald H. Roberts P.O. Box 9033 Temecula, CA 92589-9033	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to: hot air ballooning, visual impacts in Temecula Valley Wine Country, air quality, noise, sensitive habitat areas, cultural resources, land uses, air operations at French Valley airport as well as fire-fighting efforts, fire hazard, erosion, EMFs, future sport and recreation facility in Temecula, existing high school in project vicinity, Great Oak Tree south of Pala Road on land owned by Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians. • These alternative should be analyzed: no-build, effects of conservation measures, construction of additional generation facilities, distributed generation, upgrading existing lines, undergrounding transmission lines, use of public lands, alternative further removed from populated areas. • Project concerns: purpose and need, financial viability and equity of having non-benefitting general public fund its construction, adverse economic impacts. 	
January 28, 2002	City of Temecula 432 Business Park Drive-PO Box 9033 Temecula, CA 92589-9033 Jim O'Grady Assistant City Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City requests review of background information used to arrive at the Project Purpose, Objectives and Needs section of the NOP, and requests response from BLM. 	
Counties			
January 23, 2002	County of Riverside County Administrative Center 14 th Floor 4080 Lemon Street Riverside, CA 92501 Bob Buster Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial and health of Riverside County residences. • Cumulative impact of Riverside County which can be coordinated with Ms. Aleta Lawrence at (909) 955-3265. • Route recommended by Riverside County to CPUC departs from the proposed routing in the Diamond Valley area and goes easterly through the foothills and then southerly around Vail Lake and connects with the "preferred" route around the southern perimeters of the Pechanga Indian Reservation/Cleveland National Forest. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
Private Organizations			
January 8, 2002	Cilurzo Winery Audrey Cilurzo 41220 Calle Contento Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protest for whole or part of the project. ● SDG&E incorrectly states that the project would be located on the outer edge of the "Wine County" when it would cross the middle of the "Wine Country". ● The project would impact: aesthetics, noise, tourism, and would radiate electricity. ● The desert to the east is open and less inhabited. 	
January 8, 2002	The Nevada Hydro Company, Inc. (TNHC), President Peter Lewandowski 2416 Cades Way Vista, CA 92083	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TNHC response to the "SDG&E System Alternative Study- Lake Elsinore Study" : statements in SDG&E study are without factual basis and the Talega-Escondido/ Valley-Serrano 500-kV Interconnect (TE/VS) Project" should be identified as an alternative to the V-R Interconnect in the EIR/EIS. ● TNHC requests joint EIS/EIR including TE/VS as part of a single document for the V-R project. 	An attached technical response and map of the TE/VS project was included.
January 8, 2002	Redhawk Community Association on behalf of the Board of Directors Paul Runkle President- Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Redhawk Community Association Board oppose the project because of impacts to property values, and because there are other routes that would not impact areas as heavily populated. ● No project need. 	Aerial photos of the Redhawk community are attached.
February 1, 2002	Greenpeace Clean Energy Now J.P. Ross Policy Analyst 75 Arkansas San Francisco, CA 94107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Environmental effects from power plants built to feed electricity to the Valley-Rainbow Interconnect: (1) Air Quality, (2) Objectionable Odors, (3) Water Quality in New River and Salton Sea National Wildlife Refuge, (4) Reduction of Water Table in Mexicali and Imperial Valley, (5) Construction of wastewater treatment facilities. ● Expanding market for dirty electricity and allows companies to avoid California environmental regulations by building power plants on the Mexican side of the border. 	
February 4, 2002	Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP for Save Southwest Riverside County (SSRC) 369 Hayes Street San Francisco, CA 94102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More precise statement of purpose and need. ● Piecemealing environmental review. ● Project description and setting need to be updated. ● Alternatives: No Project, Voltage Support Improvements, "Southern System" Transmission Improvements, transmission Improvements North of SONGS, Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Transmission Line, Underground 230 kV Transmission Line, Transmission Line South of Devers Substation. ● Environmental Impacts: school facilities, dairy cattle farms and horse breeding operations. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
February 4, 2002	Temecula Valley Winegrowers Association P.O. Box 1601 Temecula, CA 92593-1601 Vice President Roberto Ponte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use impacts would occur including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Create a corridor in the middle of the citrus/vineyard (C/V) zone where currently allowed land uses (other than farming only) will become impossible. (2) Establish the need to re-zone a corridor in the middle of the C/V zone to allow property owners to develop land compatible with a 500 kV line. (3) Undermine and devalue an area much larger than the shadow of the transmission line due to incompatible surrounding land uses. 	
February 4, 2002	Watkins, Blakely and Torgerson, LLP for Menifee Valley Ranch LLC (MVR) 535 Anton Boulevard Suite 800 Costa Mesa, California 92626-7115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative Routes- The best route for the line from environmental standpoint is east of Briggs Road. 	Two reports on new alternative routes with graphics and cost estimates for construction were submitted.
February 5, 2002	Jackson, DeMarco, & Peckenpaugh for Centex Homes, Inc. Darren W. Stroud 4 Park Plaza, 16 th Floor Irvine, CA 92614	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project would adversely impact Centex's current plans to develop a 120-acre parcel consisting of 446 single family residential lots located in an unincorporated portion of Riverside County, California, and next to the Pechanga Indian Reservation. • Grading for the single family residential development has commenced, and the project would create significant visual, land use, aesthetic, noise, EMF health, and economic impacts. • Alternative routes recommended: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) routes B and C in PEA would cause undue harm to Centex, (2) reroute 2 of Route B is unacceptable, (3) Centex prefers Routes E,F, and G. 	
February 6, 2002	Sempra Energy James R. Dodson Attorney 101 Ash Street HQ-11B San Diego, CA 92101-3017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requests of EVMWD and TNHC to prepare a joint EIR/EIS for the TE/TS Interconnect and V-R Interconnect projects lack any merit and are not supported by facts or law: 1) Two separate projects, 2) NEPA does not require analysis of alternatives that are not part of a project, and 3) EVMWS and TNHC mis-characterize the V-R project. 	
Concerned Public			
January 7, 2002	Eileen Runde 33718 Madera de Playa Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on community values, health and safety, socioeconomic, safety and nuisance, and visual resources of the Temecula Valley. • Illegal to take people's property through eminent domain when the project is for profit. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 8, 2002	No name.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Project alternatives: (1) connecting to Ramona substation, (2) I-15 corridor, (3) no-build alternative ● No project need. ● Project shouldn't be allowed within one mile of schools or playgrounds. ● Impacts to Native Americans ● Historic and scenic values would be lost. ● Planning and zoning would be negatively impacted. ● The project would be economically detrimental. ● Seismic hazards. 	
January 8, 2002	Carlos and Angela Caceres 33358 Eastridge Place Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Views obstructed and health in danger. ● House value and quality of living space will be depreciated. 	
January 8, 2002	Dominic J. Chemello D&D Ballooning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impacts of the project to hot air ballooning in the area as take-off and landing in certain areas would be precluded. ● Aesthetic impacts would occur from the project reducing the tourism appeal of the Temecula Valley. 	
January 8, 2002	Gerard C. Chiu 32897 Adelante Street Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The high-tension towers would serve as targets for terrorists. ● Build the power plants closer to the end users. ● Towers offer new land hazards to the civilian and military aircraft that fly in Temecula Valley. ● No added value for residents of Temecula Valley. 	
January 8, 2002	Brad N. Clark 45818 Corte Carmello Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alternatives should be studied and considered in less populated areas. ● The project would result in loss of property values, and great risks to health and safety. ● Need for the project must be justified before SDG&E can exercise eminent domain. ● Impacts to hot air ballooning and air safety. ● Adverse impacts to visual resources. 	Photos of the area were attached.
January 8, 2002	Charles Green 31152 Norma Way Winchester, CA 92596	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What type of mitigation is there for the community of Winchester, or for approved or proposed specific plans in the area? ● Alternatives and impacts to biological resources should be addressed. ● Seismic hazards. ● EMF impacts should be included in the EIR. ● Aerial map shows a proposed road off Domenigoni Parkway that does not exist. ● Undergrounding of the line. ● Is the project necessary? 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 8, 2002	Betty Johnson 44728 Corte Valenci Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Co-existence between people and wildlife would be adversely impacts by the project. ● Pechanga Great Oak would be impacted. 	
January 8, 2002	Kenneth W. Johnson 44728 Corte Valencia Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Land use impacts, fire and seismic hazards, EMF effects. ● There is no longer a need for this project. ● The Devers and Talega-Serrano alternative routes should be considered. 	
January 8, 2002	Gary Matlock 24439 Corte Descanso Murrieta, CA 92562	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Land use impacts to residential areas. ● Route in the desert should be considered. 	
January 8, 2002	Jim and Patricia A. Mosman 45201 Anza Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Property value impacts. ● Economic impact to retired persons. ● Organic growers will be removed from the federally approved list if any non-organic materials are used within 30 feet of plants. ● Degradation of viewshed. ● Public lands should be used. 	
January 8, 2002	John and Mary Politano 45938 Corte Carmello Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Property devaluation over \$1 billion. ● Childhood leukemia and other EMF impacts. ● Visual impacts. ● Seismic hazards. ● Planned high school in Temecula. ● Wine Country business and tourism. ● Three golden eagles in south Temecula. 	
January 8, 2002	Daniel C. Robbins, D.O., Pediatrician Temecula, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lives of many people, especially children, living near the project are at risk. No studies have shown that high voltage power lines are safe. ● Studies done on lower voltages show risk of cancer, so the proposed higher voltage lines should not be put close to people. ● No studies have been on EMF effects of a 500 kV line. ● It is the BLM's moral obligation to decide if there is a chance the project will cause cancer in one child. A child cannot be put at risk so a large power company can get richer. ● There are other alternatives. 	
January 8, 2002	Kristi Rutz-Robbins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Possible alternatives: (1) connects to Ramona substation, (2) I-15 corridor, (3) no-build. ● There is no need for the project, and high voltage lines should not be within one mile of schools or playgrounds. ● High wind corridor makes balloons and small aircrafts at risk. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 8, 2002	Ali and Blanca Sakhapour 33381 Moming View Drive Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to Native American land. • Historic, scenic, economic, seismic risk, and land use impacts in project area • View and depreciation of property value, in addition to health impacts of young children. 	
January 8, 2002	Lee Schapel Caldwell Banker Realtor 27919 Jefferson Avenue, Suite 101 Temecula, CA 92590	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is impacting, and would impact property values. • Support alternate route not close to existing residential areas. 	
January 8, 2002	Sperling Family 36679 East Benton Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic, land use, and tourism impacts in the Temecula Wine Country. • In support of the Devers Alternative. 	
January 8, 2002	Belinda Travis 452288 Chateau Court Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community values of Temecula Valley include: (1) family community, (2) good schools, (3) oldest living oak tree, (4) aesthetics, (5) vineyards, (6) Diamond Valley Reservoir, (7) hot air ballooning, (8) French Valley Airport. • The project would affect all these amenities. 	
January 8, 2002	Cindy Valdivieso 32502 Corte Zaragoza Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property devaluation over \$1 billion. • Childhood leukemia and other EMF impacts. • Visual impacts. • Seismic hazards. • Planned high school in Temecula. • Wine Country business and tourism. • Three golden eagles in south Temecula. • Fog and humidity in the area will cause noise impacts. 	
January 10, 2002	Mel and Joan Nelson 35755 singing Falls Drive Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe negative impact on land, habitat, and wildlife north of Lake Skinner. • Negative impact to quality of life and property value. 	
January 13, 2002	Mr. and Mrs. Martin E. Ridenour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No project need. • Route for the 250 kV and 500 kV line between Alberhill and the Camp Pendleton Marine Corp Base. • Impacts to biological resources, aesthetics, and fire hazards. • Opposed to the project. 	
January 16, 2002	Letter of opposition signed by 31 persons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter of opposition to the alternate route of the project being proposed by the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District and the Nevada Hydro Company stating that impacts of the project on the communities of La Cresta and Tenaja would be disastrous because of wildfires, property values 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
		<p>decreases, biological resources, open space preservation, privately maintained roads. The letter was signed by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Susan L. Frommer, 42140 Northland Ct., Tenoja, CA 92562 (2) Saul I. Frommer, same as 1 (3) Joan M. Mattman, 18530 Calle Juanito, Murrieta, CA 92562 (4) Katherine S. Marieath, 28851 Snead Dr., Sun City, CA 92586 (5) Diana Earjart, 19126 Calle Teresa, Murrieta, CA 92562 (6) Joan K. Murphy, 9695 Camino De Paz, Murrieta, CA 92562 (7) Roberta Christ, 18020 Tenaja Road, Murrieta, CA 92562 (8) Illegible, 18001 Tenaja Road, Murrieta, CA 92562 (9) Pauline Roands, same as 8 (10) Ray Kelly, 43500 Camino de Las Brisas, Murrieta, CA 92562 (11) BE Inman, 20815 Avocado Mesa Road, Murrieta, CA 92562 (12) Illegible, 13084 Caminto Del Rocio, Del Mar, CA 92014 (13) John Earjart, 19126 Calle Teresa, Murrieta, CA 92562 (14) Richard Lockwood, 19775 Paseo Redondo, Murrieta, CA 92562 (15) Jean Lockwood, same as 14 (16) Tommy Calmur, 19620 Tenaja Road, Murrieta, CA 92562 (17) Donna Calmur, same as 16 (18) Robert Patterson, PO Box 252 Wildomar, CA 92595 (19) Cherie Patterson, same as 18 (20) Jack Henry, 43009 Manchester Ct., Temecula, CA 92592 (21) Illegible, 23021 Sweetbay Drive, Wildomar, CA 92599 (22) Susan Hurst, 39182 Corte de Ollas, Murrieta, CA 92562 (23) Barbara Zeiblik, 33250 Sunset Avenue, Menifee Valley, CA 92584 (24) William Zeiblik, same as 23 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
		<p>(25) Lynn Beakley, 19680 Avenue Presa, Murrieta, CA 92562</p> <p>(26) Carol Lucky, 37345 Calle do Lobo, Murrieta, CA 92562</p> <p>(27) Carolyn Speight, 38596 Avenida Bonita, Murrieta, CA 92562</p> <p>(28) Illegible, 18590 Hombre Lane, Murrieta, CA 92562</p> <p>(29) Illegible, 39204 Calle de Companero, Murrieta, CA 92562</p> <p>(30) Illegible, 22115 Tenaja Road, Murrieta, CA 92562</p> <p>(31) Daniel Searer, 41341 Avenida La Cresta, Murrieta, CA 92562</p>	
January 19, 2002	Denise Debus 39303 Calle Bellagio Temecula, CA 92590	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project would be an environmental disaster. • Impacts to humans, tourism industry. 	
January 22, 2002	Scott Green 17425 Cross Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 22, 2002	Andrea Sims 33280 Hollister Drive Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It makes more sense to run the lines through Temecula than through Lake Elsinore. • Strongly oppose the lines being placed in Lakeland Village. 	
January 23, 2002	Faddoul E. Baida and Family 34860 Calle Arnaz Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality impacts during construction and operation, geology, soils, seismicity, biological resources, cultural resources, water resources, agricultural resources, economic impacts, traffic and transportation, visual resources, EMFs. Mitigation measures to reduce these measures were listed in the letter. 	
January 23, 2002	James H. And Ana J. Lee 33628 Landerville Blvd. Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 23, 2002	Robert Rose 33411 Adelfa Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 23, 2002	John and Sonya Stubbins P.O. Box 1543 Wildomar, CA 92595	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object strongly to the alternate route proposed by the EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company. • Construction of the project would impact: land value, view, fire safety, health, trails, privately maintained roads and wilderness habitat. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 23, 2002	Mark and Ann M. Tretan 33761 Brand Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 24, 2002	Jill Burie 17480 Cross Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92531	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 24, 2002	Cynthia Bjorn 17440 and 17461 Haynes Avenue Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 24, 2002	John M. Bjorn 17440 and 17461 Haynes Avenue Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 24, 2002	James Lynn Fogleman 33541 Adelfa Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 24, 2002	Paul Froncak 33471 Brand Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 24, 2002	Joseph C. and Pamela P. Huss 32825 Los Encinos Drive Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality: operation impacts, ozone contribution, odors Biological resources and rare plants found near Agua Tibia Mountain including: Munz's onion, spreading navarretia, saltbrush, Nevin's Barberry, Rainbow manzanita, sage, round-leaved Boykinia, Vail Lake Ceanothus, California Live Oak, Endangered species: eagles, California Condors, and other raptors Cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, economics, noise, transportation, forestry/fire hazards, aesthetics. No project need. Alternatives including line upgrades, new generating plants and alternative energy, underground lines. 	Letter included attachments with maps, local photos, information on endangered species in the area, photos of raptors in the area, articles on Agua Tibia Mountain, and various newspaper articles.
January 24, 2002	Betty Kutt 33541 Adelfa Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 24, 2002	John D. Sperle 33480 Brand Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 24, 2002	Dybra Wagner 16127 Marian Avenue Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 25, 2002	Dorothy L. Hillegas 36585 Lake Summit Drive Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMF risks for residents, pets, and livestock. Complications of fire fighting due to transmission lines and tall towers. Project is not needed. 	
January 30, 2002	Gliin o' the Wold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments about aliens and flying saucers. 	
January 30, 2002	Mr. and Mrs. R. Morrin Anza Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No project need, only reason for the project is SDG&E' economic gain and profitability. Project should use transportation corridors, or go through Lake Elsinore. What is the purpose of scoping meetings? 	
January 30, 2002	Letter signed by 16 persons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter was signed by 16 persons stating objections to the alternate route proposed by EVMWS and Nevada Hydro being placed in the mountains west of I-15 Freeway. Signees are listed as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Richard W. Weaver 21321 Paseo Montana, Murrieta, CA 92562 Patricia B. Weaver, same as 1 Richard Scott Weaver, same as 1 Michael N. Martin, 19175 Vista De Montanas, Murrieta, CA 92562 W. Martin, same as 4 Illegible, 3851 Via Majorca, Murrieta, CA 92562 Robert Edmonds, 21100 Paseo Montana, Murrieta, CA 92562 Rosalie Edmonds, same as 7 Illegible, 38351 Via Majorca, Murrieta, CA 92562 Illegible, 38253 Via Majorca, Murrieta 92562 Illegible, 38450 Via Majorca, Murrieta, CA 92562 Illegible, 21313 Paseo Montana, Murrieta, CA 92562 Harry Hudach, 38280 Via Majorca, Murrieta, CA 92562 Marianne Hudach, same as 13 Steve Hercher, 3806 Via Majorca, Murrieta 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 30, 2002	Cowan A. Plummer and Martha B. Plummer	<p>92562 (16) Ameliene Hercher, same as 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to EVMWD's proposal for a joint EIR/EIS with Valley-Rainbow project. • Concerned with impacts to wildlife, plant life, and fire hazards. • Attached newspaper article. 	
January 31, 2002	Faddoul Baida 34860 Calle Arnaz Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project would not benefit the citizens of Riverside County, only SDG&E/Sempra. • Outdated maps were used in siting the project. • Cumulative impact of project including Pipeline No. 6 and Diamond Valley Reservoir. • EMF will destroy the RCIP of Riverside County. • Liquefaction and seismic hazards. 	
January 31, 2002	Borin van der Berg 33771 Brand Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 31, 2002	Robert D. Erisch 17150 Alta Vista Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 31, 2002	Pat Fitzpatrick 33340 Blanche Drive Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 31, 2002	Michell Greget 33631 Brand Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. • The project will cause cancer, fire, and air quality impacts. Recreation areas would be impacted. 	
January 31, 2002	Illegible 33324 Blanche Drive Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 31, 2002	Illegible 17401 Peeler Avenue Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
January 31, 2002	Heidi Knuth 16155 Marian Ave. Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 31, 2002	Lawrence Mailloce 16127 Marian Avenue Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
January 31, 2002	Adrian J. McGregor 34555 Madera de Playa Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moisture of rains and snows would not be a good environment for the project. There is no project need. Temecula Valley as significant visual resources that would be negatively impacted with the proposed project. Cumulative impacts including the Pipeline 6 project. Agriculture and tourism impacts. EMF and health impacts from Hanta Virus, Valley Fever Virus. Dust from construction and related health impacts. Noise impacts, cultural resources impacts, human and animal impacts from increased temperature around transmission line. Eminent domain is not allowed for profit making. Request review of County of Riverside's Geological Studies. Acid rain will result from the transmission line. Fire, seismic, erosion, and flood hazard. Impacts to property values. Prefer the Devers Route. 	Attachments include: photo of snow in the area, internet information on El Nino and other weather patterns, letters from Faddoul E. Baida including a personal finding of significant environmental impacts, chapters out of books on EMF, real estate listings, newspaper articles, County of Riverside Environmental issues assessment and traffic letter from 1995, letter from Dr. Hans J. Peterman
January 31, 2002	C. Schmidt 3617 Bernwood Place, #100 San Diego, CA 92130	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is not necessary and would have a severe impact to those who live under and around the project. Problem is that San Diego is not sustainable. 	
January 31, 2002	Maynard L. Weinberg 33265 Hollister Drive Lakeland Village, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
February 1, 2002	Gene Frick 17205 Monterey Road Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests to be placed on the list for notices and documents connected with this project. Enron routing alternative to the preferred route was not identified in the NOI. Stakeholders in the Enron route alternative should have been notified. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
February 2, 2002	Kimleu Hunter-Hirt 33470 Brand Street Lake Elsinore, CA 92530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Enron route is selected as a candidate for an alternative a new NOI will have to be issued. • No wires alternative. • Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
February 2, 2002	Rafael R. Telfer 41090 Anza Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed project does not offer any benefits. • Noise impacts, flood hazards • Request a new aerial survey and map to be compared to the one used by SDG&E in the original application. • Property value impacts. 	Letter included Addendum from A.J. McGregor with photos and discussion of airborne pollutants, water resources, fire and health hazards, and LEAPS project.
February 2, 2002	Rafael R. Telfer 41090 Anza Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic degradation, property value impacts, fire hazards, impacts to air operation at French Valley Airport, electrocution risk, noise impacts, EMF health impacts to humans and animals, cumulative impact with pipeline 6 project. • Letter included scientific explanation of EMFs and listed several websites. 	Attachments included photos of pipeline 6 project, his family, and hot air ballooning.
February 3, 2002	John B. Rogers 27935 Calle Vista Lejos Temecula, CA 92590-3313	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project impacts to public safety and regional security. • Confluence of utilities in the project area could be threatened by terrorists. 	
February 4, 2002	Rick and Marcia Crouse 32782 Holland Rd. Winchester, CA 92596	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human health hazards (especially young children), noise, fire hazard, aesthetics. • Project should be on vacant public land not densely populated private land. 	
February 4, 2002	Leo and Jean Gorman 45551 Anza Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect of high voltage on animals and humans over time. • Economic impact on wineries and the area. • Aesthetic impacts 	
February 4, 2002	Eion and Clara McDowell 42601 Pradera Way Temecula, CA 92590-3530	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDG&E has used its power to promote a line that is not really needed at this time or in the distant future because alternate sources of electricity are coming up. 	
February 4, 2002	Dr. S.F. Morton 32175 Ano Crest Road Winchester, CA 92596	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDG&E trespassed on private property using Phino Lane. • Proposed line prohibits property sale due to EMF effects. • Conflict of interest from BLM receiving rent money from SDG&E. • Impacts to: aesthetics, EMF effects to protected species and people, financial damage. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 1 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF LETTERS RECEIVED**

Date	Person/Agency	Comments	Attachments
February 4, 2002	Timothy J. Prince 1536 Cove Ct. San Marcos, CA 92069	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disapproval of route "E", and the SDG&E's method for route planning. 	December 12, 2001 letter from Timothy Prince to Tom Nutt, Wilbanks Resources Corporation, and November 28, 2001 letter from Tom Nutt, Wilbanks Resources Corporation to Timothy Prince were attached with maps of route "E".
February 4, 2002	Robert and Carole Yhlen 35020 Calle Campo Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impacts including: carcinogenic effects on humans, property values. Quality of life, SDG&E surveying property without permission. Alternatives not investigated sufficiently. Against route through the Temecula Wine Country 	
February 6, 2002	Mr. and Mrs. Edward Kunesh 35650 Meadow Ridge Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property devaluation, human health impacts, project need, oldest living oak tree. Prefer alternative in Cleveland National Forest, Opposed to the project. 	
February 6, 2002	Sandra Sander 33345 Blanche Drive Lake Elsinore, CA, 92530-5800	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	
February 20, 2002	Jack and Shirley Anderson 33245 Lookout Drive Lake Elsinore, CA 92530-5800	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form letter stating objection to alternate route proposed by EVMWD and Nevada Hydro Company being placed through the mountains above Lakeland Village. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENT FORMS**

Person	Comments	Attachments
<p>Don Adams 7143 Salisbury Road West Hills, CA 91307</p> <p>Shirley Allen 42200 Chaparral Drive Temecula, CA 92592</p> <p>Julie Anderson 33425 Monte Verde Road Temecula, CA 92592</p> <p>Robert Anderson 33425 Monte Verde Road Temecula, CA 92592</p> <p>Robert Anderson 33425 Monte Verde Road Temecula, CA 92592</p> <p>Ramona Armbuster 39982 Ria Calina Temecula, CA 92592-8804</p> <p>Marion Ashley 170-B Wilkenson Lane Perris, CA 92590 Director of Eastern Murrieta Water District Board of Directors of Municipal Water District of Southern California</p> <p>Faddoul Baida 34860 Calle Arnaz Temecula, CA 92592</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No project need. • Proposed route is in question. • Property value decreases. • Request review of alternative routes away from Anza Road. • Alternative sources of power should be considered. • Lines should be placed where private land and recreational interests will not be violated. • Public need to be provided with alternative trails or rights of access to trails if the project is approved. • EMF effects on humans. • Adverse impact on property values. • Not a need for the project. • More cost-effective alternatives than those proposed. • People have been impacted by the project already with thoughts of having property taken through eminent domain. • Property represents the future of the people. • The project is not needed. • Suggests a route through public lands or the desert. • Alternative routes have not been studied. • Need for the project has not been proven. • SDG&E is attempting to proceed with pre-condemnation activities before a need for the project has been established. • EMF health effects to humans. • Great Oak tree on the Pechanga Indian Great Oak Ranch. • Ancient burial grounds on the Pechanga Indian Reservation. • Oppose the project. • There are better alternatives. • Project is not needed and incompatible with existing lifestyle in the project area. • The line goes through MWD's land adjacent to the west dam of Diamond Valley Lake. • The project compromises or destroys the MWD's ability to use the property now and in the future, in addition to recreational uses. • The ability to provide new, clean, power generation from construction of a pump for extensive water pump back activities would be precluded with the project. • The existing route devastates power generation from use of power from Diamond Valley Lake, and all planned recreation uses in the area. • Request attachments A& C in October 17, 2001 letter to CPUC. • Would like another workshop with enlarged and detailed maps showing different routes and costs efficient studies, and more information as to why the current route is the proposed route. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 2 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENT FORMS**

Person	Comments	Attachments
Jane Bates P.O. Box 31 Fallbrook, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to property values and EMF health impacts to people. 	
Patricia Bennet 33398 Eastridge Place Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly oppose the project. Property value impacts. No benefit to residents. EMF health impacts. There is a better location for this project. 	
Julia S. Bilderbah 33370 Sunset Avenue Menifee, CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land use impacts with schools and homes. Adverse visual impacts. EMF effects need to be studied. Project need is unproven. 	
David L. Bradley 2153 Woodland Heights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed route is based on profit and cost, and not impacts to the people of southwest Riverside County. 	
John Burris 40624 Calle Cancion Temecula, 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aesthetic impacts. EMF impacts. 	
Rose Burris 40624 Calle Cancion Temecula, 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMF impacts No project need is sufficient enough to bring harmful EMF close to people. 	
AD Carter 4199 Corte Azule Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMF effects to cancer patients. Economic impacts. 	
Audrey Cilurzo Cilurzo Vineyard and Winery 41220 Calle Contento Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over \$100 million are generated from wine related spending in Temecula, and the project goes through the middle of the "Wine Country", and the project will decrease land values and the community value in the project area. Several endangered species are located in the area. How much land will be taken out of the "Wine Country". 	
Wendell Cole 40540 chaparral Drive Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Profit is not a legitimate reason to take property for eminent domain. The project should be re-routed out of the Temecula Valley even if the cost to SDG&E increases. 	
James Cromwell 45630 Monte Verde Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is not needed, if needed it should go through National Forest or under ground. Property values are dropping 30% along the proposed line. Cannot sell property until decision is made on project. Request for response from BLM. 	
Rick and Marcia Crouse Crouse Farms 32782 Holland Road Winchester, CA 92596	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to the project because of: 1) human health impacts, 2) noise impacts, 3) fire hazards, 4) aesthetic impacts, 5) property value impacts. Project should be done on vacant public land not densely populated private land. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 2 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENT FORMS**

Person	Comments	Attachments
Ed Day 32722 Galleans Avenue Winchester, CA 92596	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dangerous EMF field. People should not be forced to be guinea pigs until research shows for sure the health impacts. • Requests that SDG&E follow its mitigated route, rather than its proposed route. 	
Michael Foster 40396 Paseo Del Cielo Temecula, CA 92591	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the project for the following reasons: (1) EMF effects, (2) aesthetic impacts, (3) lines can be run in existing utility corridors, (4) project need has not been proven. 	
Margaret Fultz 314 Cortez San Leandro Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reason for the project to go through any of the towns as proposed. • No project need, human health impacts. 	Attached newspaper article.
Deborah and Patrick Furlong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that BLM employees wear badges at the public meeting to make it easier to identify to communicate with. • Oppose the project because: (1) EMF health impacts, (2) aesthetic impacts, (3) property value impacts, (4) does not benefit project area. 	
Armand Gerard 32017 Murrieta Road Menifee, CA 92584	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human health impacts traded for profits. • Line goes near middle and elementary schools. 	
Adria Gutierrez 32158 Callesita Fadrique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health impacts, property value impacts, aesthetic impacts. • The route through Cleveland National Forest would not effect humans. 	
Jeanne Haman 750 Breeze Hill Road #97 Vista, CA 92083	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can people live on property adjacent to, and crossed by the project? • Requests alternative routes or undergrounding. 	
Mr. Clifton Hewlett 42890 Calle Corto Temecula, CA 92590	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No project need, alternative routes need to be analyzed, negative impact on property values and lifestyle. 	
Richard Johns 35365 Via Cerro Vista Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic, property value, and EMF health-related impacts. • Public lands are available for this project, e.g. Camp Pendleton. 	
Loraine Kubachi 32157 Callesite Fadrique Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project would homes and would cause health hazards. 	
Buddy Linn 34795 Calle Bella Loma Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danger to air travel, property value impacts, health impacts, no project need. 	Included photos of his house and the Temecula Valley.
Cheryl Linn 34795 Calle Bella Loma Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The line is for profit, is not needed, and many homeowners will be harmed. 	
Adrian McGregor 34555 Maderade Playa Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Diamond Valley Reservoir is half filled and the humidity of the air basin is 80-100%. Until the lake is filled and has one year migratory studies, no EIR can be completed. • SDG&E overlooked the recreational areas in Winchester/Hemet, 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 2 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENT FORMS**

Person	Comments	Attachments
Adrian McGregor 34555 Maderade Playa Temecula, CA 92592	<p>and the planned recreation planned for the new Diamond Valley Reservoir.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High brush fire hazard. • Recommends the management rating of SDG&E to be considered, and requests the money expenditures of line breaks, line kills, worker illnesses, and fire costs to be revealed. • Children with cerebral palsy will not function because of EMFs. Leukemia survivors will not be able to live here. • What monetary rewards will be given for holocausting all these people? • Eminent domain does not allow its usage for profit only. • The project belongs in an isolated desert in southern unpopulated San Diego County. • Quality of the environment, health, and life. • People must be kept safe even if company profits are low. • Project is not needed. • Many sensitive receptors in the project area. 	
Charlene Meers 32569 Caminito Rosado Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic impacts and views of mountains in the area. 	
Raymond Meers 32569 Caminito Rosado Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire hazard, impacts to biological resources, property values. • Move the project to the desert in the east. • Project is not needed. 	
Bruce and Johanne Montour 45491 Sleepy Hollow Lane Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly oppose the project. • Economic, environmental, health, and aesthetic impacts. • Look at project alternatives, project need, and whether the project would be cost-effective. 	
Bruce and Johanne Montour 45491 Sleepy Hollow Lane Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the project. • Unacceptable economic, environmental, aesthetic, and human health impacts in the Temecula area. 	
Ray Moore 42300 Casa Verde Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the project is needed, expand the existing Talega line going west, the Devers Route, or the Mexico border area. 	
Elin Motherhead 18575 Vista de Montanas Murrieta, CA 92562	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 61 signatures were obtained from people who are members of the Santa Rosa Plateau Riding Club and are opposed to the EVMWD Alternative because of impacts to housing, views, health, roads, trails, plants, animals, and protected species. The names and addresses (where available) are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Bullet Anderson, 40101 Avenida La Cresta, Murrieta, CA 92562 (2) Marge Etchandy 38551 Calle de Companero, Murrieta, CA 92562 (3) Elin Motherhead 18575 Vista de Mountains, Murrieta, CA 92562 (4) Mike Motherhead (same as 3) 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 2 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENT FORMS**

Person	Comments	Attachments
	(5) Bob Carrick, 37550 Calle de Companero, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(6) Cynthia Boatright, 41690 Ave La Oresta, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(7) Illegible	
	(8) Illegible	
	(9) Patricia Frochlich	
	(10) Illegible	
	(11) Illegible	
	(12) Lenore Brandt	
	(13) Illegible	
	(14) Joyce C. Gaiser, 33355 Claremont, Wildomar, CA 92595	
	(15) Nanci Bartnich, 40521 Calle do Suenos, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(16) Linda Burrow, 23447 Canterbury Way, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(17) Carl Burrow, same as 16	
	(18) Linda Smith, 378855 Via Majorca, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(19) Marianne Hirdack, 38280 Via Majorca, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(20) Steve Smith, same as 18	
	(21) Lisa Hill, 38079 Calle de Lobo, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(22) Bryan Hussar, 38052 Calle do Lobo, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(23) Deni J. Woodruff, 39430 Calle Bandido, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(24) Geoff Barclay, 21075 Avenida de Arboles, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(25) Phyllis Cunningham, 37215 Avenida La Cresta, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(26) Roxanne Ralston	
	(27) Sonya Lindlea, 38820 Calle La Salida, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(28) Keith Card	
	(29) Barbara Card	
	(30) Hugo Anderson	
	(31) Virginia Von Achen	
	(32) Bill Anderson	
	(33) Norm Hull	
	(34) Linda Hull	
	(35) Lisa Evans	
	(36) Glenn Evans	
	(37) Kristen Kivmanic, 19251 Calle Teresa, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(38) Sandra Noll, 18380 Avenida Coleta, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(39) Shelli Dall, 37954 Calle de Lobo, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(40) Ron Faherty, 39000 Calle Bandido, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(41) Donna Maroit, 38528 Avenida Bonita, Murrieta, CA 92562	
	(42) Stan Kensic 39370 Avenida Bonita, Murrieta, CA 92560	
	(43) Nancy Kensic, same as 42	
	(44) Harvey Dorland, 18590 Hombre Lane, Murrieta CA 92562	
	(45) Sheila Dombrody, 19200 St. Gallen Way, Murrieta, CA 92562, Sherry Delterac 40560 Calle Bandido, Murrieta, CA 92562	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 2 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENT FORMS**

Person	Comments	Attachments
	<p>(46) Chuck Delteras (47) Nagav Joshua, 18380 Avenida Caleta, Murrieta, CA 92562 (48) Dave Drepehinski, 19251 Calle Teresa, Murrieta, CA 92562 (49) Blanche Leondis, 18405 Tenasa Road, Murrieta, CA 92562 (50) Elizabeth Bachmann, 38510 Calle de Lobo, Murrieta, CA 92562 (51) Charlie Bachmann, same as 52 (52) Debra Smith, 39202 Calle Bandido, Murrieta, CA 92562 (53) Pauline Stotsenberg, 40730 Calle Bandido, Murrieta, CA 92562 (54) Maureen Selzer, 41955 Calle Corriente, Murrieta, CA 92562 (55) Daniel Searer, 20481 Via Palopinto, Murrieta, CA 92562 (56) Raymond Ogden, 39835 Calle de Suenos, Murrieta, CA 92562 (57) Laura Ogden, same as 56 (58) Harold Ramser Jr., 39100 Avenida La Cresta, Murrieta, CA 92562 (59) Amalia Ramser, same as 58 (60) Jim Carroll, 38260 Avenida La Cresta, Murrieta, CA 92562 (61) Millie Faherty, 3900 Calle Bandido, Murrieta, CA 92562</p>	
Victor Pfnennighausen 47930 Pala Road Temecula, CA 92059	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More feasible to add some gas peaking turbines and a couple of 500 MW stream turbines to generating stations on the coast. This would give cheaper and more reliable power. 	
Dean and Twila Polopolus 34380 Lui Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be upsetting if common sense, as a consensus of the people of the project area, was set aside and utilities, politics, and money prevailed. • It the project goes in it will show the people are not considered as much as endangered species. 	
Del Ross Camta Environmental Consultants 31805 Hwy 795 PMD #225 Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide guidelines for the preparation of the EIR/EIS. • How can people be sure the BLM will not push the project through the Temecula Valley instead of through the BLM lands? 	
Harold Rouse 28100 Sycamore Mesa Road Temecula, CA 92590	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the project because the need has not been justified. • Project will reduce property values, and routes in less populated areas are available. 	
Tom Samoff 35045 Linda Rosea Road Temecula, CA 92590	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of life would be destroyed, aesthetics, EMF effects, and property values. 	
John Schaffer 41297 Anza Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Death and destruction has occurred by SDG&E's high voltage transmission lines. The EIR must address the history of existing lines and their negative impacts. 	
Roger Scherer 26442 Bechmanct Murrieta, CA 92562	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Murrieta requests that the power line avoid the incorporated City of Murrieta and the Wine Country area. 	

Addendum to the Public Scoping Report

**TABLE 2 (Cont.)
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENT FORMS**

Person	Comments	Attachments
Sharyl, Steve, and Kent Seward 35092 Calle Campo Temecula, CA 90274	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on people and animals. 	
Gary Smith 45480 Woopert Lane Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMF effects, loss of privacy, aesthetics, and property value decreases. 	
Stephanie L. Smith 45480 Woopert Lane Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project would take away from the beauty and serenity of Temecula. EMF effects, especially for small children. Property values would be affected by 1/3. 	
Mark Stiefel Stiefel Dairy 32750 Holand Road Winchester, CA 92596	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is proposed to meet future need on Pathway 15 of state's grid. EMF effects from the project on dairy properties. 	
Carrie Tomseth 35480 Linda Rosen Road Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project will cause impacts to family, homes, and home equity. 	
David Van Laeys 33031 Anasali Drive Temecula, CA 92597	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic impacts and public health. Alternative routes to the east. Impacts to viewsheds. 	
Barbara Wilder 28560 Via Santa Rosa Temecula, 92590	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pechanga Great Oak Tree on the Pechanga Great Oak Ranch. The tree is 1,500-2,000 years old as researched by UCLA and the oldest oak in North America. The tree and the Great Oak Ranch are sacred to the Pechanga People. Cremation, religious and cultural sites must also be preserved on the site. 	
Brianne Yhlen 35020 Calle Campo Temecula, CA 92592	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area provides wildlife corridors, and habitat for a variety of wildlife. Geese migrate in the area. Human health impacts. 	

APPENDIX A

Notification and Scoping Open House Meeting Materials

A-1

Public Notice

A-2

Notice of Intent

A-3

Open House Meeting Materials

APPENDIX B

Written Comments

B-1

*Written Letters Received in
Response to the NOI*

B-2

*Written Comment Forms
Received in Response to
the Public Scoping Open House*