

7. Consultation and Coordination

7.1 Public Participation and Notification

The public participation and notification program for the EIR/EIS focused on two areas of CEQA and NEPA: (1) Public Scoping and (2) Draft EIR/EIS public review. This section describes the specific public outreach methods that were used for this EIR/EIS in order to comply with these requirements.

7.1.1 Scoping Process

Scoping Requirements

Scoping, or the process of involving the public and agencies in determining the scope and content of an EIR or EIS, is encouraged and utilized under both CEQA and NEPA. Scoping is an effective way to solicit and address the environmental concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. In addition to the purpose of informing the public about the proposed Project, the scoping process is also meant to achieve the following: (1) identify potentially significant environmental impacts for consideration in the EIR/EIS; (2) identify possible mitigation measures for consideration in the EIR/EIS; (3) identify alternatives to the proposed Project for evaluation in the EIR/EIS; and (4) compile a notification list of public agencies and individuals interested in future Project meetings and notices. Scoping can take many different forms, including public and agency consultation, scoping meetings and notices such as the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent.

Proposed Project EIR/EIS - Scoping

The scoping process for the TRTP EIR/EIS consisted of four main elements, which are listed below and described in the following sections.

- 1) Publish a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR and a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS, which marked the beginning of the 30-day scoping period, announced public scoping meetings, and solicited comments from affected public agencies and members of the public.
- 2) Conduct public scoping meetings and consultation meetings with agencies.
- 3) Document in a written report the public and agency comments received on the proposed Project.
- 4) Establish an Internet web site, electronic mail address, a telephone hotline, and local EIR/EIS Information Repositories to make Project-related documents and information accessible.

As described in CEQA and NEPA, the scoping process was intended and developed to inform the public and allow interested parties to express their concerns regarding the proposed Project, thereby ensuring that relevant opinions and comments were considered in the environmental analysis for the EIR/EIS. Members of the public, relevant federal, State, regional and local agencies, interests groups, community organizations, and other interested parties were given the opportunity to participate in the scoping process through attendance at scoping meetings and by providing comments or recommendations regarding issues to be investigated in the EIR/EIS.

7.1.1.1 Notices of Preparation and Intent

NOP/NOI Requirements

As part of the scoping process, both State and federal lead agencies are required to prepare and distribute a notice informing interested parties that the lead agency will be preparing an EIR or EIS, respectively. CEQA

requires State lead agencies to prepare a NOP, while NEPA similarly requires federal lead agencies to prepare a NOI. The purpose of an NOP and NOI is to notify interested parties of the project or action and to solicit their participation in determining the scope of the EIR or EIS.

NEPA states that a federal lead agency must prepare and publish a NOI in the Federal Register “as soon as practicable” after its decision to prepare an environmental impact statement [40 CFR 1501.7]. Similar to CEQA for an NOP, NEPA also dictates the contents of a NOI when it states that a NOI must describe the proposed action and possible alternatives; describe the proposed scoping process, including any scoping meetings that may be held; and provide the name and address for a person at the lead agency that can answer questions related to the EIS [40 CFR 1508.22].

NOP/NOI for the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project EIR/EIS

Based upon the above State and federal requirements, an NOP and NOI were prepared and distributed for the proposed Project. The details of the Project’s NOP and NOI are described below.

The CPUC issued a NOP for the proposed Project on August 31, 2007. Consistent with CEQA (CEQA Guidelines §15082), the NOP summarized the proposed Project, stated the CPUC’s intention to prepare a joint EIR/EIS, and requested comments from interested parties. The NOP additionally described the EIR/EIS process and the proposed scope of the EIR/EIS; listed possible alternatives; identified public repository sites and other information sources (Project website, phone/fax hotline, and e-mail address) where Project information and documents were posted; and described the proposed Project’s scoping process and details of the scoping meetings.

The NOP was mailed via certified mail to federal, State, and local agencies. The NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse on August 31, 2007 (SCH# 2007081156), which began a 39-day comment period. The review period for the NOP ended on October 8, 2007. Copies of the NOP were distributed to federal, State, regional, local agencies, Native American tribal representatives, elected officials, property owners, and other interested parties. . Forty-nine (49) additional copies of the NOP were delivered to the local repository sites. A public scoping meeting notice, which contained information similar to that required by CEQA for the NOP, was mailed to over 15,000 individuals and agencies, and published in five newspapers.

The Forest Service issued a NOI for the proposed Project, which was published in the *Federal Register* on September 7, 2007 (FR Vol. 72, No. 173, p. 51404). Consistent with NEPA (40 CFR 1508.22), the NOI included a description of the proposed action and possible alternatives, a description of the scoping process and scoping meetings, and identification of the official at the Forest Service who could answer Project-related questions.

The NOP and NOI are found in Appendix B of this EIR/EIS.

7.1.1.2 Scoping Meetings

Scoping Meeting Requirements

Generally, formal scoping meetings are optional under CEQA unless requested by the lead agency, responsible or trustee agencies, the State Clearinghouse, or the project applicant [CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15082(c)]. However, the State lead agency is required to conduct at least one scoping meeting if the project has been determined to be of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance, as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15206

[CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15082(c)(1)]. Further, CEQA encourages consultation with any organization or person believed to be interested in the project, but it is not required [CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15083].

As stated below, CEQA [CEQA Guidelines, CCR §15082(c)] states that notices of the scoping meeting must be sent to the county or cities where the proposed project would occur, responsible agencies, other public agencies with jurisdiction over the project, and any organization or member of the public that submitted a written request for the notice.

“(1) For projects of statewide, regional or area wide significance pursuant to Section 15206, the lead agency shall conduct at least one scoping meeting. The lead agency shall provide notice of the scoping meeting to all of the following: (A) any county or city that borders on a county or city within which the project is located, unless otherwise designated annually by agreement between the lead agency and the county or city; (B) any responsible agency; (C) any public agency that has jurisdiction by law with respect to the project; (D) any organization or individual who has filed a written request for the notice.”

NEPA states that a federal lead agency may hold a scoping meeting whenever it deems it appropriate pursuant to 40 CFR 1501.7(b)(4), which states:

“As part of the scoping process the lead agency may: Hold an early scoping meeting or meetings which may be integrated with any other early planning meeting the agency has. Such a scoping meeting will often be appropriate when the impacts of a particular action are confined to specific sites.”

The required noticing for public hearings or public meetings for actions of local concern is similar to that described for the NOI in Section 7.1.1.1.

Scoping and Alternatives Meetings

As part of the public scoping process of the proposed Project, a total of seven public scoping meetings were held to present information to the public on the Project and to take public comments on the scope and content of this EIR/EIS, as well as alternatives and mitigation measures to be considered.

Public scoping meeting notices were prepared for all the scoping meetings, which provided a brief description of the Project including a map, information on the meeting locations, and information on where to send comments, contact information, and the duration of the public comment period. The notices were mailed to over 15,000 parties including agencies, elected officials, area residents, and organizations that may have been interested in the proposed Project. The advertisements provided a brief synopsis of the Project and encouraged attendance at the meetings to share comments on the Project. The Notice of Public Meeting, including the date and location of the public meeting, was advertised in newspapers

Additionally, a public meeting was held on January 17, 2008, in Brea, California, after the public comment period to discuss potential Alternatives to the Chino Hills Route Alternative (Alternative 4).

For the January 17 Alternatives meeting, 3,000 agencies, elected officials, area residents and organizations received notices regarding the time, date, and location of the meeting. The advertisements placed in local newspapers provided a brief synopsis of the proposed Project and four alternative routes in the Chino Hills area (Alternative 4), and encouraged attendance at the meeting to share comments on the proposed Project and alternatives.

The public scoping meetings listed in Table 7-1 were held to discuss what issues should be analyzed in this EIR/EIS.

| Date and Time | Location | No. of People Signed-in | Comment Letters Received @ Mtg. |
|---|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Thursday September 6, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Whittier La Serna High School, Cafeteria 15301 Youngwood Drive, Whittier, CA 90605 | 16 | 2 |
| Monday September 10, 2007 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Palmdale Palmdale Cultural Center 38350 Sierra Highway, Palmdale, CA 93550 | 11 15 | 1 1 |
| Tuesday September 11, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Rosamond Kern County Library - Wanda Kirk Branch (Rosamond) 3611 Rosamond Blvd., Rosamond, CA 93561 | 11 | 0 |
| Wednesday September 12, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Duarte Duarte Community Center 1600 Huntington Drive, Duarte, CA 91010 | 9 | 0 |
| Thursday September 13, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Rosemead Garvey Community Center 9108 Garvey Avenue, Rosemead, CA 91770 | 7 | 1 |
| Wednesday September 19, 2007 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Altadena Altadena Community Center 730 E. Altadena Drive, Altadena, CA 91001 | 13 | 0 |
| Thursday September 20, 2007 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Chino Hills Chino Hills Council Chambers 2001 Grand Avenue, Chino Hills, CA 91709 | 53 272 | 3 166 |
| Alternatives Meeting | | | |
| Date and Time | Location | No. of People Signed-in | Comment Letters Received @ Mtg. |
| Thursday January 17, 2008 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm | Brea Brea Community Center 695 E Madison Way, Brea, CA 92821 | 193 | 5 |

In addition, the date and location of the public scoping meetings were posted on the Project website, and also advertised in local newspapers. The meeting advertisements for the public scoping meetings and Alternatives meetings were placed in the newspapers listed in Table 7-2 below.

| Publication | Type | Advertisement Dates | | Areas Covered |
|------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|---|
| Daily Publication Newspapers | | | | |
| Los Angeles Daily News | Display | Tuesday, August 28 | Sunday September 2 | Lancaster, Palmdale, Santa Clarita |
| Los Angeles Times | Legal | Sunday, August 26 | Thursday, August 30 | General circulation |
| Antelope Valley Press | Display | Sunday, August 26 | Thursday, August 30 | Antelope Valley |
| The Signal Newspaper | Display | Sunday, August 26 | Thursday, August 30 | Santa Clarita |
| Whittier Daily News | Display | Sunday, August 26 | Wednesday, August 29 | Whittier and surrounding areas |
| La Opinion | Display | Wednesday, August 29 | Sunday, September 2 | General circulation |
| Chinese LA Daily News | Display | Wednesday, August 29 | Sunday, September 2 | Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties |
| The Korea Times | Display | Thursday, August 30 | * | General Circulation |
| Pasadena Star News | Display | Thursday, August 30 | Sunday, September 9 | Pasadena, Rosemead, San Gabriel Valley |
| San Gabriel Valley Tribune | Display | Thursday, August 30 | Sunday, September 9 | San Gabriel Valley |
| Inland Valley Daily Bulletin | Display | Thursday, September 6 | Sunday, September 16 | Western San Bernardino County |

| Table 7-2. Newspaper Advertisements | | | | |
|--|---------|------------------------|---|------------------|
| Publication | Type | Advertisement Dates | | Areas Covered |
| Weekly Publication Newspapers | | | | |
| Agua Dulce/Acton Country Journal | Display | Saturday, September 1 | Saturday, September 8 | Acton/Agua Dulce |
| Champion Newspaper | Display | Saturday, September 8 | Saturday, September 15 | Chino Hills |
| Acton/Agua Dulce News | Display | Monday September 10** | | Acton/Agua Dulce |
| Rosamond News | Display | Monday September 10** | | Rosamond |
| Alternatives Meeting Newspaper Advertisements | | | | |
| Publication | Type | Advertisement Dates | Areas Covered | |
| Daily Publication Newspapers | | | | |
| Inland Valley Daily Bulletin | Display | Monday, January 7th | Western San Bernardino County and Chino Hills | |
| The Chinese Daily News | Display | Tuesday, January 8th | Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties | |
| Weekly Publication Newspapers | | | | |
| Champion Newspaper | Display | Saturday, January 5th | Chino Hills, Chino, and South Ontario | |
| The Star Progress | Display | Thursday, January 10th | Brea and La Habra | |

Notes: * The Korea Times does not publish on Sundays, however their subscribers receive a copy of the LA Times on Sundays.
** Although the publication dates for these papers is September 10, according to the publisher the newspapers were available in news stands on Friday, September 7.

The basic format of the meetings included a presentation of the proposed Project including background, project description, location using maps, and potential environmental impacts. After the presentation, the meeting attendees were allowed to present verbal comments or submit prepared written comments.

Handouts and informational materials available at the public meeting are listed below.

- Meeting Agenda
- Map of the Entire Project
- Maps of the Alternative Routes
- Project Fact Sheets
- Self-addressed Speaker Comment Sheet
- Speaker Registration Card

7.1.1.3 Scoping Report Summary

There are no CEQA or State requirements regarding the preparation of a scoping report. However, NEPA states that the federal lead agency may prepare a scoping report in order to document and publicize the comments, opinions, and issues that were made during the scoping process, but it is not required [Council on Environmental Quality Memorandum: Scoping Guidance, April 30, 1981, II(b)(6)]. The Scoping Guidance, April 30, 1981, II(b)(6) states:

“Several agencies have made a practice of sending out a post-scoping document to make public the decisions that have been made on what issues to cover in the EIS. This is not a requirement, but in certain controversial cases it can be worthwhile. Especially when scoping has been conducted by written comments, and there has been no face-to-face contact, a post-scoping document is the only assurance to the participants that they were heard and understood until the draft EIS comes out.”

Scoping Report and Alternatives Comment Summary Report

In November 2007 and February 2008, a comprehensive Scoping Report and Comment Summary Report were issued respectively. The reports summarize issues and concerns received from the public and various agencies during the scoping period and in January 2008 to discuss the Chino Hills Alternative with concerned area citizens.

The specific issues raised during the public scoping process are summarized below according to the following major themes:

- Human Environment Issues and Concerns
- Physical Environment Issues and Concerns
- Alternatives

Human Environmental Issues and Concerns

The majority of public comments focused on the potential effect of the Project on the human environment, most often expressing concerns with health risks arising from changes in electric and magnetic fields (EMF), visual and scenic impacts to private property, and the potential for noise and environmental justice impacts.

- **EMF-Related Health and Safety Issues.** The potential impacts of EMFs from the proposed Project were of concern to many. The comments on this issue ranged from wanting additional information on the extent of EMF exposure from the new lines to the type of long-term health consequences associated with the proposed Project. There was significant concern regarding the impact of EMF on children, especially in areas where children play close to the transmission line corridor. In addition, there was concern expressed about the potential of EMF to affect plant growth, pets, and wildlife. A number of commenters expressed concern that the Project would cause long-term health problems such as cancer.
- **Hazards.** Property owners expressed concern with construction impacts. Some property owners were concerned that the use of helicopters would cause towers to fall and damage property or injure residents and others were concerned with natural disasters causing towers to fall. Property owners were also concerned with the potential for the Project to impede firefighters from using helicopters or planes to fight fires.
- **Noise.** Noise was another significant concern. Property owners in the Chino Hills area expressed concern with the potential for 24-hour “humming” and “buzzing” from electrical lines. Residents stated that the noise from the proposed 500-kV lines would be significantly different from existing conditions and they thought the increased noise would be unacceptable in their neighborhoods. There was concern with how the noise associated with the Project would impact recreation areas and open space, as well as wildlife in preservation areas. Agencies and residents also expressed concern with the use of helicopters to construct the towers, and how the noise associated with aircraft would impact residents, recreationists, and wildlife.
- **Visual Resources.** The public has significant concerns regarding the impacts to visual quality resulting from the proposed Project, and its impact on private residences and public recreation areas. Residents from the City of Chino Hills stated that the Project would impact their quality of life because larger towers would be placed in a corridor that they believe is too small for 500-kV transmission lines and towers. Although Chino Hill’s residents were the most vocal about their concerns with the visual impacts of the Project, residents from La Habra Heights, Hacienda Heights, Diamond Bar, and Ontario also expressed concerns with the size of the towers and general visual impact the Project would have in their communities.

There was also a significant amount of concern regarding the Project’s impact on public areas such as the Puente Hills, a planned project called River Commons, and county park facilities. For these projects, the concerns centered on the Project’s potential to significantly change the recreationist’s experience when hiking or visiting these recreation areas.

Physical Environmental Issues and Concerns

Public agencies and residents expressed concerns with the potential impacts that the Project may have on the physical environment, particularly to air quality, biological, cultural, geological, hazardous materials and hazardous wastes, hydrological and recreation resources, and traffic and transportation. In addition, some comments focused on the impacts to public service that would occur from the proposed Project.

- **Biological Resources.** The Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority (PHLNHPA) addressed the possible effects of the Project on wildlife movement and sensitive plant and animals in the Puente Hills. The PHLNHPA comments included mention of sensitive resources such as a Coastal Sage Scrub habitat and the

California Gnatcatcher. The Watershed Conservation Authority (WCA) commented on the potential impact to habitat in the River Commons project. In particular, the WCA noted the Project’s potential to interfere with wildlife movement

- **Recreation Resources.** The Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority (PHLNHPA) has significant concerns with the Project’s impact on recreationists. The Project’s larger towers would change the character of public trails in the Puente Hills. Therefore, the environmental analysis should consider impacts from the perspective of recreationists. The WCA had concerns regarding the Project’s impact on recreation areas planned for the River Commons project. They requested placement of the towers in areas where people would not typically gather so that the Project would not significantly affect the planned use for the Rivers Common site. Lastly, the County of Los Angeles had concern with how the Project would impact county parks and whether or not a park patron’s experience would be compromised with the construction of the 500-kV towers.

Other Comments

During the initial scoping period, property owners also expressed concerns with the Project’s impact on property values. The City of Chino Hills and numerous property owners expressed concern with the number of properties that would be affected by the Project. Residents of Chino Hills estimated approximately 1,000 homes would be impacted by the Project. According to these residents, if the property values substantially decreased for all of these homes as a result of the Project, then the Project’s impact to the City would be significant. Even though the Project would occur in an existing ROW, the City has grown around the transmission ROW and some houses are now less than 150 feet away from the corridor. Also, residents expressed concern with the current width of the ROW and the increased height and capacity of the towers. This widespread concern, along with concerns regarding visual resources, EMF/health, and noise, in the City of Chino Hills encouraged the City to identify an alternative route, which is described below.

Alternatives

Many of the comments received focused on providing alternatives to the proposed Project. Specifically, alternatives suggested included the possibility of utilizing tubular steel poles instead of lattice towers, exploring other routes for the proposed transmission line and placing the line underground for portions of the proposed Project. Table 7-3 summarizes the alternatives suggested during the public scoping comment period.

| Commenter Category | Type ¹ | Alternatives Description |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Agency | R | Alternative that avoids impacts to the Habitat Authority Properties and avoids sensitive areas in the Puente Hills, including the No Project Alternative. |
| Agency | R | To reduce impacts to River Commons, the existing ROW could be moved, new ROWs could be acquired, or transmission lines could be sited along the I-605 corridor. |
| Agency Private Citizens | R | Place transmission lines underground in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the area north of Vincent up Peaceful Valley, if 500 kV is necessary ▪ between tower 20/2 to the bottom near Forest View at tower 19/3 [exact GPS coordinates are provided in the comment] ▪ River Commons area ▪ City of Irwindale. |
| Agency Private Citizens | R | The City of Chino Hills recommends full evaluation of an alternative that terminates Segment 8A into the existing Serrano-Mira Loma and Serrano-Rancho Vista 500 kV transmission lines, which currently run through Chino Hills State Park. Specifically, Segment 8A would initiate as proposed by SCE, two miles east of Mesa Substation in the Whittier Narrows. It would run along the SCE proposed route until it reaches the existing Walnut/Olinda-Mira Loma (220kV) and the existing unenergized Mesa-Chino transmission where they separate from one other. This separation is about 2 miles east of highway 57 in Los Angeles County. At that point, Segment 8A would veer southeast, paralleling (in the same corridor) the existing Walnut/Olinda-Mira Loma (220kV) line for about six miles until it nears the existing Serrano-Mira Loma and Serrano/Rancho Vista 500 kV lines. At that junction, Segment 8A would terminate into a switching station where the 500-kV lines would be looped. System |

| Table 7-3. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping | | |
|--|-------------------|--|
| Commenter Category | Type ¹ | Alternatives Description |
| | | studies performed by SCE (at the City's request) indicate that this alternative is acceptable and meets WECC and CAISO reliability criteria. To accommodate the second transmission line, this alternative would require acquisition of additional ROW in the Walnut/Olinda-Mira Loma corridor. This alternative requires a gas-insulated switching station to be built in the State Park. |
| Private Citizen | R | In Lancaster, an alternative location would be to go further west of the proposed route to approximately West 115th to 117th Streets. Another alternative would be to follow the existing route but build structures on the west side of the current power lines that extend between Ave I and Ave J at West 100th Street and West 105th Street. |
| Agency | R | Combine routes such as segments 6 and 7 into segment 11. |
| Agency | R | The City of Ontario requests that an alternative be considered for the 150-foot ROW expansion west of Haven Avenue, south of Chino Avenue. The location of the project in this area impacts proposed development and therefore the City of Ontario requests a reduction in the easement width from 150 to 100 feet to minimize potential impacts to development. |
| Private Citizen | R | Consider alternative that routes the transmission lines through the City of Industry, along existing ROWs. Instead of diverting the lines north of the landfill, run the lines through Industry and then rejoin them, which avoids going through the hills. |
| Private Citizen | R | Consider alternative that follows existing transportation and commercial ROW along the 60 freeway or railroad ROWs; route power lines behind the San Gabriel Mountains and come down the 15 Freeway. |
| Agency Organization | R NW S | Broaden the alternatives considered in the document such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ routing the line through industrial areas instead of residential areas, ▪ reducing new pole height to match existing pole height, ▪ use of wind or solar energy, ▪ use of a 230-kV alternative whenever and wherever possible ▪ use perimeter locations within cities (i.e. Irwindale). |

¹ The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative), S (System Alternative) and NW (Non-Wire Alternative).

Alternatives Issues and Concerns

Pursuant to the comments above during the initial scoping period, an Alternatives Meeting was held on January 17, 2008, in Chino Hills, California, to discuss four alternatives as discussed in Section 2.4 of this EIR/EIS. Five written comments were provided at the January 2008 meeting, and 30 individuals, agencies, and organizations presented oral comments at the meeting. Eleven written comment letters were received by mail and fourteen written comments were received through the project email address. Table 7-3 provides a summary of the comments received during or after the Alternatives Meeting.

The comments at this meeting on the proposed project and four Alternative routes were as follows:

Human Environmental Issues and Concerns

- **Visual Resources.** The public has significant concerns regarding the impacts to visual quality resulting from the proposed Project, and its impact on private residences and public recreation areas. Residents from the City of Chino Hills stated that the Project would impact their quality of life because the transmission lines would negatively impact them due to the close proximity to their homes. Many comments were received about how the proposed transmission lines would detract from their experience at the Chino Hills State Park (CHSP).
- **Noise.** A few area residents were concerned about the humming created from operational transmission lines. One commenter was also concerned about how the noise from transmission lines would affect those wearing hearing aids.
- **EMF-Related Health and Safety Issues.** Many residents and citizens were concerned about the close proximity of the transmission lines to existing homes and the potential additional exposure to EMF from the proposed project. One commenter was concerned about how EMF from a 500 k-V line may create very strong radio and digital TV interference which may result in issues related to receiving information from public safety radio.

- **Hazards and Public Health and Safety.** Many commenters were concerned about the transmission lines and transformer increasing fire danger to the adjacent homes. Many citizens were concerned about towers collapsing as well. Citizens expressed concern about the construction activities being hazardous to bikers, walkers and residents with children.

Physical Environmental Issues and Concerns

- **Biological Resources.** Many residents were concerned that the transmission lines would impact urban wildlife as well as wildlife that is potentially endangered and located in the CHSP.
- **Recreation.** Citizens, agencies and organizations encouraged the preservation of the CHSP as a protected open space.

Other Comments

- **CEQA/NEPA Process.** Two local businesses and a local and state agency requested more time to fully review and assess impacts of the proposed project.
- **Coordination with Agencies.** One agency commented that the proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment. Two businesses were concerned that DTSC had not been brought in to discuss remediation activities at the Aerojet site, which is adjacent to the proposed project.
- **Legal Considerations.** An organization strongly denounced the double-circuit transmission lines through the CHSP because of a previous settlement reached in which SCE agreed to construct only a single-circuit line through this area.
- **Property Values.** Many citizens and businesses were concerned about how the proposed transmission lines would affect property values in the area.

Alternatives

The public was very supportive of Alternative Route C and least supportive of Alternative Route D. Many commenters on the proposed project route requested that the consideration of the placement of the transmission line through CHSP be eliminated entirely. Many commenters were also in support of undergrounding the lines through the CHSP.

7.1.2 Notice of Availability

Per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15085, the Notice of Completion (NOC) is a document that must be filed with the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, as soon as the Draft EIR is completed. The NOC should include: a description of the proposed Project, including location; the address where copies of the Draft EIR are available for review; and the review period during which public comments may be received. The CEQA Lead Agency shall also provide public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR at the same time it sends the NOC to the State Clearinghouse (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087). In addition to the information disclosed in the NOC, the Notice of Availability (NOA) should also include details for any scheduled public meetings or hearings (date, time, and place); a list of significant environmental effects; and whether the project site is listed under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code (hazardous waste facilities). In compliance with NEPA (40 CFR 1506.6(b)(2)), a NOA of the Draft EIS must also be published in the *Federal Register*, thus beginning the public comment period. The NOA should be mailed to the USEPA, which is required to review all EISs; the USEPA is also responsible for publishing the NOA once it is received (40 CFR 1506.9, 1506.10).

7.1.3 Draft EIR/EIS Public Hearings/Meetings

There will be a 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS. During the public review period, public meetings will be held at the dates and times indicated in the Notice of Availability.

7.1.4 Document Repository Sites

Document Repository Site Requirements

Both CEQA [CCR §15087(c)(5) and §15087(g)] and NEPA [40 CFR 1506.6(f)] require lead agencies to make project documents available to the public for review. Placing documents in repository sites is an effective way of providing ongoing information about the project to a large number of people. The CEQA/NEPA documents prepared as part of the proposed Project, which include the NOP, NOI, NOA, Draft EIR/EIS, and other notices including the notice of public meetings and notice of extension of the public review period have been or will be made available at the following public repository sites listed in Table 7-4.

| Table 7-4. Public Repository Sites | |
|--|---|
| Repository Sites | Address |
| US Forest Service, Angeles National Forest Area | |
| ANF Supervisor's Office | 701 N. Santa Anita Ave., Arcadia, CA 91006 626-574-5200 |
| Santa Clara/Mojave Rivers Ranger Station | 28245 Avenue Crocker, Suite 220, Valencia, CA 91355 661-296-9710 |
| Los Angeles River Ranger District | 12371 N. Little Tujunga Canyon Road, San Fernando, CA 91342 818-899-1900 |
| San Gabriel River Ranger District | 110 N. Wabash Avenue, Glendora, CA 91741 626-335-1251 |
| Public Libraries | |
| Arcadia Library | 20 West Duarte Rd., Arcadia, CA 91006 626-821-5567 |
| Azusa City Library | 729 N. Dalton Ave., Azusa, CA 91702 626-812-5232 |
| Baldwin Park Library | 4181 Baldwin Park Blvd., Baldwin Park, CA 91706 626-962-6947 |
| Diamond Bar Library | 1061 S. Grand Ave. Diamond Bar, CA 91765 909-861-4978 |
| Duarte Public Library | 1301 Buena Vista St., Duarte, CA 91010 626-358-1865 |
| El Monte Library | 3224 Tyler Ave., El Monte, CA 91731 626-444-9506 |
| Irwindale Public Library | 5050 N. Irwindale Ave., Irwindale, CA 91706 626-430-2229 |
| James S. Thalman Chino Hills Branch Library | 2003 Grand Ave., Chino Hills, CA 91709 909-590-5380 |
| La Cañada Flintridge Library | 4545 N. Oakwood Ave., La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011 818-790-3330 |
| Lancaster Public Library | 601 W. Lancaster Blvd., Lancaster, CA 93534 661-948-5029 |
| Monrovia Public Library | 843 E. Olive Ave., Monrovia, CA 91016 626-256-8274 |
| Montebello Library | 1550 W. Beverly Blvd., Montebello, CA 90640 323-722-6551 |
| Monterey Park Bruggemeyer Library | 318 S. Ramona Ave., Monterey Park, CA 91754 626-307-1368 |
| Ontario Main Library | 215 East "C" St., Ontario, CA 91764 909-395-2004 |

| Table 7-4. Public Repository Sites | |
|---|---|
| Repository Sites | Address |
| Palmdale City Library | 700 E. Palmdale Blvd., Palmdale, CA 93550 616-267-5600 |
| Pasadena Central Library | 285 E. Walnut St., Pasadena, CA 91101 626-744-4066 |
| Pico Rivera Library | 9001 Mines Ave., Pico Rivera, CA 90660 562-942-7394 |
| Rosemead Library | 8800 Valley Blvd., Rosemead, CA 91770 626-573-5220 |
| San Gabriel Public Library | 500 S. Del Mar Ave., San Gabriel, CA 91776 626-287-0761 |
| San Marino (Crowell) Public Library | 1890 Huntington Dr., San Marino, CA 91108 626-300-0777 |
| South El Monte Library | 1430 N. Central Ave. South El Monte, CA 91733 626-443-4158 |
| Temple City Library | 5939 Golden West Ave., Temple City, CA 91780 626-285-2136 |
| Whittier Central Library | 7344 S. Washington Ave., Whittier, CA 90602 562-464-3450 |

In order to offer another opportunity to inquire about the public scoping meetings or the proposed Project, a telephone hotline ([888] 331-9897) was established to provide periodic public messages and enable the public to leave recorded messages. Verbal comments on the EIR/EIS are not accepted on the hotline, but the hotline number does allow for comments to be submitted in writing by fax.

An e-mail address has been established for the Project (TRTP@aspeneg.com) to provide another means of submitting comments on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS. The e-mail address was provided on scoping meeting handouts and is posted on the website.

Ongoing information about the proposed Project will be made available through the Project website hosted by the CPUC. During the scoping period, the website included electronic versions of the Project application, NOP, NOI, and Project-related maps, providing another public venue to learn about the Project. The website will remain a public information resource for the Project and will announce future public meetings and hearings. The website address is:

ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/gopher-data/enviro/tehachapi_renewables/TRTP.htm

7.1.5 Project Notification List and Document Distribution List

Aspen compiled a comprehensive mailing list for the TRTP. The scoping mailing list included approximately 15,000 entries. Aspen used the mailing list to distribute the NOP and the postcard notices. Aspen will continue to use the list throughout the life of the environmental review process for the Project to distribute public notices at key milestones. It has been updated to incorporate those individuals that attended the public scoping meetings and submitted written comments on the scope of the EIR/EIS, and will also be updated after the Draft EIR/EIS is released and comments have been received. The mailing list includes the following components:

- Elected officials
- Federal, State, and local agency representatives
- Regional and Joint Power Authorities
- Angeles National Forest Scoping List (June 7, 2007)

- CPUC Service List (August 2007)
- Property owner list from SCE’s PEA (within 300 feet of the proposed Project route)
- Property owners within 301 to 500 feet of the proposed route
- Within the Angeles National Forest, property owners within 2.5 miles of the route
- Wind developers
- Tribal government representatives
- Potentially interested community organizations and interest groups
- Local libraries/document repository site

7.2 Organizations and Persons Consulted

State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15129) states that an “EIR shall identify all federal, state, or local agencies, other organizations, and private individuals consulted in preparing the draft EIR.” Table 7-5 provides a listing of those persons consulted as part of the preparation of this EIR/EIS. In addition to the contacts noted on Table 7-5, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, California Native Plant Society, Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden, California Native American Heritage Commission, and the San Bernardino, South Central Coastal, and Southern San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Centers were consulted regarding project site resources.

| Table 7-5. Organizations and Persons Consulted | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Name | Title | Organization/Agency |
| <i>Agricultural Resources</i> | | |
| James Nordstrom | Research Analyst 2 – GIS | California Department of Conservation |
| Jacqui Farnholtz | Planner 2 | Kern County Planning Department |
| <i>Biological Resources</i> | | |
| Doug Johnson | Executive Director | Cal-IPC (California Invasive Plant Council) |
| David Moskovitz | - | Puente Hills Landfill Habitat Preservation Authority |
| Janet Nickerman | Biologist | USDA Forest Service |
| Nancy Sandburg | Biologist | USDA Forest Service |
| Katie VinZant | Biologist | USDA Forest Service |
| Jesse Grantham | Biologist | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Richard Posey | Biologist | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Joseph DiTomaso | Biologist | University of California at Davis |
| Joe Burnett | Biologist | Ventana Wildlife Society |
| <i>Cultural Resources</i> | | |
| Darrel Vance | Forest Archaeologist | Angeles National Forest |
| Larynn Carver | District Archaeologist | California Department of Parks and Recreation, Chino Hills State Park |
| <i>Land Use</i> | | |
| Lorena Mejia | Assistant Planner | City of Ontario Planning Department |
| Lorelei Oviatt | Division Chief | Kern County Planning Department |
| Eileen Schoetzow | - | Los Angeles World Airports, Regional Airports Planning Div. |
| Jim Squire | - | San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department |
| <i>Noise</i> | | |
| Joe Martinez | Code Enforcement Supervisor | City of South El Monte |
| <i>Public Services and Utilities</i> | | |
| Greg Turner | Fire Chief | Chino Valley Independent Fire District |
| John Knowles | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Altadena – Station 11 |
| Rick Jimenez | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Altadena – Station 12 |
| David Middleton | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Azusa – Station 32 |
| Gerald Gonzalez | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Baldwin Park – Station 29 |
| Dan Gordon | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Baldwin Park – Station 29 |

| Table 7-5. Organizations and Persons Consulted | | |
|---|---|--|
| Name | Title | Organization/Agency |
| Eric McKeller | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Baldwin Park – Station 97 |
| Tom Jones | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Duarte – Station 44 |
| Robert Brandelli | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 130 |
| Larry Sotelo | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 166 |
| Brian Underwood | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 168 |
| Steve Bibrbaum | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, El Monte – Station 169 |
| Ernie Gregoire | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Hacienda Heights – Station 91 |
| Paul Sotelo | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Industry – Station 87 |
| Captain Sanchez | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Industry – Station 118 |
| David Molner | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Irwindale – Station 48 |
| Don Holzer | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, La Cañada Flintridge – Station 19 |
| Michael McCormack | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, La Cañada Flintridge – Station 82 |
| Chad Boozer | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, La Puente – Station 12 |
| Carlos Estrella | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, La Puente – Station 43 |
| Dana Rickman | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Lake Hughes – Station 78 |
| Joe Grayston | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Pasadena – Station 66 |
| Anthony Jefferson | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Pico Rivera – Station 25 |
| Joe Khodavandi | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Pico Rivera – Station 40 |
| Ryan Millan | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Pico Rivera – Station 103 |
| Mike Jasperson | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Quartz Hill – Station 84 |
| James Roy | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Rosemead – Station 42 |
| Al Traxler | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, San Gabriel – Station 5 |
| Guy Favatella | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, South El Monte – Station 90 |
| Scott Hagin | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 4 |
| Chuck Flack | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 17 |
| Rick Fullerton | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 28 |
| Scott Oglebie | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 59 |
| Bryan Kidder | Fire Chief | Los Angeles Fire Department, Whittier – Station 96 |
| Dave Dennis | Fire Chief | Monrovia Fire Department |
| Mark Hail | Fire Chief | Monterey Park Fire Department |
| Danny Serna | Fire Chief | Pasadena Fire Department |
| <i>Wilderness and Recreation</i> | | |
| Howard Okamoto | Recreation Officer | Angeles National Forest, Los Angeles River Ranger District |
| Justin Seastrand | Special Uses Coordinator | Angeles National Forest |
| Patrick Reynolds | Landscape Architect | Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation |
| Chuck Williams | Transmission Engineer | R.W. Beck |
| Jane Beesley | Director of Special Projects and Interpretation | San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy |
| <i>Visual Resources</i> | | |
| Sonja Bergdahl | Forest Engineer | Angeles National Forest |
| George Farra | Forest Service Engineer | Angeles National Forest |
| Jose Henriquez-Santos | Landscape Architect | Angeles National Forest |
| Elizabeth Cutler | Visual Resource Project Manager | CH2M Hill, Inc. |
| Thomas Priestley | Senior Visual Resource Specialist | CH2M Hill, Inc. |
| Enrique Arroyo | Associate Park and Recreation Specialist | California State Parks |
| David Crabtree | City Planner | City of Brea |
| John Mura | Assistant to the City Manager | City of Chino Hills |
| Johnnie Davis | Engineering Technician | City of Chino Hills |
| Ken Kietzer | Environmental Scientist | Chino Hills State Park |
| John Roe | Park Superintendant | Chino Hills State Park |

| Name | Title | Organization/Agency |
|--|--|--|
| Dennis Stephen | State Park Ranger | Chino Hills State Park |
| Gil Calderon | Assistant Center Manager | Clear Creek Outdoor Recreation Center, Los Angeles Unified School District |
| Mark Gardina | Center Manager | |
| Chuck Williams | Transmission Engineer | R.W. Beck |
| Tracy Alsobrook | Environmental Project Manager | Southern California Edison |
| Brent Gokbudak | Professional Engineer – Corporate Environment, Health and Safety | Southern California Edison |
| Susan J. Nelson | Regulatory Affairs Manager | Southern California Edison |
| Trinidad Juarez | Landscape Architect/Recreation Planner | US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Pacific Southwest Regional Office |
| <i>Development of the Tehachapi Wind Resource Area</i> | | |
| Michael Hollier, | Planner 2 | Kern County |
| Lorelai Oviatt | Division Chief | Kern County |
| Brian S. Marshall, | Deputy Chief | Kern County Fire Department |
| Richard Wood, | Sergeant | Kern County Sheriff's Office |
| Paula Dickerson | Administrative Assistant to Superintendent | Mojave Unified School District |
| Dr. Richard Swanson | Superintendent | Tehachapi Unified School District |
| Jessie Grantham | Biologist | United States Fish and Wildlife Service |

7.3 Preparers and Contributors

Table 7-6 provides a listing of those persons from the Lead Agencies, including both the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service, who were involved in the review of this EIR/EIS.

| Name | Agency | Title |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Thomas Flynn | California Public Utilities Commission | CPUC Project Manager |
| John Boccio | California Public Utilities Commission | CEQA Co-Project Manager |
| Junaid Rahman | California Public Utilities Commission | CEQA Co-Project Manager |
| Laurence Chaset | California Public Utilities Commission | Legal Counsel |
| Jody Noiron | USDA Forest Service | ANF Forest Supervisor |
| Marty Dumpis | USDA Forest Service | ANF Deputy Forest Supervisor |
| Denise Hann | USDA Forest Service | NEPA Coordinator |
| Justin Seastrand | USDA Forest Service | Special Uses Coordinator |
| Kathy Peterson | USDA Forest Service | ANF Acting NEPA Coordinator |
| Sonja Bergdahl | USDA Forest Service | ANF Forest Engineer |
| George Farra | USDA Forest Service | ANF Assistant Forest Engineer |
| Dave Conklin | USDA Forest Service | ANF Forest Fire Management Officer |
| Joe Gonzalez | USDA Forest Service | ANF Physical Science Technician (Hazardous Materials) |
| Paul Gregory | USDA Forest Service | ANF Forest Hydrology |
| Jose Henriquez-Santos | USDA Forest Service | ANF Landscape Architect |
| John Capell | USDA Forest Service | SCMRRD District Ranger |
| Mike McIntyre | USDA Forest Service | LARRD District Ranger |
| Mike McCorison | USDA Forest Service | Zone Air Resource Specialist |
| Nancy Sandburg | USDA Forest Service | ANF Forest Biologist |
| Janet Nickerman | USDA Forest Service | ANF Botanist |
| Leslie Welch | USDA Forest Service | ANF Wildlife Biologist |
| Katherine Van Zant | USDA Forest Service | ANF Botanist |
| Howard Okamoto | USDA Forest Service | LARRD Recreation Officer |

| Name | Agency | Title |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Bruce Quintelier | USDA Forest Service | SGRRD Recreation Officer |
| Mike Roberts | USDA Forest Service | ANF Roads |
| Darrell Vance | USDA Forest Service | ANF Forest Archaeologist |
| Sherry Rollman | USDA Forest Service | ANF Forest Public Affairs Officer |
| Diane Torpin | USDA Forest Service | ANF Fuels Specialist |
| Nathan Sill | USDA Forest Service | ANF Wildlife Biologist |
| Patricia Krueger | USDA Forest Service | ANF Wildlife Biologist |
| Tom Kaucher | USDA Forest Service | ANF Motorized Recreation Specialist |
| L'Tanga Watson | USDA Forest Service | SGRRD District Ranger |
| April Harges | USDA Forest Service | ANF Landscape Architect STEP |

In accordance with CEQA and NEPA (State CEQA Guidelines §15063(d)(6) and 40 CFR 1502.17, Forty Questions No. 27), Table 7-7 provides a list of the persons that prepared, or participated in the preparation of, this EIR/EIS. Also included in Table 7-7 are the qualifications (professional certifications, education, area of expertise, and years of experience) of the individual members of the EIR/EIS team.

| Name | Degree/Expertise (Years of Experience) | Role |
|--|---|---|
| EIR/EIS Prime Contractor | | |
| <i>Aspen Environmental Group (Primary Consultant)</i> | | |
| Jon Davidson, AICP | American Institute of Certified Planners; Master of Urban and Regional Planning; BA Urban Planning (27 years) | Project Manager |
| Negar Vahidi | Master of Public Administration; BA Political Science (16 years) | Deputy Project Manager |
| Lisa Blewitt | BS Chemical Engineering (12 years) | Deputy Project Manager, Project Description and Alternatives Issue Area Coordinator |
| Sandra Alarcón-Lopez | MA Architecture and Urban Planning; BA Speech and Hearing Sciences (25 years) | Public Involvement Manager |
| Chris Huntley | MS Biology; BA Biology (17 years) | Biological Resources Issue Area Coordinator; Development of the TWRA: Biological Resources |
| Jason Ricks | MS Public Health; BS Biology (13 years) | Physical Sciences, Earth & Water Resources Issue Area Coordinator; Traffic and Transportation |
| Vida Strong | Master of Urban Planning; BS Electronics Engineering (22 years) | Development of the TWRA Issue Area Coordinator |
| Sue Walker | MA Applied Geography; BA Physical Geography (19 years) | Social Sciences Issue Area Coordinator; Land Use |
| Shruti Chandra | BA Environmental Studies (10 years) | Development of the TWRA: Geology and Soils, Introduction, Land Use and Planning |
| Scott Debauche | BS Urban & Regional Planning (13 years) | Noise |
| George Hampton | BA Geography; Expert in NEPA Compliance (35 years) | Development of the TWRA: Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Utilities, Wind Development in the TWRA |
| Jacob Hawkins | Master of Environmental Science and Management; BS Biology (9 years) | Agricultural Resources; Environmental Justice |
| Susanne Huerta | Master of Urban Planning; BA Geography (2 years) | Public Services and Utilities; Development of the TWRA: Mineral Resources |
| Jamison Miner | BS Biology (5 years) | Biological Resources; Development of the TWRA: Biological Resources |
| Jennifer Lancaster | MS Biology; BS Biology (7 years) | Biological Resources; Development of the TWRA: Biological Resources |
| Matthew Long | MPP Environmental and Natural Resource Management; BA Comparative Literature (3 years) | Hydrology and Water Quality; Development of the TWRA: Noise, Wilderness and Recreation |

| Table 7-7. EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers | | |
|---|---|---|
| Name | Degree/Expertise (Years of Experience) | Role |
| Aubrey Mescher | Master of Environmental Science and Management; B.A., Environmental Studies and Film Theory (5 years) | Socioeconomics; Wilderness and Recreation; Development of the TWRA: Hydrology and Water Quality |
| Marissa Mitchell | MA Environmental Studies; BS Environmental Sciences (3 years) | Fire Prevention and Suppression |
| Will Walters, PE | PE Chemical Engineering; BS Chemical Engineering; AQ Specialist (22 years) | Air Quality |
| Stanley Yeh | MPA Environmental Policy; BS Environmental Studies (10 years) | Development of the TWRA: Introduction, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Population and Housing, Public Services, Traffic and Transportation, Wind Development in the TWRA |
| Craig Hattori | BA Philosophy; Graphics (17 years) | Computer Graphics; Technical Mapping |
| Anton Kozhevnikov | BS Geography (10 years) | Geographic Information Systems |
| Kati Simpson | BA Geography; Graphics (23 years) | Computer Graphics |
| Judy Spicer | BA English (43 years) | Contracting; Document Production |
| EIR/EIS Subcontractors | | |
| <i>Applied Earthworks, Inc.</i> | | |
| Barry Price | MA Cultural Resource Management; BA Anthropology (33 years) | Cultural Resources |
| Robert Lichtenstein | MA Archaeological Studies; BS Physics (15 years) | Cultural Resources |
| Sarah Wallace | BA Anthropology (9 years) | Cultural Resources |
| David Price | BA Anthropology (3 years) | Cultural Resources |
| Marc Linder | BA Physical Anthropology (19 years) | Cultural Resources |
| Jim Redmoon | AA Anthropology (17 years) | Cultural Resources |
| David Largo | (16 years) | Cultural Resources |
| Robin Mitchell | BA Anthropology (3 years) | Cultural Resources |
| <i>Arellano Associates</i> | | |
| Chester Britt | BA Business Administration (19 years) | Public Involvement |
| Maria Yanez-Forgash | Master of Public Administration; BA Criminal Justice (10 years) | Public Involvement |
| Elsa Argomaniz | AA Business Administration (22 years) | Public Involvement |
| <i>Christopher A. Joseph & Associates</i> | | |
| Shannon Lucas | BS Biology (11 years) | Botany |
| Amy Parravano | BS Ecology and Systematic Biology (13 years) | Botany |
| Emma Jack | PhD Plant Ecotoxicology & Ecology (13 years) | Botany |
| Chad Flynn | BS Aquatic Biology and GIS Certification Program (5 years) | Geographic Information Systems |
| <i>GeoGraphics, Inc.</i> | | |
| Gerald Hughes | BA Geography; Cartographic and GIS (25 years) | Geographic Information Systems |
| Anna Schemper | BS Environmental Science/Biology (3 years) | Geographic Information Systems |
| <i>Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.</i> | | |
| Aurie Patterson | MS Geology; BA Geology (15 years) | Geology, Soils, and Paleontology |
| James Thurber | MS Geology; BS Geology; BA Geography (26 years) | Groundwater and Contamination |
| <i>H.T. Harvey & Associates</i> | | |
| Brian Boroski | PhD Wildland Resource Science; MS Natural Resources; BS Biology (21 years) | Biological Resources |
| Patrick Boursier | PhD Plant Physiology; MS Agronomy and Range Science; BS Biological Sciences (28 years) | Biological Resources |
| Amanda Breen | PhD Plant Biology; BS Botany; BS Biology (7 years) | Biological Resources |
| Howard Clark | MS Biology; BS Biological Sciences (11 years) | Biological Resources |
| Jeff Davis | BS Wildlife and Fisheries Biology (22 years) | Biological Resources |
| Daniel Duke | JD Environmental Law; BA Communications (7 years) | Biological Resources |
| Kelly Hardwicke | PhD Ecology; BA Biology (10 years) | Biological Resources |
| Edward Kentner | PhD Genetics; MA Biology; BS Botany (13 years) | Biological Resources |

| Table 7-7. EIR/EIS Preparers and Reviewers | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| Name | Degree/Expertise (Years of Experience) | Role |
| Sharon Kramer | PhD Marine Biology, MS Zoology, BA Aquatic Biology (25 years) | Biological Resources |
| Marc Meyer | PhD Ecology; MS Biology; BA Environmental Biology (10 years) | Biological Resources |
| Darren Newman | BA Biology (11 years) | Biological Resources |
| Matt Quinn | MS Ecology & Hydrology, BA Geography (11 years) | Biological Resources |
| Jeff Seay | BA Biology (22 years) | Biological Resources |
| Onkar Singh | BS Biology (3 years) | Biological Resources |
| Randy Sisk | MS Biology; BS Biology (18 years) | Biological Resources |
| Dan Stephens | BS Natural Resources (29 years) | Biological Resources |
| <i>Hunt & Associates Biological Consulting Services</i> | | |
| Lawrence Hunt | PhD Candidate Evolutionary Ecology (Herpetology); MS Ecology and Systematics (Herpetology); BS Vertebrate Zoology (Herpetology) (30 years) | Biological Resources |
| <i>Lee Roger Anderson</i> | | |
| Lee Anderson | Master of Landscape Architecture; BS Landscape Architecture (39 years) | Visual Resources |
| Timothy Zack | Bachelor's Degree of Architecture (16 years) | Design Visualization |
| <i>R.W. Beck</i> | | |
| Chuck Williams, PE | PE Civil Engineering; BS Civil Engineering (25 years) | EMFs; Transmission Engineering |
| <i>Scheuerman Consulting</i> | | |
| Paul Scheuerman, PE | PE Electrical Engineering; BS Electrical Engineering (35 years) | Transmission Planning |
| <i>Scott White Biological Consulting</i> | | |
| Scott White | MA Biology; BA Biology (21 years) | Biological Resources |
| Justin Wood | BS Biology (8 years) | Biological Resources |

7.4 Document Distribution List

Notices regarding the availability of environmental documents, such as the NOP, NOI, NOA, and Draft EIR/EIS, were mailed to approximately 15,400 addresses, including regulatory agencies, tribal governments, community organizations, interest groups, and property owners in the vicinity of the proposed Project and alternative routes. Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were distributed to the following agencies and organizations:

Federal Agencies

- Edwards Air Force Base
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- US Environmental Protection Agency
- Caltrans District 7
- Caltrans District 8
- Caltrans District 9
- Native American Heritage Commission
- State Office of Historic Preservation

State Agencies

- Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game
- Calif. Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- Calif. Dept. of Toxic Substances Control
- Calif. Dept. of Water Resources
- Calif. Public Utilities Commission
- Calif. State Park and Recreation Commission
- Calif. Energy Commission

County/Regional Agencies

- Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (AQMD)
- County of Kern, Planning Dept.
- County of San Bernardino, Land Use Services Dept.
- Kern County Air Pollution Control District

- LA County Dept. of Environmental Health
- LA County Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- LA County Dept. of Public Works
- LA County Dept. of Regional Planning
- LA Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- Lahontan RWQCB
- Puente Hills Landfill/Native Habitat Preservation Authority
- San Gabriel and Lower LA Rivers and Mts. Conservancy
- Santa Ana RWQCB
- South Coast AQMD

Local Agencies

- City of Arcadia
- City of Azusa
- City of Baldwin Park
- City of Brea
- City of Chino
- City of Chino Hills
- City of Diamond Bar
- City of Duarte
- City of El Monte
- City of Industry
- City of Irwindale
- City of La Cañada Flintridge
- City of La Habra Heights
- City of Lancaster
- City of Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power
- City of Monrovia
- City of Montebello
- City of Monterey Park
- City of Ontario
- City of Palmdale
- City of Pasadena
- City of Pico Rivera
- City of Rosemead
- City of San Gabriel
- City of San Marino
- City of South El Monte
- City of Temple City
- City of Whittier

Organizations/Interested Parties

- Acton Town Council
- Aerojet – General Corporation
- Goodin, MacBride, Squeri, Day & Lamprey, LLP
- Law Office of J. William Yeates
- Leona Valley Town Council
- William F. Dietrich, Attorney at Law

Public Repositories

USDA, Forest Service, Angeles National Forest (ANF)

- ANF Supervisor's Office
- Santa Clara/Mojave Rivers Ranger Station
- Los Angeles River Ranger District
- San Gabriel River Ranger District

Public Libraries

- Arcadia Public Library
- Azusa Public Library
- Baldwin Park Public Library
- Diamond Bar Public Library
- Duarte Public Library
- El Monte Public Library
- Irwindale Public Library
- James S. Thalman Chino Hills Branch Library
- La Cañada Flintridge Public Library
- Lancaster Regional Public Library
- Monrovia Public Library
- Montebello Public Library
- Monterey Park Bruggemeyer Library
- Ontario Main Library
- Palmdale Public Library
- Pasadena Central Library
- Pico Rivera Public Library
- Rosemead Public Library
- San Gabriel Public Library
- San Marino Public Library
- South El Monte Public Library
- Temple City Public Library
- Whittier Central Library

Southern California Edison (SCE)

- SCE Antelope Service Center
- SCE Covina Service Center
- SCE Monrovia Service Center
- SCE Montebello Service Center
- SCE Ontario Service Center
- SCE Redlands Service Center
- SCE Tehachapi Service Center
- SCE Whittier Service Center